

**IDEA PART B MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT
REDUCTION AND COORDINATED EARLY
INTERVENING SERVICES FOR FEDERAL FISCAL
YEAR 2018 / SCHOOL YEAR 2018–2019**

OSEP Data Documentation

November 2020

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose.....	1
1.2 OSEP Background	1
2.0 IDEA Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Data and Metadata	2
2.1 LEA / ESA Data.....	2
2.2 Definitions	3
3.0 Data Quality	3
3.1 Data Quality Checks	3
3.2 Coordinated Review.....	5
3.3 Suppression	5
3.4 Data Notes	5
4.0 File Structure	5
5.0 Guidance for Using these Data - FAQs	9
6.0 Privacy Protections Used	11
Appendix A	15
Appendix B	17
Appendix C	21

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide information necessary to appropriately use the data file on Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The accompanying data file provides the following information for every local educational agency (LEA) or educational service agency (ESA) that receives a sub-grant under IDEA Section 611 or 619:

- LEA/ESA Allocations which includes the IDEA 611 and 619 allocation amounts for each LEA/ESA in the State/ entity for the reference Federal fiscal year (FFY).
- MOE Reduction which includes the determination under the 34 CFR § 300.600(a)(2) for each LEA/ESA; how much the LEA/ESA reduced of local and/or State/ entity funds taken under Section 613(a)(2)(C) for the reference school year; whether LEAs/ESAs met the MOE compliance standard; and whether funds were returned to the Department of Education for failure to meet MOE compliance standard.
- Provision of CEIS which includes whether each LEA/ESA was required to reserve funds for comprehensive CEIS (CCEIS) due to significant disproportionality during the reference school year and whether each LEA/ESA voluntarily reserved funds for CEIS; for each LEA/ESA that reserved funds for CCEIS or CEIS, the dollar amount that was reserved during the reference school year; additionally, for each LEA/ESA that reserved funds for CCEIS due to significant disproportionality, the reason for which the LEA/ESA was identified for significant disproportionality.
- Number of Children Receiving CEIS which includes the number of children who received CEIS during the reference school year and the number of children who received CEIS at any time during the reference school year and the two preceding school years and received special education and related services during the reference school year.

1.2 OSEP Background

OSEP, within the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), is dedicated to improving results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with

disabilities ages birth through 21 by providing leadership and financial support to assist States/ entities and local districts.

Section 618 of the IDEA requires that each State/ entity submit data about the infants and toddlers, birth through age 2, who receive early intervention services under Part C of IDEA and children with disabilities, ages 3 through 21, who receive special education and related services under Part B of IDEA.

There are 12 data collections authorized under Section 618: under Part B: (1) Child Count; (2) Educational Environments; (3) Personnel; (4) Exiting; (5) Discipline; (6) Assessment; (7) Dispute Resolution; and (8) MOE Reduction and CEIS; and under Part C: (9) Child Count; (10) Settings; (11) Exiting; and (12) Dispute Resolution. These data are collected via an *EDFacts* system (i.e., *EDFacts* Submission System (ESS) or the *EDFacts* Metadata and Process System (*EMAPS*)). Information related to the Section 618 data collected via ESS can be found in the [EDFacts Series - EDFacts Special Education/IDEA 2011-12 Study in the ED Data Inventory](#). Information related to the IDEA Section 618 data collected via *EMAPS* can be found in the [IDEA Section 618 entry in the ED Data Inventory](#). This data documentation deals only with the Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS data collection and file.

2.0 IDEA Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Data and Metadata

2.1 LEA / ESA Data

States/ entities are required to report Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS data under Title 1, Part A, and Subsection 618 of IDEA. States/ entities are required to submit data on every LEA or ESA that received a sub-grant under IDEA Section 611 or 619. **NOTE:** A single ESA may include multiple LEAs.

Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Data comes from one file:

- IDEA Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS

This information is submitted to OSEP via *EMAPS* by the IDEA Part B data managers in each of the 60 IDEA Part B reporting entities.

States/ entities were required to submit FFY 2018/SY 2018-19 data to *EMAPS* no later than June 17, 2020. OSEP reviewed the data for quality issues and provided feedback to States/ entities. States/ entities were given the opportunity to address the data quality issues prior to the data being published. Finalized data were extracted from the *EMAPS* system after 11:59pm ET on September 23, 2020. Please see [Appendix A](#) for the specific date each State/ entity submitted these data.

