

**Department of Education**  
**SPECIAL EDUCATION**  
**Fiscal Year 2011 Budget Request**

**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language.....	I-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	I-2
Amounts Available for Obligation.....	I-4
Obligations by Object Classification.....	I-4
Authorizing Legislation.....	I-5
Appropriations History.....	I-6
Significant Items in FY 2010 Appropriations Reports .....	I-7
Summary of Request .....	I-9
State grants:	
Grants to States.....	I-10
Preschool grants.....	I-27
Grants for infants and families .....	I-39
National activities:	
State personnel development.....	I-47
Technical assistance and dissemination .....	I-56
Personnel preparation .....	I-66
Parent Information Centers .....	I-80
Technology and media services .....	I-90
Special Olympics education programs .....	I-100
Mentoring for individuals with intellectual disabilities.....	I-102
State Tables.....	I-104

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

For carrying out the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (“IDEA”) and the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004, [\$12,587,035,000] \$12,836,190,000, of which [\$3,726,354,000] \$3,135,634,000 shall become available on July 1, [2010] 2011, and shall remain available through September 30, [2011] 2012, and of which [\$8,592,383,000] \$9,433,103,000 shall become available on October 1, [2010] 2011, and shall remain available through September 30, [2011] 2012, for academic year [2010-2011: *Provided*, That \$13,250,000 shall be for Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Inc., to support the development, production, and circulation of accessible educational materials: <sup>1</sup> *Provided further*, That \$737,000 shall be for the recipient of funds provided by Public Law 105-78 under section 687(b)(2)(G) of the IDEA (as in effect prior to the enactment of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004) to provide information on diagnosis, intervention, and teaching strategies for children with disabilities <sup>2</sup>] 2011-2012: <sup>3</sup> *Provided [further]*, That the amount for section 611(b)(2) of the IDEA shall be equal to the lesser of the amount available for that activity during fiscal year [2009] 2010, increased by the amount of inflation as specified in section 619(d)(2)(B) of the IDEA, or the percent change in the funds appropriated under section 611(i) of the IDEA, but not less than the amount for that activity during fiscal year [2009: *Provided further*, That the part B and C funds awarded to States under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for fiscal year 2009 shall not be considered for the purposes of calculating State allocations under sections 611, 619, and 634 for fiscal year 2010 and succeeding years <sup>4</sup>] 2010: <sup>5</sup> *Provided further*, That funds <sup>4</sup> made available for the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004 may be used to support expenses associated with the Special Olympics National and World games. (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2010.*)

### NOTE

Each language provision that is followed by a footnote reference is explained in the Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes document which follows the appropriation language.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>1</sup> [<i>Provided</i>, That \$13,250,000 shall be for Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Inc., to support the development, production, and circulation of accessible educational materials:]</p>	<p>This language earmarks an amount for Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Inc. This language is deleted because funding for activities under section 674(a)(1) of the IDEA related to providing recorded and electronic materials will be awarded competitively in 2011.</p>
<p><sup>2</sup> [<i>Provided further</i>, That \$737,000 shall be for the recipient of funds provided by Public Law 105-78 under section 687(b)(2)(G) of the IDEA (as in effect prior to the enactment of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004) to provide information on diagnosis, intervention, and teaching strategies for children with disabilities]</p>	<p>This language earmarks an amount for the Greater Washington Educational Television Association (GWETA). The language is deleted because funds are not requested for this project in 2011.</p>
<p><sup>3</sup>... [<del>\$12,587,035,000</del> <u>\$12,836,190,000</u>, of which [<del>\$3,726,354,000</del> <u>\$3,135,634,000</u> shall become available on July 1, [<del>2010</del> <u>2011</u>], and shall remain available through September 30, [<del>2011</del> <u>2012</u>], and of which [<del>\$8,592,383,000</del> <u>\$9,433,103,000</u> shall become available on October 1, [<del>2010</del> <u>2011</u>], and shall remain available through September 30, [<del>2011</del> <u>2012</u>], for academic year [<del>2010-2011...</del> <u>2011-2012</u>]:</p>	<p>This language provides for funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for a portion of the Grants to States program, and all of the Preschool Grants and Grants for Infants and Families programs. The language also provides that a portion of the Grants to States funds be available in an advance appropriation that becomes available for obligation on October 1 of the fiscal year following the year of the appropriation.</p>
<p><sup>4</sup> [<i>Provided further</i>, That the part B and C funds awarded to States under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for fiscal year 2009 shall not be considered for the purposes of calculating State allocations under sections 611, 619, and 634 for fiscal year 2010 and succeeding years]</p>	<p>This language is deleted because it is no longer necessary.</p>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>5</sup> <i>Provided [further]</i>, That the amount for section 611(b)(2) of the IDEA shall be equal to the lesser of the amount available for that activity during fiscal year [2009] <u>2010</u>, increased by the amount of inflation as specified in section 619(d)(2)(B) of the IDEA, or the percent change in the funds appropriated under section 611(i) of the IDEA, but not less than the amount for that activity during fiscal year [2009: ...] <u>2010</u>:</p>	<p>This language limits the amount of funds required to be transferred to the Department of the Interior under the Grants to States program to the lesser of an amount equal to the amount transferred to the Department of the Interior for fiscal year 2010 plus inflation or the percent change in the appropriation for the Grants to States program. This language also clarifies that in the event of a decrease or no change in the appropriation for the Grants to States program, the amount of funds required to be transferred to the Department of the Interior remains level with the amount they received in fiscal year 2010.</p>

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**  
**Amounts Available for Obligation**  
(\$000s)

	2009	2010	2011
Discretionary appropriation:			
Appropriation.....	\$12,579,677	\$12,587,035	\$12,846,190
Recovery Act supplemental (P.L. 111-5) .....	<u>12,200,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, adjusted discretionary appropriation.....	24,779,677	12,587,035	12,846,190
Advance for succeeding fiscal year .....	-8,592,383	-8,592,383	-9,433,103
Advance from prior year.....	<u>6,856,444</u>	<u>8,592,383</u>	<u>8,592,383</u>
Subtotal, comparable budget authority .....	23,043,738	12,587,035	12,005,470
Unobligated balance, start of year .....	12,472	13,594	0
Recovery Act unobligated balance, start of year .....	0	173	0
Unobligated balance, end of year .....	-13,594	0	0
Recovery Act unobligated balance, end of year .....	<u>-173</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, direct obligations.....	11,842,616	12,600,629	12,005,470
Subtotal, Recovery Act direct obligations .....	<u>11,199,827</u>	<u>173</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations .....	23,042,443	12,600,802	12,005,470

**Obligations by Object Classification**  
(\$000s)

	2009	2010	2011
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services .....	\$490	\$490	\$491
Peer review .....	<u>4,091</u>	<u>4,100</u>	<u>4,100</u>
Subtotal .....	4,581	4,591	4,591
Grants .....	11,842,616	12,596,211	12,000,879
Grants, Recovery Act .....	<u>11,199,827</u>	<u>173</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, obligations.....	23,042,443	12,600,802	12,005,470

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**Authorizing Legislation  
(\$000s)**

Activity	2010 Authorized	2010	2011 Authorized	2011 Request
<b>State Grants:</b>				
Grants to States ( <i>IDEA-B-611</i> )	\$23,809,729 <sup>1</sup>	\$11,505,211 <sup>2</sup>	\$26,100,000 <sup>1</sup>	\$11,755,211 <sup>2</sup>
Preschool grants ( <i>IDEA-B-619</i> )	Indefinite	374,099	Indefinite	374,099
Grants for infants and families ( <i>IDEA-C</i> )	Indefinite	439,427	Indefinite	439,427
<b>National activities:</b>				
State personnel development ( <i>IDEA-D-1</i> )	Indefinite	48,000	Indefinite	48,000
Technical assistance and dissemination ( <i>IDEA-D-2-663</i> )	Indefinite	49,549	Indefinite	49,549
Personnel preparation ( <i>IDEA-D-2-662</i> )	Indefinite	90,653	Indefinite	90,653
Parent information centers ( <i>IDEA-D-3-671-673</i> )	Indefinite	28,028	Indefinite	28,028
Technology and media services ( <i>IDEA-D-3-674</i> )	Indefinite	43,973	Indefinite	41,223
Special Olympics education programs ( <i>SOSEA</i> <sup>3</sup> -3(a))	Indefinite	8,095	To be determined <sup>4</sup>	10,000
Mentoring for individuals with intellectual disabilities	0	0	To be determined <sup>5</sup>	10,000
<b>Unfunded authorizations:</b>				
Safe learning environments ( <i>IDEA-D-2-665</i> )	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>0</u>
Total definite authorization	23,809,729		26,100,000	
Total appropriation		12,587,035		12,846,190

<sup>1</sup> Funding for technical assistance on State data collection is limited to \$25,000 thousand adjusted for inflation. This amount is estimated to be \$28,762 thousand for fiscal year 2010, and \$29,258 thousand for fiscal year 2011.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$25,000 thousand for technical assistance on State data collection in fiscal years 2010 and 2011.

<sup>3</sup> Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004.

<sup>4</sup> The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2010; reauthorizing legislation is sought.

<sup>5</sup> Legislation passed in the House and is pending in the Senate (S. 694).

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Appropriations History (\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2002 (2002 Advance for 2003)	\$8,425,595 0	\$8,860,076 (5,072,000)	\$8,439,643 (5,072,000)	\$8,672,804 (5,072,000)
2003 2003 Technical amendment (P.L. 108-83) (2003 Advance for 2004)	9,687,804 (5,072,000)	9,187,804 (5,072,000)	11,191,424 (7,572,000)	10,033,917 -497 (5,672,000)
2004 (2004 Advance for 2005)	10,690,104 (5,072,000)	11,049,790 (5,072,000)	12,227,464 (5,402,000)	11,238,832 (5,413,000)
2005 (2005 Advance for 2006)	12,176,101 (5,413,000)	12,176,101 (5,413,000)	12,328,391 (5,413,000)	11,673,606 (5,413,000)
2006 (2006 Advance for 2007)	12,126,130 (6,204,000)	11,813,783 (5,413,000)	11,775,107 (5,424,200)	11,653,013 (5,424,200)
2007 (2007 Advance for 2008)	11,697,502 (6,215,200)	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A <sup>1</sup>	11,802,867 <sup>1</sup> (5,424,200)
2008 (2008 Advance for 2009)	11,485,147 (6,215,200)	12,362,831 (6,641,982)	12,330,374 (5,924,200)	11,993,684 (6,856,444)
2009 (2009 Advance for 2010) Recovery Act Supplemental (P.L. 111-5)	12,335,943 (7,647,444) 0	12,587,920 <sup>2</sup> (8,592,383) 13,600,000	12,511,631 <sup>2</sup> (7,647,444) 13,500,000	12,579,677 (8,592,383) 12,200,000
2010 (2010 Advance for 2011)	12,579,677 (8,592,383)	12,579,677 (8,592,383)	12,587,856 <sup>3</sup> (8,592,383)	12,587,035 (8,592,383)
2011 (2011 Advance for 2012)	12,846,190 (9,433,103)			

<sup>1</sup> This account operated under a full-year continuing resolution (P.L. 110-5). House and Senate Allowance amounts are shown as N/A (not Available) because neither body passed a separate appropriations bill.

<sup>2</sup> The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2009 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress only through the House Subcommittee and the Senate Committee.

<sup>3</sup> The level for the Senate allowance reflects Committee action only.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Significant Items in FY 2010 Appropriations Reports

#### **Technical Assistance and Dissemination - Support for Deaf-Blind Centers**

Senate: The Committee intends that technical assistance for children who are both blind and deaf be funded at \$12,350,000, an increase of \$1,000,000 over the budget request.

Response: The Department plans to use the additional funds to increase technical assistance support for evidence-based practices that will help improve the instructional practices of teachers educating students with disabilities.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2011 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

(in thousands of dollars)						Change from	
Office, Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2009 Appropriation	2010 Appropriation	2011 President's Budget	2010 Appropriation Amount	Percent	
<b>Special Education</b>							
1. State grants:							
(a) Grants to States (IDEA-B-611)							
Annual appropriation	D	2,912,828	2,912,828	2,322,108	(590,720)	-20.3%	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	8,592,383	8,592,383	9,433,103	840,720	9.8%	
Subtotal		11,505,211	11,505,211	11,755,211	250,000	2.2%	
(b) Preschool grants (IDEA-B-619)							
(c) Grants for infants and families (IDEA-C)	D	374,099	374,099	374,099	0	0.0%	
	D	439,427	439,427	439,427	0	0.0%	
Subtotal, State grants		12,318,737	12,318,737	12,568,737	250,000	2.0%	
2. National activities (IDEA-D):							
(a) State personnel development (Subpart 1)							
(b) Technical assistance and dissemination (section 663)	D	48,000	48,000	48,000	0	0.0%	
(c) Personnel preparation (section 662)	D	48,549	49,549	49,549	0	0.0%	
(d) Parent information centers (sections 671-673)	D	90,653	90,653	90,653	0	0.0%	
(e) Technology and media services (section 674)	D	27,028	28,028	28,028	0	0.0%	
	D	38,615	43,973	41,223	(2,750)	-6.3%	
Subtotal		252,845	260,203	257,453	(2,750)	-1.1%	
3. Special Olympics education programs (Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act)							
4. Mentoring for individuals with intellectual disabilities (pending legislation)	D	8,095	8,095	10,000	1,905	23.5%	
	D	0	0	10,000	10,000		
Total, Appropriation	D	12,579,677	12,587,035	12,846,190	259,155	2.1%	
Total, Budget authority	D	10,843,738	12,587,035	12,005,470	(581,565)	-4.6%	
Current <sup>1</sup>		3,987,294	3,984,652	3,413,087	(581,565)	-14.6%	
Prior year's advance		6,856,444	8,592,383	8,592,383	0	0.0%	
Outlays	D	11,978,000	12,300,000	12,739,000	439,000	3.6%	
<b>Special Education, Recovery Act</b>							
1. State grants:							
(a) Grants to States (IDEA-B-611)							
(b) Preschool grants (IDEA-B-619)	D	11,300,000	0	0	0		
(c) Grants for infants and families (IDEA-C)	D	400,000	0	0	0		
	D	500,000	0	0	0		
Total	D	12,200,000	0	0	0		
Outlays	D	791,000	4,514,000	5,200,000	686,000	15.2%	

NOTE: Category Codes are as follows: D = discretionary program; M = mandatory program.

<sup>1</sup> Excludes advance appropriations of \$8,592,383 thousand in fiscal year 2009 and 2010, and \$9,433,103 thousand in fiscal year 2011 that become available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Summary of Request

The Administration is committed to ensuring that all children, including students with disabilities, have an equal opportunity to participate in a high quality education, are expected to perform to high levels, and to the maximum extent possible, are prepared to lead productive, independent lives. The fiscal year 2011 budget request for Special Education of \$12.8 billion is aimed at making this goal a reality by helping States and school districts improve the results for children with disabilities.

The Administration requests \$11.8 billion for the **Grants to States** program, an increase of \$250 million over the 2010 appropriation, to assist States and schools in covering the excess costs of providing special education and related services to children with disabilities ages 3 through 21. This request would maintain the Federal contribution toward meeting the excess cost of special education and related services at approximately 17 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure, the same level as estimated would be provided under the fiscal year 2010 appropriation. The request would provide an average of \$1,750 for each of the 6.718 million children with disabilities who are estimated to be served for 2011.

The requests of \$374.1 million for **Preschool Grants** and \$439.4 million for **Grants for Infants and Families** are the same as the fiscal year 2010 appropriation levels. The Preschool Grants program provides additional support to States and schools for providing special education services to children ages 3 through 5. The Grants for Infants and Families program provides assistance to States to help them implement statewide systems of early intervention services for children from birth through age 2.

The \$257.5 million request for **National Activities** programs would support a variety of technical assistance, dissemination, training, and other activities to help States, local educational agencies, parents, and others in improving results for children with disabilities.

**State Personnel Development, Technical Assistance and Dissemination, Personnel Preparation, and Parent Information Centers** would be funded at their 2010 levels of \$48.0 million, \$49.5 million, \$90.7 million, and \$28.0 million, respectively. The **Technology and Media Services** program would be funded at \$41.2 million, \$2.8 million less than the program's 2010 appropriation.

The **Special Olympics Education Programs** would be funded at \$10.0 million, an increase of \$1.9 million over the 2010 appropriation.

The request also includes \$10.0 million for a new program, **Mentoring for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities**, subject to the enactment of the Best Buddies Empowerment for People with Intellectual Disabilities Act of 2009. This program would support activities to increase the participation of people with intellectual disabilities in social relationships and other aspects of community life, including education and employment, within the United States.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### State grants: Grants to States

(Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B, Section 611)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): \$26,100,000 <sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$2,912,828 <sup>2</sup>	\$2,322,108 <sup>2</sup>	-\$590,720
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	<u>8,592,383</u>	<u>9,433,103</u>	<u>+840,720</u>
Total	11,505,211	11,755,211	+250,000

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 611(c) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act limits technical assistance activities to \$25.0 million, increased by the amount of inflation from year to year. It is estimated that the maximum amount authorized for fiscal year 2011 would be \$29.3 million.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$25.0 million for technical assistance activities in fiscal years 2010 and 2011.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Grants to States program provides formula grants to assist the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Secretary of the Interior, Outlying Areas, and the Freely Associated States in meeting the excess costs of providing special education and related services to children with disabilities. In order to be eligible for funding, States must serve all children with disabilities between the ages of 3 through 21, except that they are not required to serve children aged 3 through 5 or 18 through 21 years if services are inconsistent with State law or practice or the order of any court. A State that does not provide free appropriate public education (FAPE) to children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 cannot receive base payment funds attributable to this age group or funds under the Preschool Grants program.

Funds are allocated among States in accordance with a variety of factors. First, each State is allocated an amount equal to the amount that it received for fiscal year 1999. If the total program appropriation increases over the prior year, 85 percent of the remaining funds are allocated based on the number of children in the general population in the age range for which the States guarantee FAPE to children with disabilities. Fifteen percent of the remaining funds are allocated based on the number of children living in poverty that are in the age range for which the States guarantee FAPE to children with disabilities.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) also includes several maximum and minimum allocation requirements when the amount available for distribution to States increases.<sup>1</sup> If the amount available for allocation to States remains the same from one year to

---

<sup>1</sup> The amount that any single State's allocation may increase from one year to the next is capped at the amount the State received in the prior year multiplied by the sum of 1.5 percent and the percentage increase in the total amount appropriated for Part B of IDEA from the prior year. The maximum amount that any State may receive in any single fiscal year is calculated by multiplying the number of children with disabilities ages of 3 through 21 served

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

the next, States receive the same level of funding as in the prior year. If the amount available for allocation to States decreases from the prior year, any amount available for allocation to States above the 1999 level is allocated based on the relative increases in funding that the States received between 1999 and the prior year. If there is a decrease below the amount allocated for 1999, each State's allocation is ratably reduced from the 1999 level.

This is a forward-funded program that includes advance appropriations. In a typical year, a portion of the funds – the forward funded portion – become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year of the appropriation and remain available for 15 months, through September 30 of the following year. The remaining funds – the advance appropriation – become available for obligation on October 1 of the fiscal year following the year of the appropriations act and remain available for 12 months, expiring at the same time as the forward-funded portion. For fiscal year 2011, school districts will use both the forward- and advance-funded amounts primarily during the 2011-2012 school year.

