

## EMIS Change 23-65: Public Comments & Responses

\*Please note that names and contact information have been removed from this document.

### Public Comment #1

**From:** EDU EMISPublicComments <EMISPublicComments@education.ohio.gov>

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 31, 2022 2:05 PM

**To:** redacted

**Subject:** RE: EMIS Change 23-65, Public Comment

Thank you for your interest in EMIS and public comment regarding EMIS change 23-65. I forwarded your comment to the program office who requested this change and below is their response. If you have additional concerns regarding this change after reviewing the below response, please let me know and I will direct you to the appropriate contact to discuss further.

*Our intent is to require school districts to report only the students whose intervening was designed and/or implemented through Part B funds as compared to intervention funded through other sources not including Part B. The program office does not agree with the interpretation “that anyone who is doing the interventions is funded by IDEA Part B.” The school district is to determine a target population based upon its disproportionality and its improvement plan. “Entering the EMIS code for students who were discussed at SAT team along with students who have interventions” is not the intent of the reporting requirement. In this school district’s case, there would be two factors to consider; first – that there was a cost that was paid with Part B funds as part of the Comprehensive, Coordinated Early Intervening and, secondly, the district has identified a list of students that meet the criteria of the disproportionality and are being served as part of the district CCEIS Improvement Plan. The actual person providing the intervening is not the issue. The expectation is to report the students who received services or supports as part of the districts mandated intervening requirement. A district may have a much broader system of interventions, a portion of which is funded through Part B funds. Nonetheless, the district must have a targeted population based upon its plan. If students who fit that definition do receive services, a portion of which were paid directly or indirectly with Part B funds, then the students should be reported into EMIS.*

Thank you,

**Erica Weaston**

Office of Data Quality & Governance

25 South Front Street

Columbus, Ohio 43215-4183

[Erica.Weaston@education.ohio.gov](mailto:Erica.Weaston@education.ohio.gov)

[education.ohio.gov](http://education.ohio.gov)



**From:** redacted

**Sent:** Monday, May 9, 2022 11:04 AM

**To:** EDU EMISPublicComments <[EMISPublicComments@education.ohio.gov](mailto:EMISPublicComments@education.ohio.gov)>

**Subject:** EMIS Change 23-65, Public Comment

The early intervening was solely funded through IDEA Part B special education funding.

The way I would interpret this would be that anyone who is doing the interventions is funded by IDEA Part B.

This would basically eliminate 99% of who we have been coding in EMIS for CEIS. Services for Tier II and III are done by Title I teachers, Support staff, and general classroom teachers. Rarely are any of those positions funded via IDEA Part B. And often students are getting services from more than one person.. meaning the gen ed teacher is running an intervention and the Title I person is also.

Personally-my position is funded via CEIS set aside and I work with building SAT teams. I do not do any direct student interventions. For this current year, we are entering the EMIS code for students who were discussed at SAT team along with students who have interventions.

If that language is used, please be way more specific.