

Data Notes for IDEA, Part C

Early Intervention Service Settings

Alabama—Alabama reported 15 infants and toddlers in the other settings category. The state does not collect data on the types of settings that are reported in the other settings category.

Alaska—Alaska reported five infants and toddlers in the other settings category, but did not specify what types of settings are counted as other.

Arizona—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in parks, libraries, and community centers.

Arkansas—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in locations with a babysitter or grandparents and the library or church.

California—California developed less-institutional options (than acute care hospitals) for children with intense medical needs. This resulted in some changes in the California data. The children reported in the settings category programs designed for children with developmental delays and disabilities include children served in pediatric subacute care facilities and in ICF/DD-Nursing facilities. The programs are individually designed for these children. The children reported in the hospital category are primarily infants and toddlers in neonatal intensive care units. The children reported in the residential facilities setting are primarily children served at specially licensed community care facilities for those with special health care needs. Because this is the first year that complete residential data are available, the number of children reported in this category is not comparable with last year's data. That is, the increase in the use of this category is artificial. States vary considerably in the degree to which they license health facilities. Some states do not license acute hospitals, NICU, SNF or ICF. Other states like California have many specialized licensing categories. Licensing rules in California require residential facilities to provide all active treatment; thus they are responsible for IFSP components. These facilities must provide all services available to the child and family and cannot be replaced by another service provider.

The increase in the number of children served in the home is attributable to a variety of factors. First, in an effort to serve children in natural environments, the state shifted from serving children in a service provider location to serving them in the home. Second, there was a 10% increase in the number of children served by California's Part C programs. Most of these children are primarily served in the home.

Colorado—In Colorado, 217 children with IFSPs had no services listed on their IFSP. Because, without services, the state could not determine primary setting, these children were excluded from the state's settings count. The state identified five scenarios for why children do not have services listed on their IFSPs. First, there was no paid service, other than service coordination, on

the IFSP. Second, some families do receive services, but they are not paid for using IDEA funds. Third, some children previously received services, but no longer need them. A service coordinator still follows up on these children because their families do not want them to exit Part C before age 3. Fourth, some children went through the evaluation process, established eligibility, may have received services, but are currently only receiving service coordination. Fifth, the state has data it thinks may be incorrect and will have to be recoded. It is examining these data now, and if this is the case, the state will send a revision when the data are corrected.

The number of children with no services on the IFSP declined this year. Last year, 475 children had no services listed and were, therefore, excluded from the settings count.

Connecticut—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in the offices of child protective services.

Delaware—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in a childcare facility for medically fragile children.

District of Columbia—The District of Columbia attributes the increase in the number of children reported in the programs designed for developmental delay category and the decrease in the number of children reported in the programs designed for typically developing children category to a better understanding of the reporting requirements. The District reported that this understanding was a direct result of clarifications provided at OSEP's 2003 data managers' meeting. At the data meeting, OSEP made clear that to count as a program for typically developing children, the majority of children enrolled in the program must be children who do not have a disability. Previously, the District used a broader definition. It reported children in the program designed for typically developing children category if the child was in a childcare subsidy program that enrolled at least some children who were typically developing. Beginning in 2002, the District only reported children in the programs for typically developing children category if the majority of the children in the program are typically developing.

Florida—Florida reported 916 infants and toddlers in the other settings category, but did not specify what type of settings are counted as other.

Georgia—Georgia estimated race/ethnicity for 156 children who had an unknown race/ethnicity or multiple race/ethnicities.

Hawaii—The number of children reported by setting increased in 2002 because the number of children eligible for Part C services increased that year. Because Asian/Pacific Islander is the majority race/ethnicity group, the increase in the number of Asian/Pacific Islander children reported by setting is also due to the increase in the child count.

Children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily at parks, beaches, preschool, and a grandparent's house.

Idaho—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in a parent’s workplace, drug rehabilitation center, or an informal parent-sponsored community play group for children with disabilities, such as in a neighbor’s garage.

Illinois—Illinois used payment data, not the IFSP, to determine primary setting.

Illinois reported children served in community centers, YMCAs, park districts, fast food restaurants, and other community settings in programs designed for typically developing children. This is inconsistent with OSEP’s reporting instructions.

Illinois’ EI program does not authorize the receipt of services in a hospital (in-patient) or residential facility. Therefore, no children are reported in these settings. Due to a data error, children were counted in these categories last year.