2.2 Definitions

EMAPS – A Web-based tool used to provide State Education Agencies (SEAs) with an easy method of reporting and maintaining data to (1) meet Federal reporting requirements, and (2) provide information on State/ entity policies, plans, and metadata in order to aid in the analysis of data collected.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) identification number – The 7-character NCES LEA ID number that is used to uniquely identify a school district. These NCES ID numbers are also used to identify LEAs when entering data into the ESS. LEAs or ESAs receiving a 611 or 619 sub-grant that do not have an NCES ID were provided placeholder ID numbers. These placeholder ID numbers are displayed in the following format in the data file: ##F####.

3.0 Data Quality

3.1 Data Quality Checks

OSEP reviews and evaluates the timeliness, completeness, and accuracy of the data submitted by States/ entities to meet the reporting requirements under Section 618 of IDEA. OSEP also conducts year to year change analysis on data submitted by the States/ entities. All timeliness, accuracy, completeness, year-to-year and other data quality concerns data quality checks are outlined in the *EDFacts* Business Rules Single Inventory (BRSI), available on the [EDFacts Initiative](#) website.

3.1.1 Timeliness

OSEP identifies a Section 618 data submission as **timely** if the State/ entity has submitted the required data to the appropriate data submission system (i.e., ESS or EMAPS) on or before the original due date. The due dates for IDEA Section 618 data are:

- The first Wednesday in November for Part B Personnel, Part B Exiting, Part B Discipline, Part B Dispute Resolution, Part C Exiting, and Part C Dispute Resolution data collections.
- The first Wednesday in April for Part B Child Count, Part B Educational Environments, Part C Child Count, and Part C Settings data collections.
- During the third week in December for Part B Assessment data collection. This due date is aligned with the due date for the assessment data reported by States/ entities for the Consolidated State Performance Reports (CSPR).

- The first Wednesday in May for the Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS data collection. **NOTE:** For the FFY 2018/ SY 2018-19 Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS data collection, the due date was adjusted to allow States/ entities additional time to submit these data during the COVID-19 national emergency. Please see [Section 2.1](#) for specific submission dates.

3.1.2 Completeness

OSEP identifies a Section 618 data submission as **complete** if the State/ entity has submitted data for all applicable fields, file specifications, category sets, subtotals, and grand totals for a specific Section 618 data collection. Additionally, OSEP evaluates if the data submitted by the State/ entity match the information in metadata sources such as the *EMAPS* State Supplemental Survey-IDEA and the *EMAPS* Assessment Metadata Survey.

3.1.3 Accuracy

OSEP identifies a Section 618 data submission as **accurate** if the State/ entity has submitted data that meets all the accuracy edit checks for the specific data collection.

3.1.4 Year-to-Year Change Analysis

OSEP also conducts **year-to-year change analysis** in order to determine if there has been a large fluctuation in the counts reported by a State/ entity from year to year. If large changes are identified, OSEP requests that the State/ entity review the data to ensure that the changes are not the result of a data quality issue, and to provide an explanation for the large change in counts if it was not the result of a data quality issue.

3.1.5 Other Data Quality Concerns

For the MOE Reduction and CEIS data collection, OSEP conducts additional data quality checks that are not currently incorporated into the other aspects of the data quality review noted above. These data quality checks indicate situations in which OSEP would like more information on the data provided. States/ entities are asked to provide data notes to explain why their data are triggering these warnings. A list of the data quality checks / warnings for the MOE Reduction and CEIS data collection are provided in [Appendix B](#).

OSEP reviews the data notes and explanations States/ entities provide in relation to the submission of the Section 618 data to better understand if and how the State/ entity is meeting the reporting instructions and requirements for the specific data collection. Many of these data notes and explanations are published in the [Data Notes](#) documents accompanying the IDEA Section 618 data files.

3.2 Coordinated Review

The MOE Reduction and CEIS data were submitted through EMAPS. After the original close date, data experts from OSEP's Research to Practice (RTP) Division and fiscal monitoring experts from OSEP's Monitoring and State Improvement Planning (MSIP) Division conducted a collaborative review of the MOE Reduction and CEIS data submitted by States/ entities. The review included the following areas: timeliness of the data submission, completeness of the data files, accuracy of the data, other data quality concerns, and year to year change analyses. Through the coordinated review, the States/ entities received one set of data quality comments or inquiries associated with the MOE Reduction and CEIS data from OSEP. States/ entities had the opportunity to provide explanations or data notes to address OSEP's data quality inquiries. For States/ entities that had missing or inaccurate data, there were opportunities to resubmit their data files and have them reviewed prior to being published to the public.