Funds remain available for obligation at State and local levels for an additional year. Hence, States and local educational agencies will have until September 30, 2013 to obligate their fiscal year 2011 awards.

Most of the Federal funds provided to States must be passed on to local educational agencies (LEAs). However, a portion of the funds may be used for State-level activities. Any funds not set aside by the State must be passed through to LEAs. These sub-State allocations are made in a fashion similar to that used to allocate funds among States when the amount available for allocation to States increases.

State Administration – A State may reserve for State administration up to the greater of the maximum amount the State could reserve for State administration from fiscal year 2004 funds, or \$800,000, increased by inflation as reflected by the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers. For fiscal year 2011, this amount is estimated to be \$953,870, level with the maximum amount authorized in the previous year.

Other State Activities – A State may also reserve funds for a variety of other State-level activities such as monitoring, enforcement, addressing personnel needs, and providing technical assistance to LEAs. One authorized activity involves allocating set-aside funds to support a risk pool, or high cost fund, that will be used to assist LEAs in meeting the costs of serving high need, high-cost children. If a State opts to use State-level funds for a risk pool, it must use 10 percent of the funds it reserves for other State-level activities for this purpose. Federal funds set aside by a State must be distributed to LEAs or consortia of LEAs to address the needs of specific high cost children.

Starting in 2007, the amount that a State may set aside for other State-level activities is based on a percentage of its total allocation for 2006, increased for inflation. The percentage is based on whether the State opts to use funds for a risk pool and the amount of funds that the State

---

during the 2004-2005 academic year in that State by 40 percent of the annual per pupil expenditure, adjusted by the rate of annual change in the sum of 85 percent of the children aged 3 through 21 for whom that State ensures FAPE and 15 percent of the children living in poverty. Because there are multiple caps, in any single year the "effective cap" on any single State's allocation is the lowest cap for that State.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

sets aside for administration. If the State opts to use funds for a risk pool and the State sets aside \$850,000 or less for administration, the percentage is 10.5 percent. If the State opts to use funds for a risk pool and the State sets aside more than \$850,000 for administration, the percentage is 10 percent. If the State opts not to use funds for a risk pool and the State sets aside \$850,000 or less for administration, the percentage is 9.5 percent. If the State opts not to use funds for a risk pool and the State sets aside more than \$850,000 for administration, the percentage is 9 percent.

The IDEA also requires each State to maintain its level of non-Federal expenditures from one year to the next. This requirement is commonly referred to as the State “maintenance of effort.” However, IDEA allows any State that provided 100 percent of the non-Federal costs of special education services, in the 2003-2004 school year or any subsequent year, to reduce its level of expenditures by up to 50 percent of any increase in its allocation under the Grants to States program over the prior year. The Secretary may prohibit a State from exercising this authority if it is determined that a State is not adequately carrying out its responsibilities under the IDEA.

The IDEA also contains a local “maintenance of effort” requirement. Under this requirement, each LEA must maintain its total expenditures, including State and local contributions, on special education from one year to the next. The standard for determining whether this requirement has been met is that the LEA actually expends, in total or per capita, an equal or greater amount of local, or State and local, funds in each subsequent year. However, in any fiscal year that an LEA’s IDEA Part B subgrant allocation exceeds the amount that the LEA received in the previous fiscal year, the IDEA also permits certain LEAs to reduce the level of support otherwise required by this local maintenance of effort requirement by up to 50 percent of any increase in their Part B allocation. LEAs taking advantage of this flexibility must use any funds that otherwise would have been used for the education of children with disabilities to support activities that are authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Also, if an SEA determines that an LEA is not meeting all of the requirements of Part B, including meeting targets in the State’s performance plan, the SEA must prohibit that LEA from reducing its level of support.

Certain LEAs may also use up to 15 percent of their allocation, less any amount used to reduce that LEA’s maintenance of effort level, for early intervening services. Early intervening services generally address the needs of students who require additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed, but who are not identified as needing special education. If an SEA determines that an LEA has significant disproportionality on the basis of race in the identification of children as children with disabilities, in particular disability categories, in placement in particular educational settings, or in discipline, the SEA must require the LEA to use the full 15 percent for early intervening services.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The local maintenance of effort reduction authority (under IDEA, Sec. 613(a)(2)(C)) and the authority to use Part B funds for early intervening services (under IDEA, Sec. 613(f)) are interconnected. The decision that an LEA makes about the amount of flexibility that it will utilize under one authority directly affects the amount of flexibility that may be utilized under the other. Additionally, LEAs that are required to use the full 15 percent for early intervening services in the current fiscal year will be ineligible to take advantage of any of the flexibility for local maintenance of effort that would otherwise be available under IDEA, Sec. 613(a)(2)(C). For examples illustrating how these provisions relate to one another, please refer to the 34 CFR 300, Appendix D. See: <http://idea.ed.gov/download/finalregulations.pdf>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

The IDEA requires awards to the Freely Associated States of the Pacific Basin (Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands) to be in the same amounts that they received from the fiscal year 2003 appropriation.

IDEA also authorizes the Secretary to set aside a portion of the Grants to States appropriation to provide technical assistance to improve the capacity of States to meet data collection requirements necessary for the implementation of the program.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)	
2006 .....	\$10,582,961	<sup>1</sup>
2007 .....	10,782,961	<sup>1</sup>
2008 .....	10,947,511	<sup>1</sup>
2009 .....	11,505,211	<sup>1</sup>
Recovery Act .....	11,300,000	
2010.....	11,505,211	<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$15 million for technical assistance.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$25 million for technical assistance.

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$11.8 billion for Grants to States to assist in covering the excess costs associated with providing special education and related services to children with disabilities. Consistent with the President's commitment to increase funding for this program, the Administration is requesting an increase of \$250 million, or 2.2 percent, over the 2010 appropriation.

This request would provide an average of \$1,750 per child. This compares with \$1,713 per child in 2010 and \$3,395 per child in 2009 (including funding available under the Recovery Act). These averages are based on the assumption that the number of children aged 3 through 21 who will be served will remain constant at the 2009 actual level of 6.718 million. The request would maintain the Federal contribution toward offsetting the cost of special education and related services for children with disabilities at approximately 17 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure (APPE).

Prior to the enactment of the IDEA, as many as 1 million children with disabilities were excluded from educational services. The IDEA now guarantees that any child who has been identified as having a disability will have access to a free appropriate public education. The primary challenge of the program now is to improve the quality of the education provided, so that children with disabilities can, to the maximum extent possible, participate in the general education curriculum, meet challenging standards that have been established for all children, and be prepared to lead productive, independent adult lives.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) provided an additional \$10.3 billion for supplemental fiscal year 2009 formula grant awards under the Grants to States program. While local educational agencies may use Recovery Act funds for any purpose consistent with IDEA statutory and regulatory requirements, the Administration is encouraging LEAs to focus on short-term investments with the potential for long-term benefits.

The Administration's overall guidance for use of Recovery Act funds includes four key principles: (1) spend funds quickly to save and create jobs; (2) improve student achievement through school improvement and reform; (3) ensure transparency, reporting, and accountability; and (4) invest one-time Recovery Act funds wisely using evidence-based practices, and thoughtfully so as to minimize any problems that may occur when they are no longer available.

Specific examples of activities that are consistent with these principles include the following:

- Obtaining state-of-the art assistive technology devices and providing training in their use to enhance access to the general curriculum for students with disabilities.
- Providing intensive district-wide professional development for special education and regular education teachers that focuses on scaling-up, through replication, proven and innovative evidence-based strategies in reading and math and positive behavioral supports to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.
- Developing or expanding the capacity to collect and use data to improve teaching and learning.

These Recovery Act funds are available for obligation until September 2011.

From 1975, when IDEA was enacted, through 2005, the growth in the number of children with disabilities served outpaced the growth in the general population ages 3 through 21. However, in every fiscal year since 2006, the count of children with disabilities reported by States has decreased slightly from the prior fiscal year. We do not know whether the counts reported represent a new trend in the number of children being served. In the absence of better information, we have projected the numbers of children with disabilities expected to be served for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 at 6.718 million children, the same level as reported by States for fiscal year 2009.

### Department of the Interior Set-Aside

As in previous years, we are proposing that the fiscal year 2011 budget include special appropriation language limiting the amount of funding required to be provided to the Department of the Interior (Interior). The special language would limit funding for Interior to the lesser of the prior year funding level plus inflation or the percentage change in the appropriation for the Grants to States program. In the event of a decrease or no change in the appropriation for the Grants to States program, the amount of funds to be transferred to Interior would remain level with the amount Interior received in the prior fiscal year. IDEA requires that 1.226 percent of the funds appropriated for Grants to States be provided to Interior for serving Indian children with disabilities, regardless of the number of children served by Interior. At the request level, the uncapped allocation to Interior would provide an average of approximately \$20,422 for each

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

child with a disability it serves, which is approximately 11.4 times the average amount per child that States would receive. At the request level, with the cap, Interior would receive about 7.4 times the average amount per child that States would receive, which translates into an average of \$13,251 for each child with a disability, or about 131 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure (APPE) compared to 17 percent of the APPE for States overall.

### Technical Assistance

The IDEA emphasizes improving results for children with disabilities through the collection and use of performance data. The law requires each State to develop a State Performance Plan that includes measurable and rigorous targets in a number of key monitoring areas. These areas are free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment; disproportionate representation of children in special education based on race and ethnicity; and State exercise of general supervision authority in key areas such as child find, monitoring, mediation, and transition. Each State has supervisory responsibility over the provision of special education and related services to children with disabilities within its jurisdiction, to ensure that the requirements in IDEA are met. State performance data are collected through Annual Performance Reports.

IDEA authorizes the Secretary of Education to use a portion of Grants to States funds to provide technical assistance to States to improve their capacity to meet these data collection requirements. The request includes \$25 million for such technical assistance, level with the set-aside amount for fiscal year 2010. The Department would use these funds to support competitive awards to: a) help States develop Part C State data systems that would collect, analyze, and report infant and toddler outcome data; and b) include all students with disabilities in the development and modification of assessment measures of student growth, as such measures are used in growth-based accountability models.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<b><u>Program funding (\$000):</u></b>			
Formula grants to States	\$11,357,631	\$11,347,631	\$11,596,130
Formula grants to Outlying Areas	33,919	33,919	33,919
Grants to Freely Associated States	6,579	6,579	6,579
Department of the Interior	92,012	92,012	93,513
Technical assistance	15,000	25,000	25,000
Peer review of new Technical Assistance award applications	<u>70</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>70</u>
Total	11,505,211	11,505,211	11,755,211
Recovery Act appropriation	11,300,000	0	0

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (cont.)

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<b>Number of children with disabilities served ages 3 through 21</b>	6,718,000 <sup>1</sup>	6,718,000 <sup>1</sup>	6,718,000 <sup>1</sup>
<b>Average Federal share per child (\$)</b>	\$3,395 <sup>1,2</sup>	\$1,713 <sup>1</sup>	\$1,750 <sup>1</sup>
<b>Average per pupil expenditure (APPE) (\$)</b>	\$10,154 <sup>1</sup>	\$10,135 <sup>1</sup>	\$10,297 <sup>1</sup>
<b>Federal funding as a percentage of APPE</b>	33% <sup>1,2</sup>	17% <sup>1</sup>	17% <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Estimate.

<sup>2</sup> Estimate includes funds available in FY 2009 under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (P.L. 111-5).

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **Basis for Leaving Special Education for Youth with Disabilities Ages 14 and Older** <sup>1, 2, 3</sup>

	School Year <u>2004-2005</u>		School Year <u>2005-2006</u>		School Year <u>2006-2007</u>	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
<b><u>Basis:</u></b>						
Graduating with regular diploma	32.13%	214,986	32.9%	224,553	32.8%	217,635
Graduating through certification	9.0%	60,123	9%	61,676	9.6%	65,133
Transferred to regular education <sup>2</sup>	10.1%	67,707	10.5%	71,473	9.9%	66,926
Dropped out, or moved but not known to have continued in education	16.6%	111,343	15.3%	104,414	14.9%	100,913
Moved, but known to have continued in education <sup>2</sup>	31.1%	207,797	31.0%	211,162	31.6%	213,688
Reaching maximum age for Services and other reasons	<u>1.1%</u>	<u>7,127</u>	<u>1.2%</u>	<u>8,389</u>	<u>1.5%</u>	<u>7,955</u>
<b>Total</b>	100.0%	669,083	100.0%	681,667	100.0%	676,075

Source: Annual data collection from States by OSERS and through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN)/EDFacts.

<sup>1</sup> Percentages may not add to 100 percent due to rounding.

<sup>2</sup> Previous versions of this table did not contain the categories "Transferred to regular education" and "Moved, but known to have continued in education." OSERS recently revised the IDEA 618 data collection instrument and reporting categories to include these items, which track additional students with disabilities ages 14 and older who leave special education, and are mutually exclusive with other categories included in this table. Because this is the case, the percentages reported in this table are not comparable with percentages reported in the same table in Congressional Justifications prior to fiscal year 2010. So, for example, in the FY 2009 Congressional Justification the Department reported that approximately 54 percent of students with disabilities who left school graduated with a regular diploma in the 2004-2005 school year. The percentage of students with disabilities who left special education and graduated with a regular diploma reported in the 2004-2005 school year in this table is 32.13 percent. However, the actual number of students associated with both of these percentages is 214,986.

<sup>3</sup> Exiting data for students with disabilities for the 2007-2008 school year were expected to be available by fall 2009. However, several States failed to submit exit data and the Department of Education is currently working to obtain accurate and reliable data for all States.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

#### History of Children Served and Program Funding

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Children Served (000s)</u>	<u>Appropriation (\$000)</u>	<u>Federal Share Per Child<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>Percentage of APPE</u>
1977	3,485	\$251,770	\$72	5%
1978	3,561	566,030	159	10%
1979	3,700	804,000	217	13%
1980	3,803	874,500	230	12%
1981	3,941	874,500	222	10%
1982	3,990	931,008	233	10%
1983	4,053	1,017,900	251	10%
1984	4,096	1,068,875	261	9%
1985	4,124	1,135,145	275	9%
1986	4,121	1,163,282	282	8%
1987	4,167	1,338,000	321	9%
1988	4,236	1,431,737	338	9%
1989	4,347	1,475,449	339	8%
1990	4,419	1,542,610	349	8%
1991	4,567	1,854,186	406	9%
1992	4,727	1,976,095	418	8%
1993	4,896	2,052,728	419	8%
1994	5,101	2,149,686	421	8%
1995	5,467	2,322,915	425	8%
1996	5,629	2,323,837	413	7%
1997	5,806	3,107,522	535	9%
1998	5,978	3,807,700	636	11%
1999	6,133	4,310,700	701	11%
2000	6,274	4,989,685	793	12%
2001	6,381	6,339,685	991	14%
2002	6,483	7,528,533	1,159	15%
2003	6,611	8,874,398	1,340	17%
2004	6,723	10,068,106	1,495	18%
2005	6,820	10,589,746 <sup>3</sup>	1,558	18%
2006	6,814	10,582,961 <sup>3</sup>	1,551	18%
2007	6,796	10,782,961 <sup>3</sup>	1,584	17%
2008	6,718	10,947,511 <sup>3</sup>	1,609 <sup>2</sup>	17% <sup>2</sup>
2009	6,718 <sup>2</sup>	22,805,211 <sup>3,4</sup>	3,395 <sup>2,4</sup>	33% <sup>2,4</sup>
2010	6,718 <sup>2</sup>	11,505,211 <sup>3</sup>	1,713 <sup>2</sup>	17% <sup>2</sup>
2011	6,718 <sup>2</sup>	11,755,211 <sup>3</sup>	1,750 <sup>2</sup>	17% <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Federal share per child is calculated from IDEA Part B Grants to States funding, excluding amounts available for studies and evaluations or technical assistance, as applicable.

<sup>2</sup> Estimate.

<sup>3</sup> Includes \$10 million for technical assistance activities in 2005, \$15 million in 2006 through 2009, and \$25 million in 2010 and 2011.

<sup>4</sup> Estimate includes funds available in FY 2009 under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (P.L. 111-5).

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: Ensure all children with disabilities served under the IDEA have available to them a free appropriate public education to help them meet challenging standards and prepare them for independent living and postsecondary education and/or competitive employment by assisting State and local educational agencies and families.**

***Objective:** All children with disabilities will meet challenging standards as determined by national and State assessments with accommodations as appropriate.*

##### National Assessment of Educational Progress Measures

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading. <sup>1</sup>		
Year	Targets	Actual
2003	25	29
2005	35	33
2007 <sup>2</sup>	35	36
2009	37	
2011	39	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in mathematics. <sup>1</sup>		
Year	Targets	Actual
2003	23	29
2005	32	31
2007 <sup>2</sup>	33	33
2009	35	36
2011	37	

<sup>1</sup> As defined for purposes of NAEP, "students with disabilities" includes any students classified by a school as having a disability, including children who receive services under a Section 504 plan. These measures also include data for "national public" schools only. "National public" is defined as "Public schools only. Includes charter schools; excludes Bureau of Indian Education schools and Department of Defense Education Activity schools."

<sup>2</sup> No comparable NAEP assessments are scheduled for reading or mathematics in 2008 or 2010.

**Assessment of progress:** Actual National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data for 2009 reading were originally expected by November 2009, but are not yet available. NAEP defines "Basic" for students participating in the fourth-grade reading assessment as follows:

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

“Fourth-grade students performing at the Basic level should demonstrate an understanding of the overall meaning of what they read. When reading text appropriate for fourth-graders, they should be able to make relatively obvious connections between the text and their own experiences and extend the ideas in the text by making simple inferences.” NAEP defines “Basic” for students participating in the fourth-grade mathematics assessment as follows: “Fourth-graders performing at the Basic level should be able to estimate and use basic facts to perform simple computations with whole numbers, show some understanding of fractions and decimals, and solve some simple real-world problems in all NAEP content areas. Students at this level should be able to use—though not always accurately—four-function calculators, rulers, and geometric shapes. Their written responses will often be minimal and presented without supporting information.”

NAEP data for reading and mathematics are encouraging. The performance of children with disabilities has generally improved over baseline years. However, the data also show that the majority of students with disabilities do not meet or exceed even the Basic levels of achievement at any of the grade levels tested. For the 2007 fourth-grade reading assessment, only 36 percent of children with disabilities scored at or above Basic, while 69 percent of other children scored at or above Basic. For the 2009 math assessment, only 36 percent of eighth-graders with disabilities scored at or above Basic, while 73 percent of other children scored at or above Basic.

The National Center for Education Statistics collects data on the percentage of children with disabilities who are excluded from the NAEP assessments because of their disabilities. Exclusion rates are important to keep in mind when considering the performance of children with disabilities because increases in performance accompanied by reductions in children with disabilities tested might simply reflect the exclusion of more lower functioning children. Between 1998 and 2007, the exclusion rate for children with disabilities on fourth-grade reading assessments dropped from 41 percent to 34 percent. Between 2000 and 2009, the exclusion rate on eighth-grade mathematics assessments dropped from 30 percent to 22 percent. It should be noted that these percentages only include children with disabilities who have been included in the NAEP testing sample. Children in schools specifically for children with disabilities are not included in the NAEP sample.