The children reported in the other settings category include children who only received transportation services.

Indiana—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in churches, community centers, and restaurants.

Indiana attributes the decrease in the number of children reported in the other settings category to coding errors.

Iowa—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in a neighborhood school and daycare provider’s home.

Kansas—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in daycare settings.

Kentucky—Kentucky’s data collection system includes only two types of service settings categories: Home/Community-based and Office/Center-based. Of those children reported in the Office/Center-based category, some actually received services in settings designed for children with developmental delays, and others received services in settings for typically developing children. The state explained the decrease in the number of children reported in the program designed for children with developmental delays or disabilities settings category and the increase in the number of children reported in the service provider location category to a change in how it reports children classified in the state system as receiving services in the Office/Center-based category. Last year, these children were reported in the OSEP category programs designed for children with developmental delays or disabilities. This year, they are reported in the service provider location category.

Louisiana—Louisiana reported 52 infants and toddlers in the other settings category, but did not specify what type of settings are counted as other.

Maine—Maine reported 60 infants and toddlers in the other settings category, but did not specify what type of settings are counted as other.

Maryland—Maryland estimated race/ethnicity for 306 children who had an unknown race/ethnicity or multiple races/ethnicities. Of these children, 36 were reported in the category programs designed for children with developmental delays; 17 were reported in the category programs for typically developing children; 249 were reported in the home category; and 4 were reported in the service provider location category.

Massachusetts—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in parent groups.

Michigan—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in restaurants and similar locations chosen by the parents.

Minnesota—Minnesota reported seven infants and toddlers in the other settings category, but did not specify what type of settings are counted as other.

Mississippi—Mississippi reported 83 infants and toddlers in the other settings category, but did not specify what type of settings are counted as other.

Until 2002, the state did not report children in the programs designed for children with developmental delay or disabilities category. However, children were actually served in this category, but service coordinators were uncertain of what this category was, and therefore did not count the children in it. The state's implementation of its computerized data system in 2001 was followed by trainings to clarify the definitions of the category. As a result, the state is now counting children in this category.

Missouri—Missouri reported 254 children in the other settings category. These are children for whom the state could not determine primary setting. Of these 254 children, 151 did not have primary setting information because the information was lost when the state converted to a new system or the information about services received was unavailable. The remaining 103 children only received services such as service coordination or transportation. Because Missouri bases primary setting on services received, and not on all early intervention services on the IFSP, there was no setting information for these services. The state suspects that many of the children with an unknown primary service setting actually received services primarily in the home, but it cannot confirm this. As of September 2003, the primary setting field in the data system is now a required element, and the state expects fewer unknown settings reported in future data reports.

Montana—The child reported in the other settings category includes the child and his/her family receiving early intervention services primarily in a hospital.

Nevada—In 2002, the number of children reported in the service provider location category decreased by 92.78%. Nevada attributes the decrease in the number of children reported in the service provider location category to better data reporting. In 2002, state Part C staff provided

technical assistance to local providers on how to correctly code this data field. The state believes that, prior to the technical assistance, providers used the service provider category incorrectly.

New Hampshire—New Hampshire reported two infants and toddlers in the other settings category, but did not specify what types of settings are counted as other.

New Jersey—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in a parent's workplace.

New Mexico—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in various locations in the community.

New York—The increase in New York's settings data for 2002 is the result of an increase in the child count for that year. The child count increased as a result of the September 11th attack on the World Trade Center. The attack improved data entry, shortened duration to IFSP, and an increased rate of referral.

New York's 2002 settings data include 4,013 children over age 3 who were enrolled in the Early Intervention Program.

New York estimated race/ethnicity for 11,697 children (32% of its child count) who had an unknown race/ethnicity or multiple races/ethnicities.

New York reported 1,057 infants and toddlers in the other settings category, but did not specify what types of settings are counted as other.

North Carolina—North Carolina does not know what settings are included in the other settings category. The state also reported that children enrolled in Head Start are reported in the settings category programs designed for typically developing children.

Ohio—In 2002, Ohio reported more children in all but three settings categories than were reported in 2001. The increase in the other settings category is because 1,297 children reported in the 2001 child count were not reported by setting. In 2002, all children reported in the child count are also reported by setting. Under the current data collection system, setting is now a required data element.

The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in childcare centers, child protective services, and temporary shelters. In Ohio, children who receive any non-early intervention services are reported in the other setting. For example, children or families who received clothing, drug/alcohol counseling, education and employment assistance, financial, housing and legal assistance, rehabilitation services or recreational/social services were reported in the other settings category. These infants and toddlers also received early intervention services.