3.3 Suppression

OSEP identified data quality concerns and suppressed Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS data for the following States/ entities:

- District of Columbia: Data were suppressed for variables C2A.1 and C2A.2 for CESAR CHAVEZ PCS due to data quality concerns.
- Louisiana: Data were suppressed for variable C2A for Rosenwald Collegiate Academy due to data quality concerns. Data were suppressed for variables C2A.1, C2A.2, C2A.3 and C2A.4 for 60 LEAs/ESAs due to data quality concerns.
- New Jersey: Data were suppressed for variables B3 and B4 for 39 LEAs/ESAs due to data quality concerns.

3.4 Data Notes

States/ entities have the option to provide additional information to OSEP related to the data quality issues or changes. This information has been compiled and accompanies the data files for data users. Please review the [MOE Reduction and CEIS Data Notes](#) document when using the public file.

4.0 File Structure

The following table provides the layout of the Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS file.

Number of Variables: 31

Extraction Date: The date the data were extracted from EMAPS.

Updated: The date changes were made to the text, format or template of the file; if no changes have occurred this line will be blank.

Revised: The date updates were made to the data; if no changes have occurred this line will be blank.

Variable Number	Variable Name	Definition
	Reporting Year	Reference Year
	StateName	State Name
	LEAName	Name of LEA/ESA
	New/Closed LEA/ESA	New - Indicator of new LEA/ESA Closed – Indicator of closed LEA/ESA with some or all data reported NOTE: Closed LEA/ESAs with no data reported are not included in file
	NCESID	National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) identification number NOTE: LEA/ESAs that do not have an NCES ID were provided placeholder ID numbers, displayed in the format of ##F####.
	Year used to make the LEA/ESA/SEA determinations	Which school year’s data was used to make the LEA or ESA determinations that apply to whether the LEA or ESA may, based on FFY 2018 funding, reduce MOE during SY 2018-19 ¹
A2A	Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA FFY 2017 (\$)	Total FFY 2017 allocation of Section 611 funds each LEA or ESA received for FFY 2017 (i.e., funds available on July 1, 2017 and October 1, 2017)
A2B	Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA FFY 2018 (\$)	Total FFY 2018 allocation of Section 611 funds each LEA or ESA received for FFY 2018 (i.e., funds available July 1, 2018 and October 1, 2018)
A2C	Increase in LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 from FFY 2017 to FFY 2018 (\$)	Dollar amount increase in the total allocation of Section 611 funds from FFY 2017 to FFY 2018 for each LEA or ESA. See Appendix C for information regarding how this figure was calculated.
A3B	Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 619 of IDEA FFY 2018 (\$)	Total FFY 2018 allocation of Section 619 funds each LEA or ESA received for FFY 2018 (i.e., funds available July 1, 2018).
A4	Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and 619 of IDEA for FFY 2018 (\$)	Sum of the total dollar amounts of Section 611 and 619 allocations from FFY 2018 for each LEA or ESA. See Appendix C for information regarding how this figure was calculated.

¹ For SEAs that have only 1 LEA/ESA, the determination year and determination reported in this data file reflect their SEA determination.

Variable Number	Variable Name	Definition
A5	15% of the total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and 619 of IDEA for FFY 2018 (\$)	This figure represents 15% of the total (combined) dollar amount of Section 611 and 619 allocations from FFY 2018 for each LEA or ESA. See Appendix C for information regarding how this figure was calculated.
B2	Determination under 34 CFR 300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able to reduce MOE during SY 2018-19	Determination under 34 CFR § 300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able, based on FFY 2018 funding, to reduce MOE during SY 2018-19. Determinations should be specified as one of the following: meets the requirements and purposes of Part B; needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B; needs intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B; or needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B. ²
B3	Reduction of local and/or State funds taken pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C) by the LEA/ESA during SY 2018-19 (\$)	Dollar (\$) amount that each LEA or ESA reduced local, or State and local, expenditures under the IDEA MOE provision in IDEA §613(a) (2) (C) during SY 2018-19.
B4	Percent of the available reduction taken by LEA /ESA during SY 2018-19 (%)	This figure represents the percent of the available MOE reduction that the LEA or ESA took during SY 2018-19. See Appendix C for information regarding how this figure was calculated.
B5	Did the State determine whether the LEA/ESA met the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2018/SY 2018-19? (Y/N)	Whether the State determined whether the LEA or ESA met the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2018/SY 2018-19.
B6	Did the LEA/ESA meet the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2018/SY 2018-19? (Y/N)	Whether each LEA or ESA met the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2018/SY 2018-19.
B7	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 the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2018/SY 2018-19? (Y/N)	Whether the State returned non-Federal funds to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2018/SY 2018-19 by the date of the State's data submission.
B8	What amount of non-Federal funds did the State return to the Department based on the failure of	Dollar (\$) amount that the State returned to the Department based on the failure of the

² For SEAs that have only 1 LEA/ESA, the determination year and determination reported in this data file reflect their SEA determination.