The use of accommodations for children with disabilities, such as testing in small groups and extended time, has also increased substantially. For example, whereas less than one quarter of the eighth grade children with disabilities assessed in mathematics in 2000 received accommodations, approximately half received accommodations in 2007.

Because many children with disabilities are excluded from NAEP testing, NAEP results cannot be generalized to the total population of children with disabilities.

### Elementary and Secondary Education Measures

The Department has adopted 4 measures for the Special Education Grants to States program to parallel those used for the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program. Data on the measures are being collected annually through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and made available through *EDFacts*. Targets are based on a straight-line trajectory toward the

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

ESEA goal to have all children performing at proficient or advanced levels by 2014. States were not required to test students in all grades 3 through 8 in 2005. However, they were required to test children in all grades 3 through 8 in 2006. The targets for 2007 were based on the incomplete 2005 tests. Targets for 2008 through 2011 have been revised based on the more comprehensive 2006 data. Most of the performance data for 2009 should be available in September 2010.

Two measures focus on the percentages of students with disabilities scoring at the proficient or advanced levels in grades 3 through 8 on State reading and mathematics assessments. The other two measures focus on the differences between the percentages of students with disabilities in grades 3 through 8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading and mathematics assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3 through 8 scoring at these levels.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students with disabilities in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments.		
Year	Targets	Actual
<b>2006</b>		38.7
<b>2007</b>	51.8	41.5
<b>2008</b>	54.0	40.8
<b>2009</b>	61.7	
<b>2010</b>	69.4	
<b>2011</b>	77.0	

<b>Measure:</b> The difference between the percentage of students with disabilities in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading assessments.		
Year	Targets	Actual
<b>2006</b>		29.6
<b>2007</b>	21.6	28.7
<b>2008</b>	22.2	29.7
<b>2009</b>	18.5	
<b>2010</b>	14.8	
<b>2011</b>	11.1	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students with disabilities in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State mathematics assessments.		
Year	Targets	Actual
<b>2006</b>		37.8
<b>2007</b>	52.2	41.9
<b>2008</b>	53.3	42.1
<b>2009</b>	61.1	
<b>2010</b>	68.9	
<b>2011</b>	76.7	

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

**Measure:** The difference between the percentage of students with disabilities in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State mathematics assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State mathematics assessments.

Year	Targets	Actual
<b>2006</b>		27.2
<b>2007</b>	19.4	26.1
<b>2008</b>	20.5	27.5
<b>2009</b>	17.0	
<b>2010</b>	13.6	
<b>2011</b>	10.2	

**Assessment of progress:** Actual data for 2009 are expected by September 2010. Between 2007 and 2008, States showed modest improvements in their performance with respect to students with disabilities on State mathematics assessments, as well as a slight narrowing of the gap in the performance between students with disabilities and all students on State reading and mathematics assessments. The modest increases for students with disabilities in State reading and mathematics assessments between 2006 and 2007 initially suggested that States seemed to be making some progress in ensuring that such students are reasonably well-equipped to perform on State assessments, but it is no longer clear that this is true for all States. State performance in these areas, at least at the national level, has leveled off. It should also be noted that fewer than half of students with disabilities scored at the proficient or advanced levels in reading and math on State assessments (40.8 percent and 42.1 percent, respectively), and there continue to be significant gaps between the percent of children with disabilities scoring at proficient or advanced levels on State assessments in reading and math and the percent of all students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels (29.7 percent and 27.5 percent, respectively).

**Objective:** *Secondary school students will complete high school prepared for postsecondary education and/or competitive employment.*

**Measure:** The percentage of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma.

Year	Targets	Actual
<b>2006</b>	56.0	56.5
<b>2007</b>	57.0	56.1
<b>2008</b>	58.0	59.0
<b>2009</b>	59.0	
<b>2010</b>	60.0	
<b>2011</b>	61.0	

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students with disabilities who drop out of school.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2006</b>	29.0	26.2
<b>2007</b>	28.0	25.5
<b>2008</b>	27.0	24.6
<b>2009</b>	26.0	
<b>2010</b>	25.0	
<b>2011</b>	24.0	

**Assessment of progress:** Actual data for 2009 were originally expected by October 2009, but are not yet available. Data on graduations and dropouts are collected annually from States by OSERS and through EDEN/EDFacts. In determining progress on these measures, children who have moved, but are not known to have continued in school, are considered dropouts. Prior to 2004, these children were not considered in computing the drop-out rate. This change was made after discussions with State data managers indicated that, in most cases in which children move and are not known to have continued in school, the children have actually dropped out of school. Recent State reports have shown significantly fewer children reported in the “moved, but not known to have continued” category. Some of the improvement in drop-out rates may be attributable to closer tracking by States, which has resulted in some children being reported as continuing in school who would formerly have been reported as “moved, not known to have continued.”

### Postsecondary Outcomes

One of the purposes of IDEA is to help prepare children with disabilities for further education, employment, and independent living. The Department recently developed an indicator on employment and postsecondary education. This indicator tracks the percentage of students who are no longer in secondary school that had individualized education programs (IEPs) in effect at the time they left school, and were: a) enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school; b) enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; or, c) enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other form of employment within one year of leaving high school. Data for this indicator will be collected on an annual basis, directly from the States. We believe that this is a critical indicator for the program, since it is a reflection of the ultimate results of our efforts to provide special education under the Grants to States program. The Department expects to have baseline data by summer 2011.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

#### Efficiency Measure

<b>Measure:</b> The average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) response to the State.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2006	113	50
2007	100	92
2008	95	104
2009	90	
2010	88	
2011	86	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department has developed one efficiency measure for the program. That measure is the average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and the Department's response. In 2008, the most recent year for which data are available, the Department completed 10 site visits. For fiscal years 2006, 2007, and 2008, the average times between the completion of the visit and the letter of findings were 50 days, 92.2, and 103.6 days, respectively. We believe the very low average time in 2006 was atypical and not likely to recur. Therefore, we do not believe that it is appropriate to revise our targets based on performance in that year. The rise in the actual rate in fiscal year 2008 is largely due to two States that had unique circumstances and took over 200 days each. The remaining eight reports were issued between 49 and 100 days. The Department does not expect a recurrence of this situation in 2009 and subsequent fiscal years. We anticipate receiving the data for fiscal year 2009 by March 2010.

#### Other Performance Information

**IDEA National Assessment.** Section 664 of the IDEA requires the Department to conduct a national assessment of activities carried out with Federal funds. To implement this requirement, funds requested for the Special Education Studies and Evaluation program in the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) account are being used to conduct an independent evaluation of the program. As required by the IDEA, the IDEA National Assessment addresses the extent to which States, districts, and schools are implementing the IDEA programs and services to promote a free appropriate public education for children with disabilities in the least restrictive environment possible and in partnership with parents. The National Assessment will also address the effectiveness of the IDEA programs and services in promoting the developmental progress, and academic achievement of children with disabilities. The National Assessment includes the following activities:

**Analytic Support.** This contract supports the synthesis of existing evidence and new analyses of extant data sources to address research questions for the IDEA National Assessment targeting four topic areas: (1) outcomes for children with disabilities, (2) identification for early intervention and special education, (3) early intervention and special education services, and (4) early intervention and special education personnel. Priority is being given to completing studies on outcomes and identification, to be followed by studies on services and personnel. Among the data sources being used for the study are the National Assessment of Educational

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

Progress (NAEP), data from State academic assessments of children with disabilities, data submitted by States to the Department pursuant to section 618 of the IDEA, population counts by State and year from the National Center for Education Statistics Common Core of Data and the National Vital Statistics System, and data gathered from four national longitudinal studies of children with disabilities (National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study, Pre-Elementary Education Longitudinal Study, Special Education Elementary Longitudinal Study, and National Longitudinal Transition Study-2). The analyses supported by this contract will be completed by February 2011.

**Implementation Study.** This contract supports new data collection from State agencies and school districts to address implementation questions for the IDEA National Assessment in the four broad areas targeted for this study: (1) identification of children for early intervention and special education; (2) early intervention service delivery systems and coordination with special education; (3) academic standards and personnel qualifications; and (4) dispute resolution and mediation. Data collection includes three surveys of State administrators: (1) IDEA Part B administrators responsible for programs providing special education services to school-aged children with disabilities (6-21); (2) IDEA Part B section 619 coordinators who oversee preschool programs for children with disabilities ages 3-5, and; (3) IDEA Part C coordinators who are responsible for early intervention programs serving infants and toddlers. A fourth survey will collect district level data from a nationally representative sample of local special education administrators about preschool and school-age programs for children with disabilities ages 3-21. New survey data on IDEA implementation will be presented together with relevant information from State and Federal websites and from a pre-existing survey of State educational agencies and school districts. This study is scheduled to be completed by March 2010.

**Impact Evaluation of Response to Intervention Strategies.** Response to Intervention (RTI) is a multi-step approach to providing early and more intensive intervention and monitoring within the general education setting. In principle, RTI begins with research-based instruction and behavioral support provided to students in the general education classroom, followed by screening of all students to identify those who may need systematic progress monitoring, intervention, or support. Students who are not responding to the general education curriculum and instruction are provided with increasingly intense interventions through a "multi-tiered" system, and they are frequently monitored to assess their progress and inform the choice of future interventions, including possibly special education for students determined to have a disability. The IDEA permits some part B special education funds to be used for "early intervening services" such as RTI and also permits districts to use RTI to inform decisions regarding a child's eligibility for special education.

This evaluation will employ a quasi-experimental design to examine the natural variations in elementary school reading instruction, intervention, and support among districts and schools already implementing RTI across the Nation to address the following research questions:

- What are the impacts of different RTI models on academic outcomes--such as reading achievement, grade promotion, and special education identification--for students in elementary school?
- Do the impacts of RTI models vary by subgroup of students?

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

Data collection will occur on RTI implementation and on student outcomes including reading achievement, grade promotion, and identification for special education during the 2010-11 and 2011-12 school years. A final report is scheduled to be completed in 2013.

**Impacts of School Improvement Status on Students with Disabilities.** As part of the IDEA National Assessment, IES is studying changes in student outcomes after schools adopt programs focused on improving academic outcomes for students with disabilities. The focus of the study is on comparing outcomes for students with disabilities in elementary and middle schools identified for improvement with corresponding outcomes in schools not identified for improvement but still accountable for the performance of students with disabilities.

The evaluation will rely on existing data and surveys of school principals in 2010 and 2011. Key outcomes for this study align with the outcomes identified in section 664 of the IDEA, which relate to: academic achievement (including reading and mathematics); participation in the general education curriculum; receipt of special education services; receipt of such services in the least restrictive appropriate environment; and grade transitions. The final report for this evaluation is scheduled to be completed by the spring of 2013.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### **State grants: Preschool grants**

(Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B, Section 619)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$374,099	\$374,099	0

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Preschool Grants program provides formula grants to States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico to make available special education and related services for children with disabilities aged 3 through 5. In order to be eligible for these grants, States must serve all eligible children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 and have an approved application under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). A State that does not make a free appropriate public education (FAPE) available to all children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 cannot receive funds under this program or funds attributable to this age range under the Grants to States program. Currently, all States are making FAPE available to all children aged 3 through 5 with disabilities.

At their discretion, States may include preschool-aged children who are experiencing developmental delays, as defined by the State and as measured by appropriate diagnostic instruments and procedures, who need special education and related services. If consistent with State policy, State and local educational agencies also may use funds received under this program to provide FAPE to 2-year olds with disabilities who will turn 3 during the school year. IDEA requires that, to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities are educated with children who are not disabled and that removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability of a child is such that education in regular classes, with the use of supplementary aids and services, cannot be achieved satisfactorily. However, States are not required to provide public preschool programs for the general population. For this reason, preschool-aged children with disabilities are served in a variety of settings, including public or private preschool programs, regular kindergarten, Head Start programs, and childcare facilities.

Funds are distributed to eligible entities through a formula based on general population and poverty. Under the formula, each State is first allocated an amount equal to its fiscal year 1997 allocation. For any year in which the appropriation is greater than the prior year level, 85 percent of the funds above the fiscal year 1997 level are distributed based on each State's relative percentage of the total number of children aged 3 through 5 in the general population. The other 15 percent is distributed based on the relative percentage of children aged 3 through 5 in each State who are living in poverty. The formula provides several floors and ceilings regarding the amount a State can receive in any year. No State can receive less than it received in the prior year. In addition, every State must receive an increase equal to the higher

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

of: (1) the percent the appropriation grew above the prior year, minus 1.5 percent, or, (2) 90 percent of the percentage increase above the prior year. The formula also provides for a minimum increase in State allocations of 1/3 of 1 percent of the increase in the appropriation over the base year and places a ceiling on how much the allocation to a State may increase, in that no State may be allocated an increase above the prior year greater than the percent of growth in the appropriation from the prior year plus 1.5 percent. These provisions help ensure that every State receives a part of any increase and that there is no radical shift in resources among the States.

States must distribute the bulk of their grant awards to local educational agencies. They may retain funds for State-level activities up to an amount equal to 25 percent of the amount they received for fiscal year 1997 under the Preschool Grants program, adjusted upward each year by the lesser of the rate of increase in the State's allocation or the rate of inflation. The amount that may be used for administration is limited to 20 percent of the amount available to a State for State-level activities. These funds may also be used for the administration of the Grants for Infants and Families program (Part C). State-level activities include: (1) support services, including establishing and implementing a mediation process, which may benefit children with disabilities younger than 3 or older than 5, as long as those services also benefit children with disabilities aged 3 through 5; (2) direct services for children eligible under this program; (3) activities at the State and local level to meet the goals established by the State for the performance of children with disabilities in the State; and (4) supplements to other funds used to develop and implement a statewide coordinated services system designed to improve results for children and families, including children with disabilities and their families, but not to exceed 1 percent of the amount received by the State under this program for a fiscal year. The State may also use its set-aside funds to provide early intervention services. These services must include an educational component that promotes school readiness and incorporates preliteracy, language, and numeracy skills. In addition, they must be provided in accordance with the Grants for Infants and Families program to children who are eligible for services under the Preschool Grants program and who previously received services under Part C until such children enter or are eligible to enter kindergarten and, at a State's discretion, to continue service coordination or case management for families who receive services under Part C.

The number of children served under this program decreased from 710,371 in fiscal year 2008 to 708,481 in fiscal year 2009. This is the second decrease in two years. The rate of growth in the general population in this age range slowed down to increases of only 0.9 percent in fiscal year 2009 and 0.5 percent in 2008. From fiscal year 1992 to 2009, the number of children served under the Preschool Grants program still grew from 398,355 to 708,481, a 77.8 percent increase. Over the same period, the growth in the number of 3-through-5-year-old children in the general population for the 50 States and the District of Columbia was only 12 percent. The Department predicts that the number of children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 will increase in fiscal years 2010 and 2011, but only by 1 percent each year. The Department expects to receive the data on the number of children served for fiscal year 2010 in October 2010.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) provided an additional \$400 million for supplemental fiscal year 2009 formula grant awards under the Preschool Grants program. While local educational agencies may use Recovery Act funds for any purpose

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **State grants: Preschool grants**

---

consistent with IDEA statutory and regulatory requirements, the Administration is encouraging LEAs to focus on short-term investments with the potential for long-term benefits.

The Administration's overall guidance for use of Recovery Act funds includes four key principles: (1) spend funds quickly to save and create jobs; (2) improve student achievement through school improvement and reform; (3) ensure transparency, reporting, and accountability; and (4) invest one-time Recovery Act funds wisely using evidence-based practices, and thoughtfully so as to minimize any problems that may occur when they are no longer available.

Specific examples of activities that are consistent with these principles include the following:

- Obtaining state-of-the art assistive technology devices and providing training in their use to enhance access to the general curriculum for students with disabilities.
- Providing intensive district-wide professional development for special education and regular education teachers that focuses on scaling-up, through replication, proven and innovative evidence-based strategies in reading and math and positive behavioral supports to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.
- Developing or expanding the capacity to collect and use data to improve teaching and learning.
- Expanding the availability and range of inclusive placement options for preschoolers with disabilities by developing the capacity of public and private preschool programs to serve these children.

This is a forward funded program. Funds become available for obligation from July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$380,751
2007 .....	380,751
2008 .....	374,099
2009.....	374,099
Recovery Act .....	400,000
2010.....	374,099

### **FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$374.1 million for the Preschool Grants program. The request would maintain funding for this program at the fiscal year 2010 appropriation level. The Administration believes this request provides an appropriate level of resources to support activities for young children with disabilities, particularly considering the funds available under the Recovery Act and the Grants to States program under IDEA, Part B.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

The Recovery Act provided an additional \$400 million for this program. This represented a significant and unprecedented increase for the program, which has allowed State educational agencies to fund long-term training and development projects and to make purchases of durable equipment and educational materials. These funds are available for obligation until September 2011.

The Administration is requesting \$11.9 billion for the Grants to States program for fiscal year 2011, an increase of \$250 million, or approximately 2.2 percent over the fiscal year 2010 appropriation. Funding under Preschool Grants supplements funds provided to States under the Grants to States program, which serves children with disabilities aged 3 through 21, including all children served under the Preschool Grants program.

Young children with disabilities also benefit from other early childhood programs funded by the Federal Government. For example, the Administration supports the Early Learning Challenge Fund (ELCF), included in legislation that has passed the House of Representatives and is pending in the Senate. The ELCF would provide grants to support State efforts to increase the number of children in high-quality care by creating statewide standards and monitoring systems, enhancing the early childhood workforce through training and professional development, and providing more information to parents and the public, all of which will also benefit children with disabilities.

The President believes early childhood education is critical to the future success of vulnerable children, including children with disabilities, and that improved coordination among Federal early childhood programs will lead to improved services. Funding under the Preschool Grants program supports early childhood programs that provide services needed to prepare young children with disabilities to enter school ready to learn. This program also supports the inclusion of young children with disabilities in State early childhood programs and federally funded programs, such as Head Start and child care programs supported under the Department of Health and Human Services' Child Care and Development Block Grants (CCDBG). States frequently use the Preschool Grants program State-level set-aside funds to support initiatives to provide for comprehensive services to young children to ensure that children with disabilities are included in State early childhood programs and programs operated or supported by other Federal programs.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2009</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>2010</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>2011</u> <sup>1</sup>
Children served <sup>2</sup>	710,400	710,400	710,400
Share per child (whole \$)	\$1,090 <sup>3</sup>	\$527	\$527

<sup>1</sup> Estimates.

<sup>2</sup> States may, at their discretion, provide FAPE to 2-year olds who will turn 3 during the school year. However, the figures for the number of children served do not include children served by the States who are 2 years old at the time of the count, but will turn 3 during the school year.

<sup>3</sup> This figure includes funds provided under the Recovery Act in fiscal year 2009.