Oklahoma—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in community centers (6), parent's work (2),

daycare/preschool, (52), Head Start (22), churches/synagogues (7) and other unspecified settings (24).

Oklahoma attributes the increase in the number of American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic children and families reported by settings to an increase in these groups in their child count. The number of children receiving early intervention services who are from these racial/ethnic groups is the result of a statewide public awareness/child find effort that focused on reaching these populations. This outreach included the development of culturally and linguistically appropriate public awareness materials to these three racial/ethnic communities.

Oklahoma reported three fewer children by primary setting than were reported in the 2002 child count. The data entry errors may be because the state's database only collects primary setting. This restriction conflicts with the providers' efforts to provide services in the environment appropriate to each goal/outcome. Providers want to report all service settings, which can result in duplicate environments reported.

Oregon—Oregon reported two infants and toddlers in the other settings category. The state does not collect data on what types of settings are reported in the other settings category.

Pennsylvania—Pennsylvania attributes the decreases in the reported number of children in the programs for typically developing children category and in the other settings category to improved opportunities for children and families to receive supports and services in natural environments. In addition, many families request to receive supports and services in their home.

The current data system includes a limited number of community settings where children and families receive early intervention services. Children and families served in these community settings are reported to OSEP in the home category. These community settings include the home of a relative, the neighborhood playground, and other community settings.

The state explained the increase in the number of Asian/Pacific Islander children reported to an increase in child find activities.

Pennsylvania reported seven infants and toddlers in the other settings category, but did not specify what types of settings are counted as other.

Rhode Island—The children reported by setting include some children over 3 years of age (2.2% of the count). These children were reported in the age category for children ages 2-3 years.

Rhode Island estimated race/ethnicity for 134 infants/toddlers (10.6% of the total) who had an unknown race ethnicity or multiple race/ethnicities.

In Rhode Island, the IFSP form does not currently include a place to describe other settings locations. However, the services rendered form (SRF) does include a place to describe other settings locations. The SRF is completed by service providers at the time the services are delivered. Unfortunately, the settings codes used on the IFSP and the codes used on the SRF are not parallel. In future, the other location category will not be available. The other category was

used less in 2002 than in the past. The state believes this decline is because settings categories were more clearly defined for service providers.

Based on the SRF, children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in a court, daycare, library, pool, school department, professional office building, or similar environment.

South Dakota—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in a park or at the YMCA.

South Dakota attributes the increase in the number of American Indian/Alaskan Native children in its settings count to improved child find efforts. Child find efforts increased as a result of Federal monitoring.

Tennessee—Tennessee attributes the increase in the number of Black children in its settings count to improved data collection. It attributes the decrease in the number of children reported in the other settings category to a more accurate use of all settings categories. It attributes the increase in the number of children reported in the home setting category to an increase in the number of personnel providing services in the home.

The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in a room donated by a hospital to limit traveling distance for the child. The children reported in the other settings category also include children who only received transportation services. In addition, there were five children incorrectly reported in this category—one child should have been reported as center-based, one child should have been reported in a program for typically developing children, two children should have been reported in the home, and one child should have been reported in a service provider location.

Texas—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in equestrian centers, gymnasiums, churches, libraries, public schools, and public parks.

Vermont—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in playgroups, a program called Gymboree, and at the YMCA.

Virginia—Virginia attributes an increase in the number of children reported in the home setting to system changes in the state. These system changes are the result of efforts that include presentations by and consultations with national experts, statewide trainings, regional and local trainings, development and dissemination of technical assistance documents, technical assistance, participation in the OSEP National Significance Grant, and commitment at the local level to do what is best for children and families.

Virginia reported 26 infants and toddlers in the other settings category, but did not specify what types of settings are counted as other.

Washington—Washington did not report race/ethnicity for 252 children. Of these children, 46 were being served in programs for developmental delay, 12 were being served in programs for typically developing children, 151 were being served in the home, and 43 were being served in a service provider location.

Washington reported two infants and toddlers in the other settings category, but did not specify what types of settings are counted as other.

Wisconsin—Wisconsin reported 12 children in the other settings category, but did not specify what types of settings are counted as other.

Wyoming—The children reported in the other settings category include children and families receiving early intervention services primarily in parks and in their grandparent's house.