Variable Number	Variable Name	Definition
	the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2018/SY 2018-19? (\$)	LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in FFY 2018/SY 2018-19.
C2A	Required CEIS Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2018-19? (Y/N)	Whether each LEA or ESA was required to use 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 funds for CCEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2018-19.
C2A.1	Required CEIS Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'identification as a child with a disability'? (Y/N)	Whether each LEA or ESA that was required to use IDEA funds for CCEIS did so because they were identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'identification as a child with a disability' in SY 2018-19.
C2A.2	Required CEIS Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'identification by disability category'? (Y/N)	Whether each LEA or ESA that was required to use IDEA funds for CCEIS did so because they were identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'identification by disability category' in SY 2018-19.
C2A.3	Required CEIS Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'placement in a particular educational setting'? (Y/N)	Whether each LEA or ESA that was required to use IDEA funds for CCEIS did so because they were identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'placement in a particular educational setting' in SY 2018-19.
C2A.4	Required CEIS Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'disciplinary action'? (Y/N)	Whether each LEA or ESA that was required to use IDEA funds for CCEIS did so because they were identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'disciplinary action' in SY 2018-19.
C2B	Required CEIS Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA in SY 2018-19 (\$)	Dollar (\$) amount that was reserved for CCEIS in each LEA or ESA that was required to use IDEA funds for CCEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2018-19
C2C	Required CEIS Percent taken for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA in SY 2018-19 (%)	The figure represents the percent of IDEA funds that the LEA or ESA was required to reserve for CCEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2018-19. This figure was calculated using the dollar amounts from Column C2B, Column A2B, and Column A3B. See Appendix C for information regarding how this figure was calculated.
C3A	Voluntary CEIS Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up	Whether the LEA or ESA voluntarily used up to 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 funds for CEIS in SY 2018-19

Variable Number	Variable Name	Definition
	to 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 fund for CEIS in SY 2018-19? (Y/N)	
C3B	Voluntary CEIS Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS in SY 2018-19 (\$)	Dollar (\$) amount of funds reserved for voluntary CEIS during SY 2018-19
C3C	Voluntary CEIS Percent taken for voluntary CEIS during SY 2018-19 (%)	The figure represents the percent of IDEA funds that the LEA or ESA used for voluntary CEIS during SY 2018-19. This figure was calculated using dollar amounts from Column C3B, Column A2B, and Column A3B. See Appendix C for information regarding how this figure was calculated.
D2	Total number of children receiving CEIS under the IDEA in the LEA/ESA during SY 2018-19	Total number of children who received CEIS under IDEA at any point during the course of the reporting year. NOTE: These counts include only children who received CEIS that was supported by the LEA/ESA voluntarily reserving funds for this purpose. ³
D3	Total number of children who received CEIS under the IDEA anytime in the past two school years (including SY 2016-17, SY 2017-18 and SY 2018-19) and received special education and related services in SY 2018-19	Total number of children who received CEIS under IDEA anytime in the past two school years (including SY 2016-17, 2017-18, and SY 2018-19) and received special education and related services in 2018-19. NOTE: These counts include only children who received CEIS that was supported by the LEA/ESA voluntarily reserving funds for this purpose. ³

5.0 Guidance for Using these Data - FAQs

What is the primary use of this information?

The IDEA Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Collection provides the following information for every LEA or ESA that receives an IDEA Section 611 or 619 sub-grant:

- LEA/ESA Allocations which includes the IDEA 611 and 619 allocation amounts for each LEA/ESA in the State/ entity for the reference FFY.
- MOE Reduction which includes the determination under the 34 CFR § 300.600(a)(2) for each LEA/ESA; how much the LEA/ESA reduced of local

³ Starting with the FFY 2018/ SY 2018-19 MOE Reduction and CEIS data, States were instructed to report 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, under D2 and D3.

and/or State/ entity funds taken under Section 613(a)(2)(C) for the reference school year; whether LEAs/ESAs met the MOE compliance standard; and whether funds were returned to the Department of Education for failure to meet MOE compliance standard.