### History of Children Served and Program Funding

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Children Served</u> (000s)	<u>Appropriation</u> (\$000s)	<u>Federal</u> <u>Share Per Child</u>
1977	197	\$12,500	\$64
1978	201	15,000	81
1979	215	17,500	81
1980	232	25,000	108
1981	237	25,000	105
1982	228	24,000	105
1983	242	25,000	103
1984	243	26,330	108
1985	260	29,000	112
1986	261	28,710	110
1987	266	180,000	677 <sup>1</sup>
1988	288	201,054	698
1989	322	247,000	767
1990	352	251,510	715
1991	367	292,766	798 <sup>2</sup>
1992	398	320,000	804
1993	441	325,773	739
1994	479	339,257	709
1995	522	360,265	689
1996	549	360,409	656
1997	562	360,409	642
1998	572	373,985	654
1999	575	373,985	651
2000	589	390,000	662
2001	599	390,000	652

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

#### History of Children Served and Program Funding - Continued

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Children Served</u> (000s)	<u>Appropriation</u> (\$000s)	<u>Federal</u> <u>Share Per Child</u>
2002	617	\$390,000	\$632
2003	647	387,465	599
2004	680	387,699	571
2005	702	384,597	548
2006	704	380,751	546
2007	714	380,751	533
2008	710	374,099	527
2009	710 <sup>3</sup>	774,099 <sup>4</sup>	1,093 <sup>3, 4</sup>
2010	710 <sup>3</sup>	374,099 <sup>3</sup>	527 <sup>3</sup>
2011	710 <sup>3</sup>	374,099 <sup>3</sup>	527 <sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1986 changed the Preschool Grants program from a grant program that provided an incentive for States to serve children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 to a formula grant program. Funding was increased to support the change in statutory authority.

<sup>2</sup> Beginning in fiscal year 1991, the IDEA required that services be made available to all eligible children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 as a condition for receiving funding for children in this age range under the Grants to States program.

<sup>3</sup> Estimates.

<sup>4</sup> These figures include funds provided under the Recovery Act in fiscal year 2009.

## PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To help preschool children with disabilities enter school ready to succeed by assisting States in providing special education and related services.**

**Objective:** *Preschool children with disabilities will receive special education and related services that result in increased skills that enable them to succeed in school.*

**Measure:** The percentage of children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 participating in the Preschool Grants program who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

**Assessment of progress:** The Department developed student outcome measures and has been implementing a plan to collect data from the States through their Annual Performance Reports (APRs) that can be used to assess child outcomes. As part of this plan, all States reported data in the Annual Performance Reports (APRs) submitted in February 2007, February 2008, and February 2009. These data covered the July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006, July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007, and July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 reporting periods and included the status of children at entry into the program. Overall, the initial data indicate that approximately 63 percent of the children entered preschool below age expectations in the area of social-emotional development, 71 percent were below in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and 59 percent in use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

States also have collected the first and second years of data on child progress for preschool children with disabilities who entered in reporting periods July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006, July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007, and July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008; exited the program during the periods covering July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007 and July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008; and had been in the program at least 6 months. The data indicate that approximately 29 percent of the children exiting the program made progress sufficient to reach a level comparable to their same age peers in the area of social-emotional development, 26.4 percent in the area of use of knowledge and skills, and 26.7 percent in the area of use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

It should be noted that there are a number of concerns with this data. There was variation in the size of the samples in State entry level data collections; States varied in the definitions they used of “near entry” and “near exit” and criteria used to define “same age peers”; and the results varied by large margins depending on the measurement method used. The data also are limited because they only include children who were in the program at least 6 months, but less than a year. The Department awarded a new grant for the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) in fiscal year 2008 to work with the States to resolve these issues and improve the reliability of the data they submit. In February 2010, States will submit a fourth year of entry data and third year of exiting data that will include a full cohort of children aged 3 through 5. The Department expects to set performance targets in fiscal year 2011 based on this data.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of children with disabilities (aged 3 through 5) who receive special education and related services in a regular early childhood program at least 80 percent of the time.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2007</b>		41.7
<b>2008</b>	43	50.3
<b>2009</b>	43	50.6
<b>2010</b>	43	
<b>2011</b>	48	

**Assessment of progress:** Actual performance in fiscal year 2009 exceeded the target for this measure for the second year in a row. The target for fiscal year 2011 was adjusted to reflect the trend in actual performance. This measure replaced a previous measure on the extent to which children with disabilities receive their special education services in regular education settings.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

The earlier measure did not provide any information on where the child spends the bulk of his or her day and the extent to which the child has opportunities to interact with nondisabled peers.

Under the revised data collection, States must report children under one of two categories. Category A includes children attending a regular early childhood program, which is defined as a program in which at least 50 percent of the children are not disabled. The category has three reporting subsets based on the amount of time the child spends in the regular early childhood settings: (1) at least 80 percent, (2) 40 percent to 79 percent, or (3) less than 40 percent. Category B covers children who are not attending a regular early childhood program or kindergarten and has two reporting options: (1) attending a special education program or (2) not attending a special education program (e.g., getting services in the home or a provider's office). States began using the revised data collection between October 1 and December 1, 2006, inclusive. This data was reported for fiscal year 2007. A second year of data for the reporting period July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007 was reported for fiscal year 2008. Data covering July 1, 2007 to July 20, 2008 was reported in February 2009 and became available in the fall of 2009. The Department anticipates receiving the data for July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009 in October 2010.

In addition to compiling the data for fiscal year 2009, the Department revisited the data submitted for fiscal year 2008, reviewing and verifying the data. Based on this analysis, we have revised the percentage reported for fiscal year 2008 from 44.4 percent to 50.3 percent. For fiscal year 2009, the States reported that 50.6 percent of children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 spent at least 80 percent of their time in programs in regular early childhood education settings. This rate is consistent with and only 0.3 percent higher than the rate reported for fiscal year 2008. The target for fiscal year 2011 has been increased from 43 percent to 48 percent based on the new data.

In July 2007, the Department published a Federal Register notice requesting comment on a proposal to add another reporting category that would cut the data a little finer to show children in programs in which 70 percent or more of the children are not disabled. SEAs and other interested parties submitted extensive comments regarding the proposal and the general validity and reliability of this measure. States reported that they had a great deal of difficulty implementing the new system because they must collect information on where children with disabilities spend their day, not just where they receive special education and related services. The Department reviewed these comments and revised the data collection forms. One change was to eliminate the need for parents to provide information on the percentage of children with disabilities in settings where the parent has enrolled or placed the child when the child is not in special education. We further simplified the collection and reduced the reporting burden by removing the requirement to report the proportion of time that a child spends each week in a regular early childhood classroom. The form now would only require the parent to indicate whether the child's usual daily routine includes attending a regular early childhood program and, if yes, if it is less than or more than 10 hours a week. The revised data collection will also obtain information on where children receive the majority of their special education services. The first collection of preschool settings data using the new form will be school year 2010-11, with the first data reported in the Annual Performance Reports due in February 2012.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

The Department is using technical assistance providers such as the ECO Center and the Regional Resource Centers to assist States in collecting the preschool educational environments data and is providing additional technical assistance through mechanisms such as presentations at the annual State data managers' conference and other meetings and the provision of "Frequently Asked Questions" documents and a data dictionary. (<http://www.ideadata.org/docs/bdatadictionary.pdf>)

<b>Measure:</b> The number of States with at least 90 percent of special education teachers of children with disabilities aged three to five who are fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	37	33
2006	37	38
2007	38	34
2008	39	38
2009	40	
2010	40	
2011	40	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department did not meet its target for fiscal year 2008. However, it was only 1 State below the target. It also was 4 States higher than the number of States reported for fiscal year 2007. The FY 2009 total of 38 States is the same number as reported for fiscal year 2006, which supports our belief that the targets for fiscal year 2009 represent ambitious, but reasonable performance targets. We anticipate that the fiscal year 2009 data will become available in October 2010.

### Efficiency Measure

<b>Measure:</b> The average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) response to the State.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	113	50
2007	100	92
2008	95	104
2009	90	
2010	88	
2011	88	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department has developed one efficiency measure for this program. That measure is the average number of workdays between the completion of site visits in a particular fiscal year and the Department's responses to the States. Targets were set for fiscal years 2006 through 2008 based on the actual performance for fiscal years 2004 and 2005. The very low average time in fiscal year 2006, while extremely positive, is counter to the

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

trend indicated by the numbers reported for other years. The rise in the actual rate in fiscal year 2008 is largely due to two States that had unique circumstances and took over 200 days each. The eight other fiscal year 2008 reports were issued between 49 and 100 days. The Department does not expect a recurrence of this situation in fiscal years 2009 and 2010. We anticipate receiving the data for fiscal year 2009 by March 2010.

### Other Performance Information

Pre-Elementary Longitudinal Study (PEELS): The PEELS study involves a nationally representative sample of children, 3 to 5 years of age when they entered the study, with diverse disabilities who are receiving preschool special education services in a variety of settings. The study will answer questions such as:

- What are the characteristics of children receiving preschool special education?
- What services do they receive and in what settings? Who provides these services?
- What child, family, community, and system factors are associated with the services children receive and the results they attain?
- What are their transitions like between early intervention (programs for children from birth to 3 years old) and preschool, and between preschool and elementary school?
- To what extent do the children participate in activities with other children their age who are not receiving preschool special education services? To what extent are preschool special education graduates included in general elementary education classes and related activities?

What short-and long-term results do children achieve in preschool, kindergarten, and early elementary school?

In January 2009, the latest report from this study was released, "Early School Transitions and Social Behavior of Children with Disabilities: Selected Findings from the Pre-Elementary Education Longitudinal Study." Transitions are a time when changes in eligibility for services can occur. For example, over the course of the data collection, the study found that 20 to 21 percent of children who transitioned from preschool to kindergarten were declassified (i.e., children who were receiving special education services in preschool but were determined not to have an eligible disability or to require special education services when they were reevaluated). In contrast, of children who did not undergo a transition, only 5 to 9 percent of children in the sample were declassified.

Based on teacher reports, there were no statistically significant differences in the ease with which children transitioned to kindergarten by gender, race/ethnicity, household income, or primary disability. However, there were some statistically significant differences based on parent reports of the ease of children's transition to kindergarten by demographics. Parents of Hispanic children were more likely than parents of Black or White children to report "a somewhat hard" or "very hard" transition to kindergarten. The support and involvement of schools in the process of transitioning to kindergarten was significantly associated with how easy the transition was perceived to be by parents and teachers. For example, 87 percent of

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

parents and 86 percent of teachers reported that the transition was “somewhat” or “very easy” when the school initiated support to facilitate the transition.

For all three years of data collection, parents were asked a number of questions about their children’s social skills and behavior. Parent reports regarding their children’s social skills and behaviors changed significantly during the time their children were receiving preschool services, generally in the direction of improved social skills and fewer behavior problems. The study also found that transfers out of special education were closely associated with children’s social skills and the extent that they no longer exhibited problem behaviors. (<http://www.peels.org>)

Other Studies: The Department also is conducting the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study program through the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). This program involves two overlapping cohort studies, a Birth Cohort (ECLS-B) and a Kindergarten Cohort (ECLS-K). Both are ongoing studies that focus on children’s early school experiences. The ECLS-K has followed the kindergarten class of 1998-99 through eighth grade. The ECLS-K provides descriptive information on children’s status at entry to school and their transition into school, and their progression through middle school. The ECLS-B is designed to follow children from 9 months through kindergarten. It focuses on health, development, early care, and education during the formative years of children born in 2001. These studies also are providing some data on outcomes experienced by children with disabilities participating in preschool programs and baseline data on outcomes experienced by nondisabled children.

The Office of Special Education Programs, and subsequently the National Center on Special Education Research, have sponsored a special education questionnaire for teachers in the ECLS-K Study and the collection of more extensive data on children with disabilities and their programs, including the identification of, receipt of services for, and use of special equipment for a number of disabling conditions that may interfere with a sampled child’s ability to learn. The children in the ECLS-K cohort were 5 years of age in school year 2006-07, when the first kindergarten data collection was conducted. During this collection, the majority of the children in the cohort were age-eligible for kindergarten, although all sample children were evaluated, regardless of kindergarten enrollment status. Since about a quarter of the cohort were not age-eligible for kindergarten until fall 2007, a second kindergarten data collection was fielded in 2007 to measure the kindergarten experiences of these children. The ECLS-K followed children through the cohort’s eighth grade year in school year 2008-09. The final data for the 8th and final year of data collection was released in July 2009. A new study, the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class of 2010-11 (ECLS-K:2011) replaces the ECLS-K and will be an ongoing study sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The ECLS-K: 2011 will provide descriptive information on children’s status at entry to school, their transition into school, and their progression through the elementary grades.

Data from ECLS-K on demographic and school characteristics indicate that for the cohort of students beginning kindergarten in 1998, specific learning disabilities and speech or language impairments were the most prevalent primary disabilities over the grades studied. The percentage of the student cohort receiving special education grew from 4.1 percent in kindergarten to 11.9 percent of students in fifth grade. The results also indicate that higher percentages of boys than girls and of poor students than nonpoor students received special education. About 12 percent of students receive special education in at least one of the grades:

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **State grants: Preschool grants**

---

kindergarten, first, and third grade, including 16 percent of boys, 8 percent of girls, 18 percent of poor children, and 10 percent of nonpoor children. One in three students who receive special education in early grades, first receive special education in kindergarten. Half of those who begin special education in kindergarten are no longer receiving special education by third grade. In addition to students' gender and poverty status, results are presented separately for other student and school characteristics, including race/ethnicity and school control, urbanicity, region, and poverty concentration.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### **State grants: Grants for infants and families**

(Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part C)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$439,427	\$439,427	0

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Grants for Infants and Families program (Part C) awards formula grants to the 50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Secretary of the Interior, and Outlying Areas to assist them in implementing statewide systems of coordinated, comprehensive, multidisciplinary, interagency programs and making early intervention services available to children with disabilities, aged birth through 2, and their families. Under the program, States are responsible for ensuring that appropriate early intervention services are made available to all eligible birth-through-2-year-olds with disabilities and their families, including Indian children and families who reside on reservations geographically located in the State. Infants and toddlers with disabilities are defined as children who: (1) are experiencing developmental delays, as measured by appropriate diagnostic instruments and procedures, in one or more of the following five areas: cognitive development, physical development, communication development, social or emotional development, or adaptive development; or (2) have a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay. Within statutory limits, "developmental delay" has the meaning given the term by each State. In addition, States have the discretion to provide services to infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays if they do not receive appropriate early intervention services.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) gives States the discretion to extend eligibility for Part C services to children with disabilities who are eligible for services under section 619 and who previously received services under Part C until such children enter or are eligible under State law to enter kindergarten or elementary school, as appropriate. The Act further stipulates that any Part C programs serving children aged 3 or older must provide an educational component that promotes school readiness and incorporates preliteracy, language, and numeracy skills and provide a written notification to parents of their rights regarding the continuation of services under Part C and eligibility for services under section 619. In fiscal year 2009, two States elected to make Part C services available to children with disabilities ages birth through 5.

The statute also includes authority for a State Incentive Grants program. The purpose of this program is to provide funding to assist States that have elected to extend eligibility for Part C services to children with disabilities aged 3 years until entrance into kindergarten or elementary school. The State Incentive Grants program is in effect in any fiscal year in which the appropriation for Part C exceeds \$460 million. In fiscal year 2009, due to the addition of funds

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **State grants: Grants for infants and families**

---

from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the total of funds appropriated for Part C exceeded the \$460 million level. Each of the two States that extended Part C services to children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 received additional funds through this program

The statewide system also must comply with 17 statutory requirements, including having a lead agency designated with the responsibility for the coordination and administration of funds and a State Interagency Coordinating Council to advise and assist the lead agency. One of the purposes of the Part C program is to assist States to coordinate payment for early intervention services from Federal, State, local, and private sources, including public and private insurance coverage. These include Medicaid, the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), Social Security Disability Insurance and Supplemental Security Income, and Early Head Start.

Funds allocated under this program can be used to: (1) maintain and implement the statewide system described above; (2) fund direct early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families that are not otherwise provided by other public or private sources; (3) expand and improve services that are otherwise available; (4) provide a free appropriate public education, in accordance with Part B of the IDEA, to children with disabilities from their third birthday to the beginning of the following school year; (5) continue to provide early intervention services to children with disabilities from their third birthday until such children enter or are eligible to enter kindergarten or elementary school; and (5) initiate, expand, or improve collaborative efforts related to identifying, evaluating, referring, and following up on at-risk infants and toddlers in States that do not provide direct services for these children.

The IDEA requires that early intervention services be provided, to the maximum extent appropriate, in natural environments. These services can be provided in another setting only when early intervention cannot be achieved satisfactorily for the infant or toddler in a natural environment. The natural environment includes the home and community settings where children would be participating if they did not have a disability. Each child's individualized family service plan (IFSP) must contain a statement of the natural environments in which early intervention services will be provided, including a justification of the extent, if any, to which the services will not be provided in a natural environment.

Allocations are based on the number of children in the general population aged birth through 2 years in each State. The Department of Education uses data provided by the United States Census Bureau in making this calculation. No State can receive less than 0.5 percent of the funds available to all States, or \$500,000, whichever is greater. The Outlying Areas may receive not more than 1 percent of the funds appropriated. The Secretary of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Education, receives 1.25 percent of the aggregate of the amount available to all States. Interior must pass through all the funds it receives to Indian tribes, tribal organizations, or consortia for the coordination of early intervention services on reservations with Interior schools. Tribes and tribal organizations can use the funds they receive to provide (1) help to States in identifying Indian infants and toddlers with disabilities, (2) parent training, and (3) early intervention services.

This is a forward funded program. Funds become available for obligation from July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$436,400
2007.....	436,400
2008.....	435,654
2009.....	439,427
Recovery Act .....	500,000
2010.....	439,427

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$439.4 million for the Grants for Infants and Families program for fiscal year 2011, the same as the fiscal year 2010 appropriation. The Administration believes that the request level is appropriate, especially in light of the funds previously made available under the Recovery Act and other early childhood programs.

The Recovery Act provided an additional \$500 million for this program. This represented a significant one-time increase for the program, which has allowed State lead agencies to fund training and development projects and to make purchases of durable equipment and other educational materials. These funds are available for obligation until September 2011.

The Grants for Infants and Families program is the primary mechanism by which the Federal Government ensures that infants and toddlers with disabilities receive appropriate early intervention services. Funds requested for the Part C program would be used to support early intervention programs that provide services designed to lessen the needs of infants and toddlers with disabilities for future or more extensive services and to ensure that very young children with disabilities receive the supports and services they need to prepare them to participate in a meaningful manner when they are ready to enter formal education.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2009</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>2010</u> <sup>2</sup>	<u>2011</u> <sup>2</sup>
Range in size of awards to States:			
Smallest State award <sup>3,4</sup>	\$4,551	\$2,153	\$2,153
Average State award <sup>3</sup>	17,894	8,281	8,281
Largest State award <sup>3</sup>	\$113,071	\$53,560	\$53,560
Children served <sup>2</sup>	332,000	342,000	352,000

<sup>1</sup> The fiscal year 2009 awards reflect funds provided under the Recovery Act, including funds for States participating in the State Incentive Grants program.

