

Understanding Table 8

Report on Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS)

What is Table 8?

Table 8 is a new data collection required by USED's Office of Special Education Programs as authorized by the **Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)**. It provides data on **Maintenance of Effort (MOE)** reductions taken by local educational agencies (LEAs – generally known as school districts) in 2009—the year of distribution of all IDEA funds provided by the Recovery Act (ARRA). Table 8 also provides LEA-level data on use of IDEA funds for **Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS)**—either *required* and *voluntary*.

What is Maintenance of Effort (MOE)?

The term “**Maintenance of Effort**,” often shortened to “**MOE**,” refers to the requirement found in many federally funded grant programs (e.g., Title I, IDEA, Voc Ed) that State Educational Agencies (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEA)—generally known as school districts—each maintain the **same level of state and local funding from year to year as a condition of receiving federal funding**. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) has very specific rules regarding MOE for both SEAs and LEAs

Provisions in IDEA allow an LEA to decrease its MOE from one fiscal year to the next. One of these provisions is triggered by an increase in Federal funds, as occurred with the ARRA, allowing LEAs to take a reduction equal to up to 50% of the increase. Outside of these provisions, IDEA requires that LEAs expend the same amount of local / state funding for special education and related services as it expended in the previous fiscal year.

IMPORTANT! LEAs that reduce MOE due to an increase in federal funds (such as the increase that occurred in 2009 due to the ARRA) are not required to return to the previous (higher) level of local spending when federal funds decline. The MOE remains at the reduced level unless/until the LEA voluntarily increases spending.

Failure to meet MOE requirements may result in the LEA losing eligibility to receive its annual IDEA federal funding *and* requiring an LEA to repay funds, using a non-federal source, to the SEA, which is *required* to send funds to the US Department of Education.

Explanation of data presented in Table 8

Column	Explanation of data
Section A: LEA Allocations	
A2A	Total Federal funds received by LEA for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2008 under IDEA Part B Section 611 – School-age students
A2B	Total Federal funds received by LEA for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2009 under IDEA Part B Section 611 – School-age students PLUS IDEA ARRA allocation.
A2C	The dollar increase in the total allocation of Section 611 funds from FFY 2008 to FFY 2009
A3A	Total Federal funds received by LEA for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2008 under IDEA Part B Section 619 – Preschool program
A3B	Total Federal funds received by LEA for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2009 under IDEA Part B Section 619 – Preschool program PLUS IDEA ARRA allocation.
A3C	The dollar increase in the total allocation of Section 619 funds from FFY 2008 to FFY 2009
A4	Total (combined) dollar amount of Section 611 and 619 allocations for FFY 2009
A5	15% of the total (combined) dollar amount of Section 611 and 619 allocations from FFY 2009 (A4). This is the maximum allowable amount that the LEA can spend on Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS)
Section B: Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Reduction	
B2	The determination that controls whether the LEA may be able, based on FFY 2009 funding, to reduce MOE during SY 2009-2010. Only LEAs with a rating of 1 are eligible to take a reduction to MOE. KEY: 1 = meets the requirements and purposes of Part B; 2 = needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B; 3 = needs intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B; 4 = needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B <i>(Note: Criteria for each determination varies from state to state)</i>
B3	The actual dollar (\$) amount that the LEA or ESA reduced local, or State and local, expenditures under the IDEA MOE provision in IDEA §613(a)(2)(C) during SY 2009-10.
B4	The percent of the allowable MOE reduction that the LEA or ESA took during SY 2009-10. Maximum allowable is equal to 50% of the increase in 611 funds in 2009 over 2008 (Amount in Column A2C) <i>(See example of MOE reduction on page 3.)</i>
Section C: Provision of Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS)	
C2A	Was the LEA or ESA required to use 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2009-10? KEY: 1 = NO, 2 = YES (Under 34 CFR §300.646(b)(2), LEAs (including ESAs) that are identified by the SEA as having significant disproportionality based on race and ethnicity in identification, placement, or disciplinary actions must use 15% of IDEA funds for CEIS. NOTE: LEAs required to use 15% of funds for CEIS may NOT reduce MOE (B3)
C2B	The dollar (\$) amount the LEA must reserve and use IDEA funds for CEIS in SY 2009-10. The figure reported in Column C2B should match the figure in Column A5. NOTE: If Column C2A is "1" the LEA or ESA was not required to reserve funds for CEIS.
C2C	The percent of IDEA funds that the LEA or ESA was required to reserve for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2009-10.
C3A	Did the LEA or ESA voluntarily use up to 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 funds for CEIS in SY 2009-10? KEY: 1 = NO, 2 = YES (Under 34 CFR §300.226, LEAs (including ESAs) may use up to, but not more than, 15% of IDEA funds for CEIS.)
C3B	The dollar (\$) amount of funds reserved for voluntary CEIS during SY 2009-10. NOTE: Maximum allowable MOE reduction (B3) is reduced by any amount voluntarily used for CEIS.
C3C	The percent of IDEA funds that the LEA or ESA used for voluntary CEIS during SY 2009-10
Section D: Number of Children Receiving Coordinated Early Intervening Services	
D2	The total number of children who received CEIS under IDEA at any point during the course of the reporting year.
D3	The total number of children who received CEIS under IDEA anytime in the past two school years (including SY 2007-08, SY 2008-09, and SY 2009-10) and received special education and related services in 2009-10.

Example of MOE reduction

FFY 2009 allocation (Column A2B)	\$1,100,000
<i>Minus</i> FFY 2008 allocation (Column A2A).....	- \$500,000
Increase in funds between FFY 2008 and 2009 (Column A2C).....	\$600,000
Maximum % of increase allowed to be taken as MOE reduction.....	50%
Maximum allowable amount for MOE reduction.....	\$300,000 <i>(50% of \$600,000)</i>
Amount of reduction taken by LEA (Column B3).....	\$60,000
Percent of allowable MOE reduction taken (Column B4).....	20%

More information:

- Table 8 2009 State-by-state summary
<http://www.ideamoneywatch.com/docs/States.2009.table8.pdf>

- LEA-level 2009 Table 8 by state
<http://ideamoneywatch.com/balancesheet/?p=341>

- IDEA Maintenance of Effort requirements for local educational agencies
<http://idea.ed.gov/explore/view/p/%2Croot%2Cstatute%2CI%2CB%2C613%2C>

- IDEA Coordinated Early Intervening Services
<http://idea.ed.gov/explore/view/p/%2Croot%2Cdynamic%2CTopicalBrief%2C8%2C>