- Provision of CEIS which includes whether each LEA/ESA was required to reserve funds for comprehensive CEIS (CCEIS) due to significant disproportionality during the reference school year and whether each LEA/ESA voluntarily reserved for funds for CEIS; for each LEA/ESA that reserved funds for CCEIS or CEIS, the dollar amount that was reserved during the reference school year; additionally, for each LEA/ESA that reserved funds for CCEIS due to significant disproportionality, the reason for which the LEA/ESA was identified for significant disproportionality.
- Number of Children Receiving CEIS which includes the number of children who received CEIS during the reference school year and the number of children who received CEIS at any time during the reference school year and the two preceding school years and received special education and related services during the reference school year.

The data collected using this survey is authorized by the IDEA, Section 618.

These data were previously reported in Table 8, "Report on IDEA Part B Maintenance of Effort Reduction (34 CFR §300.205(a)) and Coordinated Early Intervening Services (34 CFR §300.226)."

The data are also used for monitoring the programs and activities under IDEA, reported in OSEP's Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of IDEA, and used to respond to ad hoc requests for internal and external stakeholders.

Are all States/ entities required to submit the IDEA Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Report via EMAPS for FFY 2018/SY 2018-19?

Yes. This data file includes all 50 States plus the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Bureau of Indian Education, outlying areas and freely associated States (American Samoa, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas and Palau).

What reporting year will this data collection cover?

The LEA/ESA allocations reported in the IDEA Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Report represent both FFY 2017 and FFY 2018. FFY 2017 includes Section 611 funds available on July 1, 2017 and October 1, 2017. FFY 2018 includes Section 611 funds available on July 1, 2018 and October 1, 2018 and Section 619 funds available on July 1, 2018. The other data elements represent SY 2018-19. The

count of children receiving CEIS should cover an entire year.

6.0 Privacy Protections Used

Beginning in August 2012, the US Department of Education established a Disclosure Review Board (DRB) to review proposed data releases by the Department's program offices (e.g., OSEP) through a collaborative technical assistance process so that the Department releases as much useful data as possible, while protecting the privacy of individuals and the confidentiality of their data, as required by law.

The DRB worked with OSEP to develop appropriate disclosure avoidance plans for the purposes of the Section 618 data releases that are derived from data protected by The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and IDEA and to help prevent the unauthorized disclosure of personally identifiable information in OSEP's public IDEA Section 618 data file releases.

The DRB applied the FERPA standard for de-identification to assess whether a "reasonable person in the school community who does not have personal knowledge of the relevant circumstances" could identify individual students in tables with small size cells (34 CFR §99.3 and §99.31(b)(1)). The "reasonable person" standard was used to determine whether the data have been sufficiently redacted prior to release such that a "reasonable person" (i.e., a hypothetical, rational, prudent, average individual) in the school community would not be able to identify a student with any reasonable certainty. School officials, including teachers, administrators, coaches, and volunteers, are not considered in making the reasonable person determination since they are presumed to have inside knowledge of the relevant circumstances and of the identity of the students.

For each LEA/ESA that receives an IDEA 611 or 619 sub-grant from the State/ entity, the following data elements are reported:

1. IDEA section 611 allocation amount (in \$)
2. IDEA section 619 allocation amount (in \$)
3. the LEA determination (i.e., meets the requirements and purposes of Part B; needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B; needs intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B; or needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B)
4. the amount of local and/or State/ entity funds reduced under Section 613(a)(2)(C) (i.e., MOE reduction) (in \$)
5. Did the State/ entity determine whether the LEA/ESA met the MOE compliance standard in the reference year? (responses - Yes/No)
 - a. If yes, did the LEA/ESA meet the MOE compliance standard in the reference year? (responses - Yes/No)
 - i. If no, by the date of this data submission, did the State/ entity return non-Federal funds to the Department based on the failure of the

LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in the reference year? (responses - Yes/No)

1. If yes, what amount of non-Federal funds did the State/entity return to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in the reference year? (in \$)
6. whether the LEA/ESA was required to reserve funds for CEIS (responses – Yes/No)
 - If yes, whether the LEA/ESA was identified as having a significant disproportionality due to ‘identification as a child with a disability’ (Yes/No)
 - If yes, whether the LEA/ESA was identified as having a significant disproportionality due to ‘identification by disability category’ (Yes/No)
 - If yes, whether the LEA/ESA was identified as having a significant disproportionality due to ‘placement in a particular educational setting’ (Yes/No)
 - If yes, whether the LEA/ESA was identified as having a significant disproportionality due to ‘disciplinary action’ (Yes/No)
 - If yes, the amount reserved (in \$)
7. Whether the LEA/ESA voluntarily reserved funds for CEIS (responses – Yes/No)
 - If yes, the amount reserved (in \$)
8. Total number of children receiving CEIS under IDEA within the school year
9. Total number of children who received CEIS anytime in the past two school years and received special education and related services in this school year

The DRB has determined that the fiscal data from which data elements 1-7 are derived are not subject to the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, 5 U.S.C. § 552a, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, 20 U.S.C. § 1232g, or the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1417(c). Further, none of the data were collected under a “pledge of confidentiality,” which could trigger privacy protections under other Federal laws including the provisions of the Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002, 44 U.S.C. 3501 note, and that none of the data were collected by the Institute of Education Sciences, which could subject the data to Section 183 of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, 20 U.S.C. § 9573.