<sup>2</sup> Estimates.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To enhance the development of infants and toddlers (birth to three) with disabilities and support families in meeting the special needs of their child.**

**Objective:** *The functional development of infants and toddlers will be enhanced by early intervention services.*

**Measure: Functional abilities** – The percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities participating in the Part C program who demonstrate improved social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and use appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

**Assessment of progress:** The Department established five categories for reporting child progress in the three outcome areas: (1) the percentage of children who do not improve functioning; (2) the percentage of children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparably to same-aged peers; (3) the percentage of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers, but did not reach it; (4) the percentage of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers; and (5) the percentage of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers. However, baseline data and targets are not yet available for this measure. The Department has been implementing a plan to collect data from all States through their Annual Performance Reports (APRs) that can be used to assess child outcomes. As part of this plan, all States reported data on entering students in the Annual Performance Reports (APRs) submitted in February 2007, 2008, and 2009. The data covered the July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006, July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007, and July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 reporting periods, respectively, and included the status of children at entry into the program.

The point of entry data indicated that approximately 55 percent of the children entered Part C below age expectations in the area of social-emotional development, 71 percent were below

---

<sup>3</sup> The calculations for smallest, average, and largest awards do not include the Outlying Areas or the Department of the Interior.

<sup>4</sup> IDEA, section 643(c)(2) provides for a minimum allocation to States of the greater of \$500,000 or ½ of 1 percent of the amount available to States after the reservations for the Outlying Areas and the Bureau of Indian Education are excluded.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

expectations in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and 64 percent were below expectations in use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. In FY 2009, the States reported their second year of exiting data, which indicated that approximately 24 percent of the children exiting the program made progress sufficient to reach a level comparable to their same age peers in the area of social-emotional development, 28.2 percent in the area of use of knowledge and skills, and 32.2 percent in the area of use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. It should be noted that there are a number of concerns with this initial data. There was a great deal of variation in the size of the samples in State data collections and measurement approaches used to collect data; States varied in the definitions they used of “near entry” and “near exit” and criteria used to define “same age peers;” and the results varied by large margins depending on the measurement method used. The Department awarded a new grant for the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) in fiscal year 2008 to work with the States to resolve these issues and improve the reliability of the data they submit.

The Department only received data on exiting children in February 2008 and 2009. Progress is measured for children who have been in the program at least 6 months. When States submit the next round of data in February 2010, we will have a full cohort of entry and exiting data for children aged birth through 2. This will be the first report of exiting data that includes children aged birth through 2. These data will provide the baseline for establishing targets for the performance measure on child progress. This measure has been identified as a long-term performance measure for this program.

**Measure: Family capacity** – The percentage of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped them to (1) know their rights, (2) effectively communicate their children’s needs, and (3) help their children develop and learn.

**Assessment of progress:** A second year of data for this measure was submitted by the States in their Annual Performance Reports in February 2009. However, the Department believes that the data collection is flawed, and that there are numerous problems with the quality and consistency of the data collected. Not all of the State agencies provided data, and those that submitted data did not use the same methods to collect it. Some States used the family survey tool developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) and others used the Early Childhood Center (ECO) family survey, State-developed surveys, or a mix of questions from different surveys. There also were variations in the definition of the population to be included in the data collection, timing of the survey, and method used to conduct the surveys, such as hand delivery, mail, telephone, and combinations of the three. In addition, there is no tool for assessing and comparing the data submitted. The Department is working to correct these problems. However, we expect that it will be a long time before meaningful data on this measure can be collected.

**Objective:** *All infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families will receive early intervention services in natural environments that meet their individual needs.*

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

<b>Measure:</b> The number of States that serve at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under age one through Part C.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	27	25
2007	27	24
2008	27	25
2009	27	25
2010	27	
2011	27	

**Assessment of progress:** For a number of years, only 24 or 25 States have served at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under the age of one, and the program has not met its target in any year. The 1 percent threshold for this measure is based on the prevalence rate data for 5 conditions: 0.4 percent - severe mental retardation; 0.2 percent - hearing impairment; 0.1 percent - visual impairment; 0.2 percent - physical conditions (spina bifida, cerebral palsy, etc.); and 0.1 percent - autism. Data on numbers of infants and toddlers with disabilities being served under the Grants for Infants and Families program are reported annually by State lead agencies responsible for the implementation of these programs. The Department provides assistance to the States on improving their child find programs through programs such as the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) and the Regional Resource Centers (RRCs). The U.S. Census Bureau provides the population data used for this measure. The Department expects to receive data for fiscal year 2010 (December 1, 2009 child count) in November 2010.

<b>Measure:</b> The number of States that serve at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age 2, through Part C.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	31	30
2007	31	29
2008	31	31
2009	31	34
2010	31	
2011	32	

**Assessment of progress:** The number of States that served at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age 2, increased by 3 over the prior year and exceeded the target. Fiscal year 2008 was the first year that the target was met for this measure. It is too soon to determine if the high level achieved in fiscal year 2009 will be maintained. However, the Department has increased the target for fiscal year 2010 from 31 to 32 based on the trend demonstrated over the past several years. Data on numbers of infants and toddlers with disabilities being served under the Grants for Infants and Families program are reported annually by State lead agencies responsible for the implementation of these programs. The Department provides assistance to the States on improving their child find

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

programs through programs such as the NECTAC and the RRCs. The 2 percent threshold for this measure is based on prevalence data on the percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities in the general population. The U.S. Census Bureau provides the population data used for this measure. The Department expects to receive data for fiscal year 2010 in November 2010.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of children receiving age-appropriate early intervention services in the home or in programs designed for typically developing peers.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006	85	91
2007	86	91
2008	86	92
2009	87	
2010	87	
2011	93	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department has met or exceeded its targets for this measure every year since fiscal year 2000, and its performance continues to improve. Based on this data, the Department has increased the target for fiscal year 2011 to 93 percent. Data on settings in which children receive services are reported by State lead agencies on an annual basis. To assist States to continue to improve their performance in this area, the Department provides technical assistance and disseminates information on effective home visiting and other practices related to providing services in natural settings. The Department expects that fiscal year 2009 data will become available in November 2010.

### Efficiency Measures

<b>Measure:</b> The average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) response to the State.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		60
2007		60
2008		82
2009	79	
2010	79	
2011	79	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department has developed one efficiency measure for this program. That measure is the average number of workdays between the completion of site visits in a particular fiscal year and the Department's response to the State. The data indicates that the Office of Special Education programs conducted 10 site visits in fiscal year 2008, with an average of about 82 days from the site visit to the response to the State. Data for fiscal year 2009 is not yet available. However, we anticipate receiving it by March 2010.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

#### Other Performance Information

The National Center for Education Statistics is sponsoring the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study - Birth Cohort (ECLS-B) (<http://nces.ed.gov/ecls/Birth.asp>). This is a nationally representative, longitudinal study following an initial sample of 14,000 children born in 2001 through kindergarten entry (fall 2006 for 75 percent of the sample and fall 2007 for the remaining 25 percent). The data describe the early development, preparation for school, and key transitions experienced by these children during the early childhood years. The study assesses a broad range of developmental domains, including physical, cognitive, social, and emotional. In addition, each data collection solicits detailed information about the children's health and development.

The study has provided demographic information regarding infants and toddlers with disabilities. For example, the ECLS-B data collection over-sampled moderately low and very low birth-weight children because low birth weight is associated with developmental issues, including a variety of disabilities. This relationship was confirmed by the study. The Department anticipates that the study may provide additional information about children's health and development that is relevant to children with disabilities. (<http://nces.ed.gov/ECLS/birth.asp>)

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### **National activities: State personnel development**

(Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part D, Subpart 1)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite <sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$48,000	\$48,000	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2011.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The State Personnel Development (SPD) program provides grants to assist State educational agencies (SEAs) in reforming and improving their systems for personnel preparation and professional development of individuals providing early intervention, educational, and transition services to improve results for children with disabilities.

The SPD program focuses on professional development needs. At least 90 percent of the funds must be spent on professional development activities, including the recruitment and retention of highly qualified special education teachers. No more than 10 percent can be spent on State activities, such as reforming special education and regular education teacher certification (including recertification) or licensing requirements and carrying out programs that establish, expand, or improve alternative routes for State certification of special education teachers.

Awards are based on State personnel development plans that identify and address State and local needs for the preparation and professional development of personnel who serve infants, toddlers, preschoolers, or children with disabilities, as well as individuals who provide direct supplementary aids and services to children with disabilities. Plans must be designed to enable the State to meet the personnel requirements in Parts B and C (section 612(a)(14) and section 635(a)(8) and (9)) of IDEA. These plans must also be integrated and aligned, to the maximum extent possible, with State plans and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Grants are made on a competitive basis for any fiscal year in which the amount appropriated is less than \$100 million. However, if the amount appropriated is \$100 million or greater, funds would be distributed as formula grants, with allotments based on the relative portion of the funds the State received under Part B. Competitive awards are made for periods of 1 to 5 years with minimum awards to States of not less than \$500,000 and not less than \$80,000 for Outlying Areas. The maximum award to States is \$4 million per fiscal year. The factors used to determine the ultimate amount of each competitive award are: the amount of funds available; the relative population of the State or Outlying Area; and the types of activities proposed, alignment of proposed activities with the State's personnel standards, alignment of proposed

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **National activities: State personnel development**

---

activities with the State's plan and application under sections 1111 and 2112 of the ESEA, and the use, as appropriate, of scientifically-based research.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006 .....	\$50,146
2007 .....	0 <sup>1</sup>
2008 .....	22,598
2009 .....	48,000
2010 .....	48,000

---

<sup>1</sup> No funds were appropriated for this program in FY 2007. The fiscal year 2006 appropriation that remained available through September 30, 2007 was used to support FY 2007 awards.

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$48 million for the State personnel development (SPD) grants program to assist State educational agencies to improve results for children with disabilities through the delivery of high quality instruction and the recruitment and retention of highly qualified personnel. The request, which maintains funding at the 2010 level, would be used to support 37 continuation awards and 9 new awards.

Personnel shortages and inadequately trained teachers in special education are among the most pressing and chronic problems facing the field. SPD projects assist in addressing critical State and local needs for personnel preparation and professional development identified in the State's Personnel Development Plan. Projects provide personnel with the knowledge and skills to meet the needs of, and improve the performance and achievement of infants, toddlers, preschoolers, and children with disabilities, and to meet the State's performance goals established in accordance with section 612(a)(15) of IDEA. Support for special education personnel preparation activities is also provided through the Personnel Preparation program, under which the Secretary makes competitive awards, primarily to IHEs, to help States meet their responsibility to train and employ adequate numbers of fully certified personnel to serve children with disabilities.

Activities funded through this program are intended to support a statewide strategy to prepare, recruit, and retain teachers who are highly qualified under IDEA and the ESEA, and who are prepared to deliver scientific research-based or evidence-based instruction. States must develop SPD activities in a collaborative fashion and seek the input of teachers, principals, parents, administrators, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel.

#### Improving the Knowledge and Skills of Teachers Serving Children with Disabilities

Teacher quality is one of the most important factors in improving student achievement and eliminating achievement gaps between our neediest students and their more advantaged peers. Research shows that effective teaching is integral to improving the academic achievement of students who are at greatest risk of not meeting high academic standards. It is critical that

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **National activities: State personnel development**

---

children with disabilities from low-income and minority backgrounds have the same access to highly qualified and highly effective special education teachers as do children with disabilities attending schools in low poverty districts.

To help ensure that the activities funded under this program support State efforts to improve teacher quality, consistent with the requirements of IDEA and ESEA, the Department awarded grants in the past 3 years to applicants that proposed projects to prepare teachers to deliver scientifically-based instruction or evidence-based instructional practices, and to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers who are prepared to deliver such instruction in order to improve results for children with disabilities. In fiscal year 2009, the Department encouraged applicants under an invitational priority to propose programs of personnel preparation and professional development that address the inequitable distribution of highly qualified special education teachers between low and high poverty schools. Section 14005(d)(2) of the Recovery Act identified inequities in the distribution of highly qualified teachers between low and high poverty schools as one of the four areas of reform that need to be addressed by States under the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund.

The SPD program provides funding for professional development to improve the knowledge and skills of special education and regular education teachers serving children with disabilities. Specifically, SPD funds are used to provide training in effective interventions. Examples of such interventions include positive behavioral interventions and supports to improve student behavior in the classroom, scientifically-based reading instruction, early and appropriate interventions to identify and help children with disabilities, effective instruction for children with low incidence disabilities, and successful transitioning to postsecondary opportunities. Funds also assist States in utilizing classroom-based techniques to assist children prior to referral for special education. Listed below are a few examples of how States are using SPD funds to improve the knowledge and skills of teachers serving children with disabilities.

- North Carolina has used its SPD funds to increase the quantity and improve the quality of professional personnel providing leadership and instruction for the statewide educational program for students with disabilities. One of the main goals of the project is to improve the basic skills performance of students with disabilities. Students receiving reading instruction from teachers trained by the SPD gained 15 points in their statewide reading assessment scores from 2008 to 2009. Students who received math instruction from teachers trained by the SPD gained 18 points on the statewide math assessment from 2008 to 2009.
- Illinois has used its SPD funds to establish and implement a coordinated, regionalized system of professional development that will increase the capacity of school systems to provide early intervening services, aligned with the general education curriculum, to at-risk students and students with disabilities. The project's professional development system focuses on training in scientific, research-based reading instruction; progress monitoring; response to intervention; and standards-aligned instruction and assessment. A total of 57 schools across 39 districts are served by this project. All of the sites that have collected data for 2 years have demonstrated use of knowledge and skills gained through their training. After 2 years of participation in the Alliance for School-based Problem-solving & Intervention Resources in Education (ASPIRE) project, 55 percent of the continuing sites that house at least grades K-3 showed an increase in the percentage of grade 3 students

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

who met or exceeded State standards in reading, as measured by the 2007 and 2008 Illinois Standards Achievement Test.

- Georgia has used its SPD funds to decrease dropout rates for students with disabilities. Using research based practices such as math strategies for students who struggle, student mentoring programs, positive behavior supports, and parent and student activities focusing on attendance and involvement, 7 of 15 school districts (46.6 percent) reported a decrease in the drop-out rate for students with disabilities in the first year (2007-2008 school year) of the project.
- Michigan has used its SPD funds to provide professional development in connection with the implementation of its Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi). Research was conducted by graduate students at Oakland University on three project schools implementing MiBLSi. The three sample sites studied by the researchers all experienced significant improvements in the reduction of the number of special education referrals during each of their MiBLSi intervention years. Another area of improvement all three schools experienced was in the reduction in the number of behavior referrals. Finally, reading achievement improved in both of the sample sites that had collected at least one full year of data. Early indications are that the third sample site will report an increase in reading achievement at the end of the school year.

### Recruiting and Retaining Highly Qualified Special Education Teachers

The SPD program also supports States in developing and implementing strategies that are effective in promoting the recruitment and retention of highly qualified special education teachers. These include strategies such as teacher mentoring provided by exemplary special education teachers, principals, or superintendents; induction and support for special education teachers during their first 3 years of employment as teachers; and providing incentives, including financial incentives, to retain special education teachers who have a record of success in helping students with disabilities. Listed below are examples of how two States are using SPD funds to recruit and retain highly qualified special education teachers.

- Florida has used its SPD funds to work with the existing system of regional Personnel Development Partnerships to provide local school districts with a single access point for all professional development planning and implementation for education and related services personnel. Existing programs are being scaled up, including Para-to-Teacher Tuition Support, Induction and Mentoring, Virtual ESE Distance Learning, and Weekends with the Experts programs. A new program aimed at assisting special education teachers to become highly qualified is also being developed and implemented. In addition, endorsement courses that are needed to meet requirements for specific common competencies and training in Pre-Kindergarten Disabilities, Autism Spectrum Disorders, and Severe/Profound Disabilities are being implemented, leading to an increase in the number of personnel serving students with these disabilities. Statewide, from the 2005-2006 school year to the 2006-2007 school year, there was a 1.37 percent increase in full time special educators. In addition, the number of non-traditional and underrepresented personnel participating in pre-service, alternative, and/or continuing education programs rose more than 15 percent.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

- Alabama has used its SPD funds to implement a mentoring program, Gaining Expertise through Mentoring and Support (GEMS), to increase the retention of fully qualified teachers. The goals of the program are to: (1) build collegial relationships between mentor teachers and beginning teachers to promote instructional excellence; (2) develop self-efficacy for beginning teachers as well as their mentors, to improve teaching satisfaction and job retention of special education teachers and related service personnel; and (3) identify the needs of beginning teachers and generate and implement strategies to support beginning teachers within the context and culture of special education. These goals were implemented by utilizing 11 Regional In-service Centers to provide ongoing training and technical assistance to school systems in their regions on the GEMS. Alabama's retention efforts have led to a decrease in the need to hire new teachers.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Project funding:			
SPD awards			
New	\$3,437	\$ 9,076	\$8,905
Continuations	44,548 <sup>1</sup>	38,889	39,060
Peer review of new award applications	<u>15</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>35</u>
Total funding	48,000	48,000	48,000
Average award	\$1,066	\$1,043	\$1,043
Number of awards:			
New awards	4	9	9
Continuation awards	<u>41</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>37</u>
Total awards	45	46	46

<sup>1</sup> About \$1.543 million of these funds will be used to support FY 2010 continuation costs.

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program. The program has two long-term measures, four annual measures, and an efficiency measure.

An objective assessment of the SPD program's performance data collection, analysis, and reporting is being conducted as a part of Department's Data Quality Initiative (DQI). In FY 2009, the contractor reviewed the procedures in place to assess performance on the four SPD

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

measures that use grantee Annual Performance Reports (APRs) as the data source. In its interim report on the DQI SPD tasks conducted in FY 2009, the contractor documented the challenges of implementing these procedures and offered recommendations for enhancing the procedures, including clarifying terms and instructions and presenting sampling options. Performance data for fiscal years 2008 and 2009 are not reported because panel reviews of the grantee information reported in the APRs for those years have not been conducted and decisions about appropriate targets for FY 2010 and future years have been postponed until the Department has examined the DQI report's findings and recommendations related to the SPD program.

**Goal: To assist State educational agencies in reforming and improving their systems for providing educational, early intervention, and transitional services, including their systems of professional development, technical assistance, and dissemination of knowledge about best practices, to improve results for children with disabilities.**

**Objective:** *Provide personnel with the knowledge and skills to meet the needs of, and improve the performance and achievement of, infants, toddlers, preschoolers, and children with disabilities.*

#### Annual Measures

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of personnel receiving professional development through the State Personnel Development program on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2007</b>		30
<b>2008</b>	40	
<b>2009</b>	60	
<b>2010</b>		
<b>2011</b>		

**Assessment of progress:** This measure assesses the program's performance in providing personnel with professional development on instructional or behavioral practices that are scientific- or evidence-based. An expert panel reviews information submitted with a SPD project's Annual Performance Report (APR) to determine whether or not the training activities provided by a SPD project meet the standard for a scientific- or evidence-based instructional practice, based on pre-determined criteria. The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) staff use the results of the panel review and data in the APR to identify the number of personnel that received professional development on instructional practices that were judged to be scientific- or evidence-based. The measure is calculated by dividing the number of personnel who received professional development based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices by the total number of personnel who received professional development provided by SPD projects that are in at least their second budget period.