The data from which data elements 8-9 are derived are “education records” within the meaning of The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (20 U.S.C. § 1417c; 34 CFR § 300.610 & 34 CFR § 300.611) and are therefore protected by FERPA and IDEA.

Data elements 1-7:

Because these data elements are not protected by any confidentiality or privacy statutes, no privacy protections are required.

CEIS Child Count (data element 8):

CEIS funds can be used (1) to provide services to individual students, a classroom or multiple classrooms of students, or an entire school; and/or (2) to provide professional development to teachers. In the case of providing professional development, all the students working with that teacher would be counted as “receiving CEIS” (regardless of the students’ need for special education or related services).

Because the definition of this data element includes all students of those teachers receiving professional development under CEIS, this child count represents an estimate and may not directly correspond to either the actual number of students who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services and who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment (i.e., students in need of receiving CEIS services) nor to the number of students in special education in the LEA. Consequently, because of the broad definition and the fact that these data are presented at the LEA level without being disaggregated by any other characteristics (i.e., they are not broken down by race, sex, or type of disability), the DRB has determined that the risk of disclosure is negligible and that no additional privacy protections are required for this data element.

2-year cumulative CEIS and Special Education Child Count (data element 9):

The definition of this data element includes students with disabilities who received CEIS in the past 2 years and were identified for special education and related services during the reference year. This number could be higher or lower than the count of students with disabilities receiving special education and related services in the district, as reported in the Child Count data, for the reference year. The Child Count data are snapshot counts taken on the State/ entity-designated child count date. The total count of students with disabilities receiving special education and related services in the district, as reported in the Child Count data, could be **higher** than this count because there could be students with disabilities receiving special education and related services that did not receive CEIS. The total count of students with disabilities receiving special education and related services in the district, as reported in the Child Count data, could be **lower** than this count because this count is a cumulative count which is collected throughout the school year. Consequently,

because this count does not directly correspond to the number of students with disabilities and the fact that these data are presented at the LEA level without being disaggregated by any other characteristics (i.e., they are not broken down by race, sex, or type of disability), the DRB has determined that the risk of disclosure is negligible and that no additional privacy protections are required for this data element.

Appendix A

Date of the Last State/ Entity Level Submission to EMAPS

State/ Entity	Submission Date for the FFY 2018/SY 2018-19 MOE Reduction & CEIS Data
Alabama	6/16/2020
Alaska	6/04/2020
American Samoa	4/09/2020
Arizona	9/23/2020
Arkansas	9/01/2020
Bureau of Indian Education	6/16/2020
California	9/16/2020
Colorado	4/15/2020
Connecticut	4/24/2020
Delaware	6/16/2020
District of Columbia	9/23/2020
Federated States of Micronesia	4/23/2020
Florida	9/17/2020
Georgia	9/08/2020
Guam	4/22/2020
Hawaii	5/20/2020
Idaho	6/14/2020
Illinois	6/17/2020
Indiana	8/24/2020
Iowa	9/17/2020
Kansas	8/24/2020
Kentucky	6/08/2020
Louisiana	9/23/2020
Maine	9/22/2020
Maryland	9/23/2020
Massachusetts	9/23/2020
Michigan	8/24/2020
Minnesota	9/23/2020
Mississippi	9/17/2020
Missouri	9/18/2020
Montana	8/24/2020
Nebraska	9/21/2020
Nevada	9/02/2020
New Hampshire	9/01/2020
New Jersey	9/08/2020
New Mexico	9/23/2020
New York	9/23/2020
North Carolina	9/01/2020
North Dakota	9/17/2020
Northern Marianas	4/07/2020
Ohio	9/20/2020

State/ Entity	Submission Date for the FFY 2018/SY 2018-19 MOE Reduction & CEIS Data
Oklahoma	6/11/2020
Oregon	4/06/2020
Pennsylvania	9/23/2020
Puerto Rico	6/16/2020
Republic of Palau	6/11/2020
Republic of the Marshall Islands	5/04/2020
Rhode Island	9/23/2020
South Carolina	9/23/2020
South Dakota	9/22/2020
Tennessee	9/22/2020
Texas	9/10/2020
Utah	6/15/2020
Vermont	6/15/2020
Virgin Islands	9/17/2020
Virginia	8/24/2020
Washington	9/23/2020
West Virginia	6/16/2020
Wisconsin	9/18/2020
Wyoming	6/17/2020

- Data not submitted

Appendix B

Warning Messages

Column	Warning Message
A2A A2B	A warning will be written to the final report when column A2A or A2B contain either a zero or 'NA'.
A3B ⁴	A warning will be written to the final report when column A3B contains either a zero or 'NA'. If the NCESID for the LEA/ESA can be found in FS039 DG18, the warning shall only fire if the LEA/ESA offers PK or K in FS039 DG18.
A2A A2B A3B ⁴	A warning will be written to the final report when column A2A, A2B, or A3B contain an M.
A2C B3	A warning will be written to the final report when column A2C (increase in LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 of IDEA) is less than or equal to 0 and column B3 (reduction of local and/or State funds taken pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C)) is greater than 0.
B2	A warning will be written to the final report when 'NA' is the value for column B2 (specify the determination under 34 CFR§300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able to reduce MOE).
B2	A warning will be written to the final report when 'M' is the value for column B2 (specify the determination under 34 CFR§300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able to reduce MOE).
B2 B3	A warning will be written to the final report when column B2 (specify the determination under 34 CFR §300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able to reduce MOE) is not equal '1' and column B3 (reduction of local and/or State funds taken pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C)) is greater than 0.
B3	A warning shall be written to the final report when M is the value for column B3 (Reduction of local and/or State funds pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C) by the LEA/ESA).
B3 C3B	A warning shall be written to the final report when column B3 (reduction of local and/or State funds taken pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C)) is greater than zero and C3B (Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS) is greater than zero.
B4	A warning will be written to the final report when the percent available reduction taken by the LEA/ESA (B4) is greater than 100%.
B5	A warning will be written to the final report when 'M' is the value for column B5 (Did the State determine whether the LEA/ESA met the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?).
B5 B6	A warning will be written to the final report when column B5 (Did the State determine whether the LEA/ESA met the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?) is Yes and column B6 (Did the LEA/ESA meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year]?) is 'M' or 'NA'.
B5	A warning will be written to the final report when column B5 (Did the State

⁴ The Warnings "A3B = 0 or NA" and "A3B = M" are applicable only to the 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

Column	Warning Message
B6 B7 B8	determine whether the LEA/ESA met the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]) is No, 'M' or 'NA' and columns B6 (Did the LEA/ESA meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]), B7 (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 the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]) and B8 (What amount of non-Federal funds did the State return to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]) are not all 'M' or 'NA'
B6	A warning will be written to the final report when 'M' is the value for column B6 (Did the LEA/ESA meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]).
B6 B7 B8	A warning will be written to the final report when column B6 (Did the LEA/ESA meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]) is Yes, 'M' or 'NA' and columns B7 (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 the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]) and B8 (What amount of non-Federal funds did the State return to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]) are not both 'M' or 'NA'
B6 B7	A warning will be written to the final report when column B6 (Did the LEA/ESA meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]) is No and column B7 (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 the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]) is 'M' or 'NA'
B7	A warning will be written to the final report when 'M' is the value for column B7 (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 the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]).
B7 B8	A warning will be written to the final report when column B7 (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 the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]) is Yes and column B8 (What amount of non-Federal funds did the State return to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]) is 'M' or 'NA'
B7 B8	A warning will be written to the final report when column B7 (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 the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]) is No and column B8 (What amount of non-Federal funds did the State return to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]) is not 'NA'
B8	A warning will be written to the final report when 'M' is the value for column B8 (What amount of non-Federal funds did the State return to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]).
B8 A4	A warning will be written to the final report when column B8 (What amount of non-Federal funds did the State return to the Department based on the failure of the LEA/ESA to meet the MOE compliance standard in [the reference year?]) is