In FY 2007, an expert panel reviewed the APRs of the 8 projects that were in at least their second budget period and found that 30.5 percent of the personnel received professional

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

development based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices. In future years, there will be a larger pool of projects eligible for review. Expert panel reviews were not conducted in FYs 2008 and 2009.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of State Personnel Development projects that implement personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies in their State Performance Plans.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		38
2007	38	88
2008	88	
2009	92	
2010		
2011		

**Assessment of progress:** For all SPD projects that are in at least their second budget period, this measure is the percentage of projects conducting professional development activities that are explicitly identified as an improvement strategy in their State Performance Plan (SPP). In FY 2006, only 8 of the 49 SPD projects funded under this program were conducting projects under the new State Personnel Development grants authority. The other grantees were conducting their projects under the prior State Improvement Grant authority. In FY 2006, OSEP staff reviewed the SPPs and project APRs of the 8 SPD projects for the FY 2005/2006 performance period and found that only 37.5 percent of the projects conducted activities that were explicitly identified in the State's SPP. In FY 2007, the percentage increased to 87.5 percent based on a review of the same 8 projects. The Department has emphasized to States that SPD funds should be used as a resource to support the improvement strategies specified in their SPP. In addition, OSEP staff discuss project performance on the program's measures during monthly teleconferences with project staff, including project evaluators, and at the Annual Project Directors Meeting. Panel reviews were not conducted in FYs 2008 and 2009.

**Objective:** *Improve the quality of professional development available to meet the needs of personnel serving children with disabilities.*

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

#### Annual Measure

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of professional development/training activities provided through the State Personnel Development program on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2007</b>		61
<b>2008</b>	61	
<b>2009</b>	75	
<b>2010</b>		
<b>2011</b>		

**Assessment of progress:** This measure assesses the program's performance in providing training on scientific- or evidence-based instructional or behavioral practices. Grantees must include a description of each professional development activity provided by the project in their APR. In FY 2007, an expert panel reviewed the information submitted with the APR from the 8 SPD projects who were in at least their second budget period to determine whether or not each of the professional development training activities provided by the project was focused on a scientific- or evidence-based instructional practice. Based on this information, the reviewers determined that professional development/training activities on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices accounted for 61 percent of the total professional development/training activities conducted by SPD projects. Expert panel reviews were not conducted in FYs 2008 and 2009. The Department expects significant improvement on this measure in FY 2010 because the pool of projects eligible for review were funded under a grant priority that focused on the preparation of personnel to deliver scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices.

Long-term Measure: The percentage of professional development activities provided through the SPD program focusing on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices that are sustained through on-going and comprehensive practices.

The grantee's Final Performance Report must provide detailed documentation on how the professional development provided by the project was sustained, including a description of on-going and comprehensive practices being conducted by the project. A stakeholder panel will review the final performance report to determine whether there is evidence that elements are in place to sustain professional development on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices provided by the project. Elements/criteria for meeting this standard will be provided to the panel (e.g., provision of mentoring, coaching, structured guidance, modeling, continuous inquiry, etc.). Performance on this measure will be assessed beginning with the first cohort of grants under the SPD authority that end in FY 2010.

**Objective:** *Expand the use of scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices in schools.*

Long-term Measure: The percentage of State Personnel Development projects that successfully replicate the use of scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices in schools.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **National activities: State personnel development**

---

For this measure, grantees will be required to document in their final performance report how the use of one or more instructional or behavioral scientific- or evidence-based practices has been replicated in schools within the State, including the number of schools where the practice has been implemented with fidelity. Instructional practices that are implemented with fidelity (delivered with strict adherence to their original design) are more likely to achieve their intended outcomes. A stakeholder panel will review each project's final performance report to determine whether the project has met the standard for replicating or "scaling up" a scientific- or evidence-based practice with fidelity, based on criteria to be provided by OSEP. Performance on this measure will be assessed beginning with the first cohort of grants under the SPD authority that end in FY 2010.

**Objective:** *Implement strategies that are effective in meeting the requirements described in section 612(a)(14) of IDEA to take measurable steps to recruit, hire, train and retain highly qualified personnel in areas of greatest need to provide special education and related services.*

**Annual Measure:** In States with SPD projects that have special education teacher retention as a goal, the statewide percentage of highly qualified special education teachers in State identified professional disciplines (e.g., teachers of children with emotional disturbance, deafness, etc.) who remain teaching after the first 2 years of employment.

This measure is the percentage of highly qualified special education teachers participating in a SPD retention activity who remain teaching for at least 2 years following their participation in the SPD activity. A stakeholder panel will review project performance reports of SPD projects that have special education teacher retention as a goal. Project data on the number of personnel participating in a SPD retention activity will be collected annually through the APR. Project data on the number of such participants who were retained as special education teachers for at least 2 years will be reported by the grantee in its Final Performance Report. Performance on this measure will be assessed beginning with the first cohort of grants under the SPGD authority that end in FY 2010. The program's aggregated retention results will be compared to national data on retention.

### **Efficiency Measure**

The efficiency measure for this program is the percentage of projects whose cost per individual receiving professional development on scientific- or evidence-based practices is within a specified range. The cost per individual will be calculated by dividing total Federal grant funds by the number of individuals who receive professional development on scientific- or evidence-based practices. The Department plans to establish a baseline after the Department completes its review of the data collection and review process for the SPD measures, and after panel reviews are completed.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### **National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination**

(Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part D, Subpart 2, Section 663)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite <sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$49,549	\$49,549	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2011.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Technical Assistance and Dissemination (TA&D) program is the primary vehicle under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) for putting information into the hands of individuals and organizations serving children with disabilities and their families. The program makes competitive awards to provide technical assistance, support model demonstration projects, disseminate useful information, and implement activities that are supported by scientifically-based research. These awards are intended to improve services provided under the IDEA, including the practices of professionals and others involved in providing services that promote academic achievement and improve results for children with disabilities.

A majority of the grants funded under the TA&D program support individual centers that tend to focus their work on a single substantive area, population, or age range, such as early intervening services, dispute resolution, early childhood behavior, drop-out prevention, and positive behavioral interventions. Most activities supported through the TA&D program are coordinated to address the needs of a variety of audiences. While these audiences vary, in general, they include teachers, related services personnel, early intervention personnel, administrators, parents, and individuals with disabilities.

In addition to facilitating the adoption of model practices, technical assistance and dissemination activities promote the application of knowledge to improve practice by: determining areas where technical assistance and information are needed, preparing or ensuring that materials are prepared in formats that are appropriate for a wide variety of audiences, making technical assistance and information accessible to consumers, and promoting communication links among consumers.

TA&D activities are based on the best information available. One source of the scientifically-based research findings that are used to inform technical assistance and dissemination activities is the What Works Clearinghouse in the Institute of Education Sciences. This is particularly true in cases where there is alignment between the topical focus of a center and work being supported through the What Works Clearinghouse, such as dropout prevention. The duration of awards varies with the award's purpose. Most individual awards are made for a period of 5 years.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$48,903
2007.....	48,903
2008.....	48,049
2009.....	48,549
2010.....	49,549

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2011, the Administration is requesting \$49.5 million for the Technical Assistance and Dissemination (TA&D) program, the same as the 2010 appropriation. The request includes about \$11.8 million (including peer review costs) for new technical assistance, dissemination, and model projects, and \$37.7 million for continuation projects.

Funds available for new awards would be used to establish several new centers in areas for which grants supporting current centers are expiring, including a center on infant behavior and a national early learning technical assistance center, and fund up to 3 new projects that would support the development of model multi-tiered interventions. These funds would also be used to support several grants that are jointly-funded between the TA&D program and the Personnel Preparation program, including a center that would help States provide technical assistance related to the needs of children who are deaf and blind and up to 4 grants related to postsecondary education for the deaf. The Office of Special Education Programs is also considering how these funds may be used to support the Administration's key reform goals, particularly in relation to assessment and struggling schools.

Continuation funding would be provided for a variety of projects, including those that focus on particular topics, age ranges of children, disabilities, and target audiences. These include, for example:

#### *Projects focusing on particular topical areas:*

- National Dropout Prevention for Students with Disabilities – This center, located at Clemson University, provides technical assistance that is designed to help States build capacity to develop, select, and implement effective, evidence-based interventions and programs to improve school completion rates among students with disabilities. (<http://www.ndpc-sd.org/>)
- Partial support for three Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) technical assistance centers focusing on instruction, teacher quality, and high schools – These centers are part of an OESE system of 21 regional and content technical assistance centers, which received initial funding in 2005. (<http://www.ed.gov/programs/newccp/index.html>)
- National Center on Dispute Resolution – This center provides technical assistance that is designed to increase the effective use of mediation and other collaborative strategies to resolve disagreements, frequently between schools and parents of children with disabilities,

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

about services provided through special education and early intervention programs.  
<http://directionservice.org/cadre/index.htm>

*Projects focusing on children with disabilities by age or grade:*

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center – This center provides technical assistance that is designed to help States develop and implement child and family outcome measures for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with disabilities. These measures can be used in local, State, and national accountability systems. The ECO Center is a collaboration between SRI International, FPG Child Development Institute at UNC-Chapel Hill, Juniper Gardens Children's Project, the National Association of State Directors of Special Education, and the University of Connecticut Health Center. (<http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~eco/index.cfm>)

*Projects focusing on children with particular disabilities:*

- Deaf-Blindness Projects – The Department supports 50 State and multi-State technical assistance projects providing technical assistance on children who are both deaf and blind, as well as one project to provide technical assistance to these State and multi-State projects. The Department also supports a coordinating center that provides technical assistance to State and multi-State projects, which will be re-competed in fiscal year 2011. The current grantee's Web site is located at: <http://www.tr.wou.edu/ntac/>

*Projects focusing on particular audiences:*

- State and Federal Policy Forum for Program Improvement – This cooperative agreement facilitates communication between the Office of Special Education Programs and State and local administrators, and synthesizes national program information to improve the administration of special education programs. The Policy Forum will be re-competed in fiscal year 2010. The current grantee's Web site is located at: <http://www.projectforum.org/>

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<u>Program funding:</u>			
Specialized technical assistance and dissemination:			
New	0	\$1,500	\$2,627
Continuations	<u>\$14,725</u>	<u>11,955</u>	<u>9,902</u>
Subtotal	14,725	13,455	12,529
Model Demonstration Centers:			
New	773	1,360	2,231
Continuations	<u>2,399</u>	<u>1,974</u>	<u>1,974</u>
Subtotal	3,172	3,334	4,205

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination**

---

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) (continued)

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Regional/Federal Resource Centers:			
New	\$6,500	\$1,300	0
Continuations	<u>0</u>	<u>6,500</u>	<u>\$7,800</u>
Subtotal	6,500	7,800	7,800
Early childhood technical assistance:			
New	0	0	3,800
Continuations	<u>4,710</u>	<u>5,284</u>	<u>1,500</u>
Subtotal	4,710	5,284	5,300
Secondary, transition and postsecondary technical assistance:			
New	812	1,040	1,300
Continuations	<u>2,399</u>	<u>2,100</u>	<u>1,900</u>
Subtotal	3,211	3,140	3,200
Technical assistance for children who are both deaf and blind:			
New	160	0	1,850
Continuations	<u>11,125</u>	<u>11,350</u>	<u>9,500</u>
Subtotal	11,285	11,350	11,350
Transfers to Elementary and Secondary Education:			
New	0	3,000	0
Continuations	3,000	0	3,000
Federal technical assistance, technical assistance in data analysis, State and Federal information exchange, other:			
New	734	612	0
Continuations	<u>1,155</u>	<u>1,514</u>	<u>2,125</u>
Subtotal	1,889	2,126	2,125
Peer review of new award applications	57	60	40
Total:			
New	8,979	5,812	11,808
Continuations	39,513	43,677	37,701
Peer review of new award applications	57	60	40
Total	<u>48,549</u>	<u>49,549</u>	<u>49,549</u>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To assist States and their partners in systems improvement through the integration of scientifically-based practices.**

**Objective 1:** *States and other recipients of Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination program services will implement scientifically- or evidence-based practices for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities.*

**Objective 2:** *Improve the quality of Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination projects.*

**Objective 3:** *The Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination program will identify, implement, and evaluate evidence-based models to improve outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities.*

Six performance measures have been developed for the Technical Assistance and Dissemination (TA&D) program. Three of these measures are annual measures, two are long-term, and the last is a measure of efficiency.

Annual Measures: The three annual measures deal with the quality, relevance, and usefulness of products and services provided by the program. These measures were developed as part of a cross-departmental effort to make measures relating to technical assistance and dissemination activities more consistent department-wide. However, the measures have been adapted to reflect the unique purposes of the TA&D program. Baseline data for 2005 and 2006 were incomplete and not of high quality, so they have not been included here. Actual data for 2007 and subsequent years reflect more accurate measurements of program activities and a change in the rating standards used to judge performance for the measures. Targets for these measures were revised in 2008, based on a single year of data from 2007. The Department is planning to revise targets for all three measures again in 2010 on the basis of 3 years of trend data. Actual data for 2011 are expected by October 2010. The measures are:

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Technical Assistance and Dissemination products and services deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2007		74
2008	76	80
2009	77	94
2010	78	
2011	79	

**Assessment of progress:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using expert panels of reviewers who assess grant implementation by reviewing a sample of products and services developed by grantees against a listing of scientifically- or evidence-based practices in key target areas that have been identified by the Department as critical. The sample of grantees included in this measure for each year consists of approximately 26 TA&D centers and 10 State Deaf-Blind programs. Each TA&D center included in the sample is asked to submit its best product or service, and the Department's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) randomly selects a typical product or service from a database containing all products and services. Each State Deaf-Blind grantee included in the sample is asked to submit a best product or service, and a typical product or service. Products and services are divided into the categories of policy and practice. Items that are considered to be in the area of practice are reviewed by the science panel, and policy items are reviewed by the State representative stakeholder panel.

All products and services are reviewed and scored on the basis of a rubric, developed by OSEP, that is designed to yield ratings on the extent to which the content of submitted materials is: evidence-based, valid, complete, and up-to-date. Specifically, the rubric is designed to yield ratings on the basis of the following two quality dimensions: (1) Substance (Does the product reflect the best of current research and theory or policy guidance, as demonstrated by a scientifically- or evidence-based approach, a solid conceptual framework, appropriate citations and other evidence of conceptual soundness?); and (2) Communication (Does the product have clarity in its presentation, as evidenced by being free of editorial errors, appropriately formatted, and well organized?). The total score for any individual product or service reviewed is the sum of the two quality dimension sub-scores. High quality for any individual product or service is defined as a total score of 6 or higher of 9 possible points.

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of TA&D center products and services that received an average quality rating of 6 or better (30 in 2009) by the total number of products and services reviewed (32 in 2009). The same calculation is completed for the State Deaf-Blind grantees (e.g., in 2009, 23 products and services received scores of 6 or better, divided by 25 products or services reviewed). The results of these calculations are assigned weights that correspond with the proportion of total program funds expended in each area, and then added together to provide a single overall quality rating for the program.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

Program grantees have made progress in ensuring that products and services are of reasonably high quality. The Department is planning to monitor individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Technical Assistance and Dissemination products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified members of the target audiences of the technical assistance and dissemination.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2007		94
2008	94	95 <sup>3</sup>
2009	94	93
2010	94	
2011	94	

**Assessment of progress:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using expert panels of reviewers who assess grant implementation by reviewing a sample of products and services developed by grantees against a listing of scientifically- or evidence-based practices in key target areas that have been identified by the Department as critical. The sample of grantees included in this measure for each year consists of approximately 26 TA&D centers and 10 State Deaf-Blind programs. Each TA&D center included in the sample is asked to submit its best product or service, and OSEP randomly selects a typical product or service from a database containing all products and services. Each State Deaf-Blind grantee included in the sample is asked to submit a best product or service, and a typical product or service. Products and services are divided into the categories of policy and practice. Items that are considered to be in the area of practice are reviewed by the science panel, and policy items are reviewed by the State representative stakeholder panel.

All materials are reviewed and scored on the basis of a rubric, developed by OSEP, that is designed to yield ratings on the extent to which the content of materials is responsive to priority issues and challenges confronting the target groups. Specifically, the rubric is designed to yield ratings on the basis of the following three dimensions related to relevance: (1) Need (Does the content of the material attempt to solve an important problem or critical issue?); (2) Pertinence (Does the content of the material match the problem or issue facing the target group or groups?); and (3) Reach (To what extent is the content of the material applicable to diverse populations within the target group?). The total score for any individual product or service reviewed is the sum of the three quality dimension sub-scores. High relevance for any individual product or service is defined as a total score of 6 or higher of 9 possible points.

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of TA&D center products and services that received an average quality rating of 6 or better (30 in 2009) by the total number of products and services reviewed (32 in 2008). The same calculation is completed for the State Deaf-Blind grantees (e.g., in 2009 23 products and services received scores of 6 or better, divided by 25 products or services reviewed). The results of these calculations are assigned weights that correspond with the proportion of total program funds expended in each area, and then added together to provide a single overall rating for the program.

---

<sup>3</sup> This data point has been corrected from the amount reported in prior year CJs, which was 89 percent.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

As reflected by the targets through 2011, for this particular measure the Department is seeking to maintain current levels of performance. While overall performance under this measure has been strong in every year for which data have been collected, and grantees seem to do an adequate job ensuring that products and services are of high relevance, the Department continues to monitor individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of all Technical Assistance and Dissemination products and services deemed by experts to be useful by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2007	48	80
2008	50	78
2009	52	82
2010	80	
2011	82	

**Assessment of progress:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using expert panels of reviewers who assess grant implementation by reviewing a sample of products and services developed by grantees. The sample of grantees included in this measure for each year consists of approximately 26 TA&D centers and 10 State Deaf-Blind programs. Each TA&D center included in the sample is asked to submit its best product or service, and OSEP randomly selects a typical product or service from a database containing all products and services. Each State Deaf-Blind grantee included in the sample is asked to submit a best product or service, and a typical product or service. Products and services are divided into the categories of policy and practice. Items that are considered to be in the area of practice are reviewed by the science panel, and policy items are reviewed by the State representative stakeholder panel.

All materials are reviewed and scored on the basis of a rubric, developed by OSEP, that is designed to yield ratings on the extent to which the content can be easily and quickly adopted or adapted by the target group, and the likelihood that the product or service, if adopted, will produce the desired result. Specifically, the rubric is designed to yield ratings on the basis of the following three (3) dimensions related to usefulness: (1) Ease (Does the content of the product or service description address a problem or issue in an easily understood way, with directions or guidance regarding how a problem or issue can be addressed?); (2) Replicability (Is it likely that the information derived from the product or service will eventually be used by the target group to achieve the benefit intended?); and (3) Sustainability (Is it likely that the information derived from the product or service will eventually be used in more than one setting successfully over and over again to achieve the intended benefit?). The total score for any individual product or service reviewed is the sum of the three quality dimension sub-scores. High usefulness for any individual product or service is defined as a total score of 6 or higher of 9 possible points.

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of TA&D center products and services that received an average quality rating of 6 or better (26 in 2009) by the total number of products and services reviewed (32 in 2009). The same calculation is completed for the State Deaf-Blind

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination**

---

grantees (e.g., in 2009, 23 products and services received scores of 6 or better, divided by 25 products or services reviewed). The results of these calculations are assigned weights that correspond with the proportion of total program funds expended in each area, and then added together to provide a single overall rating for the program.