Column	Warning Message
	greater than column A4 (Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and 619 of IDEA for [the reference year] (\$))
C2A	A warning shall be written to the final report when 'M' is the value for column C2A (Required CEIS Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality).
C2A A5 C2B	A warning will be written to the final report when column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) is YES and the absolute value of the difference between column A5 (15% of the total LEA/ESA allocation for Sections 611 and 619 for [the reference year]) and column C2B (Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA) is \geq \$10.
C2A B3	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was "Yes" and column B3 (reduction of local and/or State funds taken pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C)) is greater than 0.
C2A	A warning shall be written to the final report when C2A is YES, and none of the following are YES: C2A.1; C2A.2; C2A.3; and C2A.4.
C2A C3A	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was "Yes" and Column C3A (Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up 15% of IDEA 611 or 619 fund for CEIS) was "Yes".
C2A C2B	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was "Yes" and column C2B (Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA) was zero, NA, or M.
C2A C2A1 C2A2 C2A3 C2A4	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was 'No', 'NA' or 'M' and C2A.1 (Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'identification as a child with a disability'?), C2A.2 (Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'identification by disability category?'), C2A.3 (Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'placement in a particular educational setting?') and/or C2A.4 (Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'disciplinary action?') was "Yes".
C2A C2B	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was No, NA, or M and column C2B (Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA) was greater than zero.
C2A C2B A5	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was No, NA, or M, column C2B (Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA) was greater than zero and the absolute value of the difference between column A5 (15% of the total LEA/ESA allocation for Sections 611 and 619) and column C2B (Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA) is \geq \$10.
C2A	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the

Column	Warning Message
C3A D2	LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was “No”, “M” or “NA” and Column C3A (Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up 15% of IDEA 611 or 619 fund for CEIS) was “No” or “M” and column D2 (total number of children who received CEIS during reference period) is greater than zero.
C2A.1 C2A.2 C2A.3 C2A.4 C2B C3A C3B D2 D3	A warning will be written to the final report when column C2A.1, C2A.2, C2A.3, C2A.4, C2B, C3A, C3B, D2 or D3 contain an ‘M’.
C2B C3B	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2B (Required CEIS Amount reserved for required CEIS) was greater than zero, and column C3B (Voluntary CEIS Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS) was greater than zero.
C3A C3B	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C3A (Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up 15% of IDEA 611 or 619 fund for CEIS) was “Yes” and column C3B (Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS) was zero, M or NA.
C3A A5 C3B	A warning will be written to the final report when column C3A (Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 fund for CEIS) is YES and column C3B (Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS) minus column A5 (15% of the total LEA/ESA allocation for Sections 611 and 619) is >=\$10.
C3A D2	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C3A (Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up 15% of IDEA 611 or 619 fund for CEIS) was “Yes” and column D2 (Total number of children receiving CEIS under the IDEA in the LEA/ESA) was zero, M, or NA.
C3A C3B	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C3A (Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up 15% of IDEA 611 or 619 fund for CEIS) was No, M or NA and column C3B (Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS) was greater than zero.

Appendix C

Auto-Calculations Performed by the EMAPS System

Column	Calculation
A2C	The value for column A2C (Increase in LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 from [previous year] to [reference year] (\$)) is calculated by subtracting column A2A (Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA [previous year] (\$)) from column A2B (Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA [reference year] (\$)).
A4	The value for column A4 (Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and 619 of IDEA for [reference year] (\$)) is calculated by adding the total dollar values of columns A2B (Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA [reference year] (\$)) and A3B (Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 619 of IDEA [reference year] (\$)).
A5	The value for column A5 (15% of the total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and 619 of IDEA for [reference year] (\$)) is calculated by taking the total dollar amount for column A4 (Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and 619 of IDEA for [reference year] (\$)), multiplying by .15 and rounding the result to two decimal places.
B4	The value for column B4 (Percent of the available reduction taken by LEA/ESA during [reference year] (%)) is calculated by subtracting column A2A (Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA [previous year] (\$)) from A2B (Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA [reference year] (\$)) and multiplying the difference by 50%. Divide column B3 (Reduction of local and/or State funds taken pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C) by the LEA/ESA during [reference year] (\$)) by the product obtained, multiply by 100 and round the result to two decimal places. If A2B minus A2A is a negative value, “+” will appear in the data file for B4.
C2C	The value for column C2C (Required CEIS Percent taken for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA in [reference year] (\$)) is calculated by taking the value in column C2B (Required CEIS Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA in [reference year] (\$)) and dividing it by the value in A4 (Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and 619 of IDEA for [reference year] (\$)), multiplying by 100 and rounding the result to two decimal places.
C3C	The value for column C3C (Voluntary CEIS Percent taken for voluntary CEIS during [reference year] (%)) is calculated by taking the value in column C3B (Voluntary CEIS Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS in [reference year] (\$)) and dividing it by the value in A4 (Total LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 and 619 of IDEA for [reference year] (\$)), multiplying by 100 and rounding the result to two decimal places.

NOTE: Values reported as “M” (i.e., missing) and NA (i.e., not applicable) are considered 0 in auto-calculations.