As evidenced by the fact that actual performance at the program level far exceeds established targets, program grantees have made substantial progress in ensuring that products and services are useful. Targets for this measure in 2010 and 2011 have been revised based on actual data for 2007 through 2009. To improve actual performance under this measure over the next few years, the Department is planning to monitor individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

Long-term Measures: Two long-term measures have been developed for the program for which data will be collected every 2 years. They are:

- The percentage of school districts and service agencies receiving TA&D services regarding scientific- or evidence-based practices for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities that implement those practices. (Targets and a baseline will be established in FY 2010 on the basis of data from 2009 and 2010. In 2009, the first year data were collected for this measure, 30 out of 38 (79 percent) districts and agencies sampled were implementing evidence-based practices).
- Of the TA&D projects responsible for developing models, the percentage of projects that identify, implement and evaluate effective models. (Targets and a baseline will be established in FY 2010 on the basis of data from 2009 and 2010. In 2009, the first year data were collected for this measure, 14 out of 16 (88 percent) projects responsible for developing models were actively engaged in identifying, implementing, and evaluating effective models).

### **Efficiency Measures**

The Department has developed a common efficiency measure for OSEP programs that provide technical assistance, including the Special Education TA&D program. It is “the cost per unit of technical assistance, by category, weighted by the expert panel quality rating.” As of fall 2009, the Department has a single year of data for this measure. The cost per unit of technical assistance technical assistance offered by centers supported under the TA&D program in 2009 was \$1,096. In 2009, the “per unit” cost is based on cost information submitted by 24 of the 28 centers supported through this program. Of the 24 centers that submitted cost information, the Department randomly selected a 50 percent sample (n=12) and calculated the cost per unit of technical assistance for each individual center. The cost per unit of technical assistance for individual each TA&D center is calculated by dividing the average of cost of developing a randomly selected sample of products and services offered by each center by the number of persons who received or used such products and services. This cost per unit information is then averaged across all centers included in the sample to obtain a single overall average cost per unit of technical assistance for the program. The Department is currently working to determine whether or not, and how, these cost factors should be weighted.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

#### **Other Performance Information**

In connection with the ongoing National Assessment of IDEA, the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) recently launched an evaluation of the IDEA TA&D program, along with technical assistance activities that are currently supported under the other IDEA, Part D programs, such as Centers that provide technical assistance on specific topical areas. The evaluation, which started in August 2009, will be conducted over a 5-year period. This evaluation will inform policymakers and practitioners about (a) the nature of the technical assistance services provided by TA&D grantees, (b) the experiences of SEAs and LEAs that interact with such grantees, (c) the implementation of practices recommended by such grantees, and (d) whether implementation of recommended practices is associated with improved outcomes for children and youth with disabilities.

The evaluation addresses these research questions using data gathered from OSEP, through *EDFacts*<sup>1</sup>, and through new surveys of TA&D grantees, SEA officials responsible for IDEA implementation, and school district special education directors.

---

<sup>1</sup> *EDFacts* is a U. S. Department of Education initiative to put performance data at the center of policy, management and budget decisions for all K-12 education programs. *EDFacts* centralizes performance data supplied by K-12 State educational agencies (SEAs) with other data assets, such as financial grant information, within the Department to enable better analysis and use in policy development, planning and management. *EDFacts* relies on the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN), a centralized portal through which States submit their educational data to the U.S. Department of Education.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### National activities: Personnel preparation

(Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part D, Subpart 2, Sections 661 through 662)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite <sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$90,653	\$90,653	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2011.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Personnel Preparation program helps States meet their responsibility to train and employ adequate numbers of fully certified personnel to serve children with disabilities by supporting competitive awards to:

- Provide research-based training and professional development to prepare special education, related services, early intervention, and regular education personnel to work with children with disabilities,
- Ensure that those personnel are highly qualified, and possess the skills and knowledge that are needed to serve children with disabilities, and
- Ensure that regular education teachers have the necessary knowledge and skills to provide instruction to students with disabilities in regular education classrooms.

The Secretary is required to make competitive grants that support training activities in a few high priority areas, including: general personnel development, beginning special educators, leadership, and low incidence disabilities.

Personnel Development. This broad authority requires the Secretary to support at least one of the following activities: (a) promoting partnerships and collaborative personnel preparation and training between institutions of higher education (IHEs) and local educational agencies (LEAs), (b) developing, evaluating, and disseminating innovative models for the recruitment, induction, retention, and assessment of highly qualified teachers, (c) providing continuous training and professional development to support special education and general education teachers and related services personnel, (d) developing and improving programs for paraprofessionals to become special educators, (e) promoting instructional leadership and improved collaboration between general and special education, (f) supporting IHEs with minority enrollment of not less than 25 percent, and (g) developing and improving programs to train special educators to develop expertise in autism spectrum disorders.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **National activities: Personnel preparation**

---

Beginning Special Educators. The Secretary is also required to provide support for beginning special educators. Specifically, the Secretary is required to make at least one award to: (a) enhance and restructure existing teacher education programs or develop teacher education programs that prepare special education teachers by incorporating an extended (e.g., an additional 5<sup>th</sup> year) clinical learning opportunity, field experience, or supervised practicum, or (b) create and support teacher-faculty partnerships between LEAs and IHEs (e.g., professional development schools) that provide high-quality mentoring and induction opportunities with ongoing support for beginning special educators or in-service support and professional development opportunities.

Personnel to Serve Children With Low Incidence Disabilities. Awards to support personnel to serve children with low incidence disabilities are designed to help ensure the availability of quality personnel in this area by providing financial aid as an incentive to the pursuit of careers in special education, related services, and early intervention. Under this authority, the term “low incidence disabilities” primarily refers to visual or hearing impairments, and significant cognitive impairments. In carrying out this authority, the Secretary is required to support activities that benefit children with low incidence disabilities, such as: training personnel; providing personnel from various disciplines with interdisciplinary training that will contribute to improvements in early intervention and educational outcomes for children with low incidence disabilities; and preparing personnel in the innovative uses of technology to enhance educational outcomes for children with low incidence disabilities, and to improve communication with parents.

Leadership Personnel. Leadership preparation activities focus on improving results for students with disabilities by ensuring that leadership personnel in both regular and special education have the skills and training to help students with disabilities achieve to high standards. Under this authority, leadership personnel may include a variety of different personnel, such as teacher preparation and related service faculty, administrators, researchers, supervisors, and principals. Authorized activities include training personnel at the graduate, postgraduate, and doctoral levels, and providing interdisciplinary training for various types of leadership personnel.

All Personnel Preparation competitions emphasize the value of incorporating best practices, as determined through research, evaluations, and experience. These include practices related to personnel training and professional development, as well as the provision of special education, related services, and early intervention services.

While individuals and students are not eligible for awards under the Personnel Preparation program, many grantees are required to use at least 65 percent of their award(s) to support scholarships. In recent years, approximately half of the program’s total appropriations have been used to support student scholarships. A large majority of the grants awarded through this program go to IHEs. Awards are made throughout the fiscal year. Duration of awards varies from 3 to 5 years, depending on the type of project.

Students who receive financial assistance (e.g., tuition, stipend, fees) from projects funded under the program are required to pay back such assistance, either by working for a period of time after they complete their training in the area(s) for which they received training, or by making a cash repayment to the Federal Government.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

Beyond awards to IHEs that focus on providing scholarships to train additional special education personnel, the Department also makes awards to centers under this program. Unlike awards that provide support for scholarships, which are designed primarily to increase the supply of personnel, center-based awards tend to focus on enhancing the quality of work in a particular topical area, through such activities as professional development, technical assistance, partnerships, or the development of materials and best practices. Centers currently funded under this program support work in a number of high priority areas related to personnel, such as:

- The Principal Leadership Professional Development Center – This center, a partnership between the National Institute for Urban School Improvement, the University of Arizona, and the University of Colorado, is designed to enhance the effectiveness of principals through the use of on-line professional development tools and resources. The center's general goal is to increase the number of inclusive schools that successfully serve all their students, including culturally diverse students, English learners, and students with disabilities. Strategies to accomplish this goal include building on-line communities of practice among current leaders, and providing a variety of technical assistance and professional development materials that enable principals to lead change using data-driven, team-based processes, and learn about effective, research-based practices that improve learning outcomes. (<http://www.niusileadscape.org/>)
- The National Professional Development Center on Autism Spectrum Disorders – This multi-university project promotes the use of evidence-based teaching strategies for children with autism spectrum disorders. This center is a collaboration between the University of North Carolina, the University of Wisconsin, and the University of California at Davis Medical School. (<http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~autismPDC/>)
- The National Center to Improve Recruitment and Retention of Qualified Personnel for Children with Disabilities – This center offers services that are designed to help States and local educational agencies increase their capacity to - develop and implement personnel data management plans; plan and deliver professional development partnerships to meet local needs more effectively; and attract, develop, and support new and existing personnel. (<http://www.personnelcenter.org/index.cfm>)
- The IDEA and Research for Inclusive Settings (IRIS) Center – This center works with experts from across the Nation to create free, high-quality, interactive, on-line professional development modules, case study units, and a variety of activities, the purpose of which is to provide research-validated information about working with students with disabilities in inclusive settings. All IRIS materials are available free of charge through the IRIS Web site (<http://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu>).
- The Center to Mobilize Early Childhood Knowledge (CONNECT) – This center, which is housed at the University of North Carolina's Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute, is working with the early childhood community to create a series of web-based resources that focus on and respond to challenges faced each day by those working with young children with disabilities and their families. (<http://community.fpg.unc.edu/>)

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

- The National Center on High Quality Personnel in Inclusive Preschool Settings – This center, which is also housed at the University of North Carolina’s FPG Child Development Institute, develops and disseminates evidence-based training materials that are designed to assist all States in increasing the number of high quality personnel serving preschoolers with disabilities in inclusive settings.  
[http://www.fpg.unc.edu/projects/project\\_detail.cfm?projectid=539](http://www.fpg.unc.edu/projects/project_detail.cfm?projectid=539)
- The Center on Personnel Studies in Special Education – This center conducts studies that are designed to provide insights into chronic and pressing special education issues, such as beginning teacher quality, effective personnel training, certification and licensure, alternative certification, supply and demand, and the effects of preparation alternatives.  
<http://www.coe.ufl.edu/copsse/index.php>

Since 2002 the Department has invested an increasingly large portion of the funds available under this program in centers. In FY 2010, the Department expects to fund approximately 11 centers, which will account for roughly 11 percent of the funds available under the program. In FY 2002, the Department funded 7 centers, accounting for roughly 6 percent of total program funds.

Additional support for personnel preparation activities is provided through the State Personnel Development Grants (formerly State Improvement Grants) program, under which the Secretary makes competitive awards to help SEAs reform and improve in-service training and professional development activities for teachers, including the recruitment and retention of highly qualified special education teachers. A variety of other programs administered by the Department also make competitive awards that support training and professional development activities that are designed to enhance classroom effectiveness of teachers, including special education personnel.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$89,720
2007.....	89,720
2008.....	88,153
2009.....	90,653
2010.....	90,653

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2011, the Administration requests \$90.7 million for the Personnel Preparation program, the same level as the 2010 appropriation. Of this amount, at least \$25.7 million would be used for new projects (including peer review costs of approximately \$.3 million) and \$65.0 million would support the continuation of grants made in prior years.

The Department is currently exploring how funds available to support new activities under this program can be better targeted to address Administration priorities relating to personnel and human capital. Administration priorities in this area include: addressing the inequities in the

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **National activities: Personnel preparation**

---

distribution of highly qualified teachers (consistent with Section 14005(d)(2) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act)), alleviating on-going personnel shortages by targeting funds on training programs that provide for alternative certification and dual certification; increasing the supply of principals who are adequately prepared to ensure the provision of evidence-based services for children with disabilities; and taking aggressive steps to measure teacher effectiveness, and evaluating teacher pre-service preparation programs by looking at student outcomes.

While the funds available through this program are by no means sufficient to resolve on-going nationwide personnel shortages in special education, they do contribute to: the on-going development of best practices; improvements in the overall quality of training offered, and; the training of additional special education, related services, and leadership personnel in certain high priority areas where program investments have been targeted over time, such as training personnel to provide services to students with low incidence disabilities.

Available data relating to personnel shortages in special education, such as State-reported data illustrating the percentage of special education teachers fully certified in States and Outlying Areas, strongly support the need for continued Federal investment in this area. Persistent shortages of qualified personnel have been reported since the enactment of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in the mid-1970s. Recruiting and retaining special educators is particularly challenging for high poverty schools. Data from a recent report, *Teacher Quality Under No Child Left Behind: Final Report*, illustrate the challenge. According to this study, completed by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) for the Department in January 2009, approximately half of all districts in the country reported difficulty attracting highly qualified mathematics, science, and special education teachers in the 2006-2007 school year, while an overwhelming 90 percent of high-poverty districts reported the same difficulty. (See: <http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/teaching/nclb-final/index.html>). Likewise, according to data that States are required to report pursuant to Title II of the Higher Education Act (HEA) (see <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/teachprep/2006-title2report.pdf>), through 2006, a higher percentage of certification waivers were issued to special education teachers (5 percent) than teachers in any other subject area except foreign languages (7 percent), and nationwide teachers who receive waivers are more likely to be employed in high-poverty districts.

Beyond the challenges associated with hiring and retaining special educators, an ongoing challenge for States under IDEA has been to ensure that all special educators are highly qualified. According to the AIR study, despite large gains in the overall percentages of special educators nationwide who reported being highly qualified, special education teachers were still five times more likely to report that they were not highly qualified (10 percent) than general education teachers (2 percent). Of all special education teachers, 72 percent reported they were highly qualified in the 2006-2007 academic year, compared to 84 percent of general education teachers. The percentage of special education teachers who reported they were highly qualified varied substantially by school level: the percentage was lower for high school teachers (56 percent) than for elementary and middle school teachers (71 percent and 83 percent, respectively). (See: <http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/teaching/nclb-final/index.html>).

As States work to address this problem, program funds are being used to provide critical support for promising practices. For example, since fiscal year 2007, the Department has

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

supported 56 Special Education Pre-Service Training Improvement grants to IHEs to restructure or redesign existing training programs for special educators, and to ensure that curricula are aligned with evidence-based practices, and that all graduates receiving stipends meet the highly qualified teacher requirements upon program completion. Beginning in FY 2009, the Department also funded the Paraprofessional Pre-service Training Improvement grants to IHEs to ensure that coursework and curricula, internships, and mentoring components of training programs are evidence-based, and meet the standards for paraprofessionals contained in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as well as State certification and licensure requirements.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<u>Program funding:</u>			
Low incidence disabilities grants:			
New	\$4,502	\$5,080	\$4,000
Continuations	<u>10,111</u>	<u>9,795</u>	<u>9,579</u>
Subtotal	14,613	14,875	13,579
Leadership training grants:			
New	6,979	4,400	4,400
Continuations	<u>12,287</u>	<u>12,716</u>	<u>13,789</u>
Subtotal	19,266	17,116	18,189
Minority institution grants: <sup>1</sup>			
New	2,239	3,000	3,000
Continuations	<u>6,741</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>10,000</u>
Subtotal	8,980	13,000	13,000
Training improvement grants:			
New	1,406	2,500	2,500
Continuations	<u>4,058</u>	<u>5,429</u>	<u>7,929</u>
Subtotal	5,464	7,929	10,429

---

<sup>1</sup> This category includes awards to institutions with minority enrollments of not less than 25 percent. Under IDEA, Part D, Sec. 681(c)(2), the Secretary is required to reserve not less than 2 percent of the total amount of funds appropriated under Part D, subparts 2 and 3 for outreach and technical assistance activities for historically Black colleges and universities and IHEs with minority enrollments of not less than 25 percent, which translates into \$4.097 million in fiscal year 2009, \$4.244 million in fiscal year 2010, and \$4.189 million in 2011.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) (continued)

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Other personnel development grants: <sup>2</sup>			
New	\$5,103	\$4,120	\$5,000
Continuations	<u>17,242</u>	<u>17,204</u>	<u>16,204</u>
Subtotal	22,345	21,324	21,204
National Activities: <sup>3</sup>			
New	3,039	6,550	6,450
Continuations	<u>16,559</u> <sup>4</sup>	<u>9,509</u> <sup>5</sup>	<u>7,452</u>
Subtotal	19,598	16,059	13,902
Peer review of new award applications	387	350	350
Program Totals:			
New	23,268	25,650	25,350
Continuations	66,998	64,653	64,953
Peer review of new award applications	<u>387</u>	<u>350</u>	<u>350</u>
Total	90,653	90,653	90,653

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department is working to develop reliable and systematic ways to understand the effects of activities supported through the Personnel Preparation program. While State-reported data provide critical insights into the overall conditions in the market for special educators, such data do not shed much light on program effectiveness. Unfortunately, relatively little is known about the overall effectiveness of the Personnel Preparation program.

#### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the

---

<sup>2</sup> This category includes a wide range of training and development activities currently supported through the program, such as awards to train: personnel to serve infants, toddlers and pre-school age children with disabilities; personnel to provide related services, speech/language services, and adapted physical education to children with disabilities; and personnel to serve school-age children with high incidence disabilities.

<sup>3</sup> This category includes investments in national centers in a variety of different critical need areas, including the National Center to Enhance the Professional Development of School Personnel Who Share Responsibility for Improving Results for Children with Disabilities, the Professional Development Center for Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders, the Center on High Quality Personnel in Inclusive Preschool Settings, the Principal Leadership Professional Development Center to Support School Improvement to Ensure Access to, and Participation and Progress in the General Education Curriculum in the Least Restrictive Environment, and the National Center to Enhance the Training of Personnel Who Share Responsibility for Young Children with Disabilities.

<sup>4</sup> The FY 2009 continuation awards total includes approximately \$9.98 million in FY 2010 continuation costs.

<sup>5</sup> The FY 2010 continuation awards total includes approximately \$5.28 million in FY 2011 continuation costs.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal: To prepare service providers and leadership personnel in areas of critical need who are highly qualified to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

***Objective 1:** Improve the curricula of IDEA training programs to ensure that personnel preparing to serve children with disabilities are knowledgeable and skilled in practices that reflect the current knowledge base.*

***Objective 2:** Increase the supply of teachers and service providers who are highly qualified for and serve in positions for which they are trained.*

***Objective 3:** Enhance the efficiency of the expenditure of Federal dollars under the program.*

### Long Term Performance Measures

The program has two long-term measures that are designed to provide information on the quality of the program by looking at the skills of scholars supported using program funds.<sup>4</sup> The first long-term measure is:

<b>Measure:</b> Percentage of degree/certification recipients who maintain employment for 3 or more years in the area(s) for which they were trained and who are fully qualified under IDEA.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2007</b>		90
<b>2008</b>		91
<b>2009</b>	91	65
<b>2010</b>	93	
<b>2011</b>	95	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department currently collects data for this measure using a temporary collection methodology that involves surveying a small sample (n=9) of the largest IHEs that receive program funds to support student training. This measure is currently calculated by dividing the total number of degree recipients from the 9 largest grantees that, according to those institutions, maintained employment for 3 years in the area(s) for which they were trained and who are highly qualified by the total number of degree recipients who graduated in any single year from those programs. For example, for 2009 the numerator is the total number of degree recipients who received degrees in 2004, maintained employment for 3 or more years in the area for which they were trained, and who are fully qualified under IDEA

---

<sup>4</sup> The Department originally proposed an additional long-term measure that would have tracked the percentage of low incidence positions that are filled by personnel who are fully qualified under IDEA. However, after attempting to collect these data using a number of strategies, the Department decided to drop this measure because States do not currently disaggregate teacher qualification data by disability category.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

(n=280), and the denominator is the total number of degree recipients graduating from these 9 institutions in 2004 (n=431). Because these data are currently collected from only 9 grantees, they are not comparable with data presented in the other program performance measures and they are most likely not representative of the whole program. It is not yet clear why actual performance for these 9 grantees dropped so much in FY 2009. Beginning in 2010, however, the Department expects to obtain data for all currently funded program grantees that support training grants through the National Center for Service Obligation (NCSO). NCSO is the OSEP-supported contractor that follows students post-graduation to determine whether or not individuals are complying with the program's service obligation requirement. Using data from the NCSO, the Department plans to re-calculate the data for this measure using data for all grantees.

The second long-term measure is:

<b>Measure:</b> Percentage of scholars completing Special Education Personnel Preparation funded training programs who are knowledgeable and skilled in evidence-based practices for children with disabilities.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2008</b>		44
<b>2009</b>	46	39
<b>2010</b>	49	
<b>2011</b>	52	

**Assessment of progress:** Grantees submit data annually through the Department Personnel Preparation Data Report (PPD) web-based data collection (see: <http://www.osepppd.org/>). This measure presents information on the percentage of scholars completing programs who passed an independent exam, such as the Praxis II, that is designed to assess the knowledge and skills of special educators. This measure is calculated by dividing the total number of scholars who pass an exam demonstrating knowledge and skills in evidence-based practices for children with disabilities (1,047 students in 2009) by the total number of students who completed training programs – including students who passed a test (1,047 students in 2009), students who did not pass a test (72 students in 2009), students who did not take a test (865 students in 2009), students for whom grantees did not know if they took a test (690 students in 2009), students for whom test data was missing (4 students in 2009), and students for whom test data are not available (2,678 students in 2009).

The Department does not currently require IHEs receiving program funds to use an independent assessment to assess the knowledge and skills of individuals graduating from institutions supported with program funds. The actual data and targets for this program are unusually low because, while all scholars receiving program funds are included in the denominator, a substantial number of these scholars (approximately 865 out of 2,678 in 2009) do not participate in independent assessments. These scholars attend programs at IHEs located in States that do not currently require graduates to pass an independent assessment to measure the knowledge and skills of graduates. Such IHEs either measure knowledge and skills through a “comprehensive,” but not independent, examination process (such as an “oral examination” administered by faculty at the IHE), or through some other mechanism. The Department is currently conducting a number of analyses to determine the extent to which specific

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

management actions may be taken to improve performance on this measure, as well as to determine the validity and reliability of these data. The Department also plans to monitor grantees more closely to determine how they are assessing graduates knowledge and skills in evidence-based practices for children with disabilities, and how these alternate approaches compare with the use of an independent assessment.

### Annual Performance Measures

The program also has five annual performance measures. All five of these measures are designed to provide information on various aspects of program quality, including scholars who receive funding through the program. While several years of data have been collected for most of these annual measures, the Department recently recalculated all years of actual performance to ensure that the appropriate subcategories of “unknowns” were included in the denominators. In most cases, because the actual data changed substantially, new targets also had to be established. These measures are:

<b>Measure:</b> Percentage of projects that incorporate scientifically- or evidence-based practices in their curricula.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2007</b>		42
<b>2008</b>	50	56
<b>2009</b>	60	49
<b>2010</b>	65	
<b>2011</b>	70	

**Assessment of progress:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor using an expert panel of 5 experts, who review a randomly selected sample of 50 percent of grantee course syllabi submitted by funded applicants in the same cohort of grantees. Syllabi, which are taken from grantee applications, are reviewed against a listing of between 5 and 7 scientifically- or evidence-based practices in key target areas that have been identified by the Department as critical for all projects -- including assessment, behavior, inclusive practices, instructional strategies, literacy, transition, and early childhood, as appropriate. The score for every individual syllabus is the sum of the evidence-based practices observable in that syllabus. In order to meet the standard for incorporating evidence-based practices all evidence-based practice areas reviewed must be identifiable in the syllabus.

In FY 2009, 39 syllabi were included from the following types of programs: high incidence program (11 syllabi scored), early childhood programs (2 syllabi scored), low incidence programs (11 syllabi scored), minority programs (5 syllabi scored), and leadership programs (10 syllabi scored). The average panel scores assigned in each of these areas were: 81.8 percent (FY 2009 was the first year high incidence grantees were included), 50.0 percent (the corresponding score for early childhood grants in FY 2008 was 88 percent), 63.6 percent (the corresponding score for low incidence grants in FY 2008 was 44 percent), 0 percent (the corresponding score for minority institutions in FY 2008 was 71 percent), and 20 percent (the corresponding score for leadership grant in FY 2008 was 33 percent), respectively. These individual ratings are multiplied by the number of syllabi included in each area, and the sum is divided by the total number of syllabi included (39 in 2009), yielding a total of 48.7 percent.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

Based on 3 years of data it appears that program grantees could improve substantially in the task of ensuring that program curricula do, in fact, incorporate evidence-based practices. Applicants for training grants under this program are not supposed to receive funding unless syllabi submitted are evidence-based. The Department is pursuing a number of management-related strategies to address the performance under this measure, including: examining the application peer review process to determine how syllabi are reviewed and rated by reviewers before program awards are made, and the extent to which this initial review process aligns with the review conducted for this performance measure; establishing a requirement in training grant programs that all course syllabi be reviewed again during the first year of the grant, and if necessary be revised; requiring all training grantees to work with OSEP-supported centers that currently promote the use of evidence-based practices in training programs. The Department is also monitoring individual grantees more aggressively to ensure they take steps to improve their performance in these key areas over time.

<b>Measure:</b> Percentage of scholars who exit training programs prior to completion due to poor academic performance.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2006</b>	0.99	3
<b>2007</b>	0.99	2
<b>2008</b>	0.99	2
<b>2009</b>	0.99	1
<b>2010</b>	0.99	
<b>2011</b>	0.99	

**Assessment of progress:** Grantees submit data annually through the Department Personnel Preparation Data Report (PPD) web-based data collection (see: <http://www.osepppd.org/>). No calculation is necessary. The data are taken directly from the PPD data collection. Approximately 1 percent of all scholars receiving program funds exited training programs prior to completion due to poor academic performance in 2009, down from 2 percent in 2007 and 2008. While there is some room for improvement here, on average IHEs appear to be doing a reasonably good job of ensuring that scholars do not exit training programs prior to completion due to poor academic performance. Despite the strong overall performance of grantees on this measure, the Department believes it is essential to retain this measure to signal to grantees that the agency has an on-going interest in ensuring that they maintain high standards when recruiting students to receive Federal scholarship funds.

<b>Measure:</b> Percentage of degree/certification recipients who are working in the area(s) for which they are trained upon program completion.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2006</b>	n/a	73
<b>2007</b>	69	70
<b>2008</b>	72	73
<b>2009</b>	75	75
<b>2010</b>	78	
<b>2011</b>	81	

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

**Assessment of progress:** Grantees submit data annually through the PPD web-based data collection. This measure is calculated by dividing the total number of degree and certification recipients and were working in the area(s) for which they received training at the completion of the program (1,955 in 2009) by all degree and certification recipients who were employed (1,955 in 2009), recipients who were not employed in their area of training (194 in 2009), recipients for whom grantees did not know if they were employed upon program completion (285 in 2009), recipients who were not employed (153 in 2009), recipients for whom employment data were missing (11 in 2009), and recipients for whom employment status was not known (2,598 in 2009). Individuals who received only an endorsement are excluded from all calculations.

On average, over time approximately two-thirds of degree/certification recipients funded through this program end up working in the area for which they were trained upon program completion. The program already has a service obligation requirement that requires scholars to work for several years in the area for which they received training for each year they received Federal support, or pay back the full amount received. The Department is currently conducting a review to determine if the 25 percent who are not working in the area for which they were trained upon completing a program are employed in special education, or out of field. Beyond this, it is difficult to determine with any precision what might be driving the results under this measure. For example, the results are directly impacted by LEA teacher assignment and placement practices, but it is not yet clear to what extent this is so. LEA teacher assignment and placement practices could also, in turn, be impacted by the economy. As the tax base shrinks and additional teachers are “laid off,” it is reasonable to expect that more teachers will be assigned to teach classes “out-of-field.” The Department is also considering additional steps that can be taken to ensure that grantees more effectively recruit and train students who will ultimately end up working in the area for which they received training, and to improve training courses and curricula to ensure that graduates will be competitive in the market.

<b>Measure:</b> Percentage of degree/certification recipients who are working in the area(s) for which they are trained upon program completion and who are fully qualified under IDEA.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2008</b>	n/a	69
<b>2009</b>	70	70
<b>2010</b>	72	
<b>2011</b>	74	

**Assessment of progress:** Grantees submit data annually through the PPD web-based data collection. This measure is calculated by dividing the total number of non-leadership degree recipients who were working in the area(s) for which they received training at the completion of the program and who are highly qualified (1,690 for 2009) by all degree recipients who were employed, who were not employed, and for whom the employment status was not known, minus students working in positions for which the State does not have certification and licensure requirements (2,407 for 2009). Note that the population included in calculations for this measure differs from the population included in the previous measure. While the denominator in the previous measure includes all students currently employed, not employed, and those for whom employment status was not known, the denominator here excludes students working in positions for which the State has no licensure or certification requirements. Additionally,

## **SPECIAL EDUCATION**

### **National activities: Personnel preparation**

---

scholars who received only an endorsement, as well as students who received leadership training, are excluded from all calculations because highly qualified status does not apply to these individuals.

On average, over time approximately three-quarters of degree/certification recipients funded through this program end up working in the area for which they were trained, and are highly qualified, upon program completion. The program already has a service obligation requirement that requires scholars to work for several years in the area for which they received training for each year they received Federal support, or pay back the full amount received. The Department is currently conducting a review to determine if the 25 percent who are not working in the area for which they were trained are employed in special education or out of field. The Department is also considering additional steps that can be taken to ensure that grantees more effectively recruit and train students who will ultimately end up working in the area for which they received training, and to improve training courses and curricula to ensure that graduates will be competitive in the market.

### **Efficiency Measures**

The Department recently developed a new efficiency measure for the Personnel Preparation program. This measure is: 1) the Federal cost per degree or certification program recipient working in the area(s) in which they were trained upon program completion.

The Department used data from prior years to calculate results for this measure through FY 2007. In 2009, the Federal cost per fully qualified degree or certification recipient working in the area of training was \$24,774. Corresponding results for 2008 and 2007 are \$25,123 and \$23,763, respectively.

This measure links directly to the program's annual performance measures, and should enable comparisons across grantees or sub-sets of similar grantees. The Department is currently working with a contractor to analyze grantee-level results to identify high performing institutions that other grantees can look to as examples for improving program performance. Grantee-level data will also be used to compare the relative efficiency of program grantees, both in relation to one another as well as in relation to other Federal programs that provide graduate level scholarships.

The data used to calculate this measure come from the Department's PPD web-based data collection. The cost per degree/certification program recipient is calculated for individual cohorts of students by dividing the sum of all project costs supported with Federal funds (across all years of each individual scholar's training) (\$115,669,312 in FY 2009) by the number of degree recipients that successfully completed training programs and who are working in the area(s) in which they were trained upon program completion (4,669 in FY 2009).

### **Other Performance Information**

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) awarded a \$2.8 million, 4-year evaluation contract for the Personnel Preparation program at the end of fiscal year 2007. The evaluation includes two separate components. The first is a study of IHEs that have applied for funds to train personnel

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **National activities: Personnel preparation**

---

under the program. This portion of the study is designed to: (1) collect descriptive data from all the funded and non-funded applicants to the FY 2006 and FY 2007 competitions (185 funded and 265 non-funded), and (2) document changes to the applicants' courses of study.

A web survey of Project Directors is planned for fall 2009 with items addressing the following elements of individual courses of study: (1) status; (2) focus; (3) entry and completion requirements; (4) grant support for students; (5) changes to the course of study since the time of the application; (6) enrollment and completion information; (7) standardized exit exam scores; (8) allocation of Personnel Preparation program grant funds; and (9) information about program completers. Documentation of a sample of changes made to funded and non-funded courses of study will be rated by an expert panel for quality. These may, for example, include: (1) syllabi and assessments from newly created or substantially modified courses; (2) materials documenting new training units, modules, or fieldwork; (3) new recruitment plans; (4) re-organized or relocated courses of study; (5) new mentoring programs; (6) curriculum vitae of new faculty members; and (7) new credentials resulting from candidate efforts in the course of study. Three members of the IHE Expert Review Panels will review the documents representing each change and rate the contributions made to the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the specific personnel preparation course of study.

The second component of the evaluation is a study of the National centers funded under the program. This component of the evaluation is designed to: (1) document the products and services generated by the National centers; (2) produce a rough estimate of their costs; and (3) rate the quality, relevance, and usefulness of a sample of those products and services. The study of the National centers will include all 12 of the centers funded between 2001 and 2008.

Data collection will be conducted in 2009 and 2010, as close as possible to the end date for each center's funding. Following initial telephone interviews with center staff, an inventory will be completed by center staff that will catalog the cumulative accomplishments of each center. Data from the inventory of products and services will be the basis for selecting a sample of each center's products for review by the National centers Review Panel, which will comprise individuals with expertise relevant to the work of each center. Centers may designate up to 10 percent of their products as *signature works*, which will be sampled in a separate stratum. Once the products have been sampled, center staff will be asked to provide descriptive information about each and to submit all available materials relevant to the sampled products or services. Three experts will review each product or service for quality, relevance, and usefulness. Results of the ratings will be reported for each center in two metrics: the percentage of products rated of high quality, high relevance, or high usefulness; and mean quality, relevance, and usefulness scores.

Final results are expected by fall 2011.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### National activities: Parent information centers

(Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part D, Subpart 3, Sections 671-673)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite <sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$28,028	\$28,028	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2011.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Parent Information Centers program is one of the primary vehicles under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) for providing information and training to parents of children with disabilities. The program supports competitive awards to help ensure that:

- Children with disabilities and their parents receive training and information designed to assist these children in meeting developmental and functional goals and challenging academic achievement goals, and in being prepared to lead productive independent adult lives;
- Children with disabilities and their parents receive training and information on their rights, responsibilities, and protections under IDEA, in order to develop the skills necessary to cooperatively and effectively participate in planning and decision making relating to early intervention, educational, and transitional services; and
- Parents receive coordinated and accessible technical assistance and information to assist them in improving early intervention, educational, and transitional services and results for their children and families.

The IDEA authorizes three types of projects: parent training and information centers, community parent resource centers, and technical assistance for parent centers.

Parent training and information centers must serve parents of children of all ages (birth to 26) and all types of disabilities. The centers are often the only education programs in their States that serve the entire range of disabilities and ages. Awards are made only to parent organizations as defined by IDEA. The training and information provided by the centers must meet the training and information needs of parents of children with disabilities living in the areas served by the centers, particularly underserved parents and parents of children who may be inappropriately identified. At least one award for a parent training and information center must be made in each State, subject to the receipt of acceptable applications. Large and heavily populated States have multiple centers.

Community parent resource centers are parent training and information centers, operated by local parent organizations, that help ensure that underserved parents of children with

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

disabilities, including low-income parents, parents of children with limited English proficiency, and parents with disabilities, have the training and information they need to enable them to participate effectively in helping their children. Community parent resource centers are required to establish cooperative partnerships with the other parent training and information centers in their States.

Technical assistance is authorized to assist parent training and information centers, including community centers, in areas such as coordinating parent training efforts, disseminating scientifically based research and information, and promoting the use of technology. These technical assistance services enhance the ability of parent centers to serve parents effectively.

In order to receive an award for a parent center, an applicant must be a parent organization that has a board of directors the majority of which consists of parents of children with disabilities. The board must also include individuals with disabilities and individuals working in the fields of special education, related services, and early intervention. The parent and professional members of the board must be broadly representative of the population to be served, including low-income parents and parents of limited English proficient children.

While parent centers act as direct resources for parents and families, they also serve as referral points to other resources such as those available under the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program and from the Institute of Education Sciences. Technical Assistance and Dissemination activities are coordinated with Parent Information Centers activities to ensure that parents participating in parent training projects as well as other parents have access to valid information that is designed to address their needs.

The budget award periods for all three project types start on October 1 of the fiscal year following the award. Parent training and information centers awards are made typically for a period of 5 years. Awards for community parent resource centers are made typically for a period of 3 years.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$25,704
2007.....	25,704
2008.....	26,528
2009.....	27,028
2010.....	28,028

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's request for the Parent Information Centers program is \$28 million, the same level as the fiscal year 2010 appropriation. Family involvement in children's learning is critical to achieving high-quality education. Decades of research show that positive school-family partnerships can be built to inform and involve families in their children's learning.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

Studies show that all families can take concrete steps that significantly help their children succeed in school, regardless of their income, education, or knowledge of the English language.

The training and information provided by the parent centers help ensure that parents have the knowledge and skills to help their children with disabilities succeed. In addition to helping parents better understand the nature of their children's disabilities and their educational and developmental needs, the centers provide training and information on how parents can work with professionals serving their children. For school-aged children, this includes participating with administrators and teachers in the development of their child's individualized education programs (IEPs), as provided for by IDEA. For infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services, it means participating with a multidisciplinary team in the development of individualized family service plans (IFSPs).

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which includes provisions that affect all children, emphasizes the role of parents in education through provisions that stress shared accountability between schools and parents for high student achievement, expanded public school choice and supplemental educational services, local development of parental involvement plans, and building parents' capacity for using effective practices to improve their children's academic achievement. For a non-regulatory guidance document that provides a detailed overview of parent involvement in the context of ESEA, see:

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/parentinvguid.doc>.

Parent centers use a variety of mechanisms for providing information to parents. These include websites, one-on-one support, telephone call-in numbers, training workshops, and dissemination of written materials. These resources are often available in languages other than English, particularly Spanish (<http://www.cflparents.org/espanol/index.htm>).

The parent centers also play an important role in dispute resolution by explaining to parents the benefits of alternative methods of dispute resolution, such as mediation, which States are required by IDEA to make available. These alternative methods of dispute resolution can help avoid costly litigation. As part of that role, parent centers are required, at the option of State educational agencies, to contract with those State educational agencies to provide individuals who will meet with parents to explain the IDEA-mandated mediation process.

The 2011 request includes \$22.4 million for new and continuing parent training and information centers, \$3.0 million for new and continuing community parent resource centers, and \$2.4 million to fund 7 continuation awards to provide technical assistance to centers.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<u>Program funding:</u>			
Parent training and information centers:			
New	\$4,962	\$3,104	\$5,242
Continuations	<u>16,451</u>	<u>19,089</u>	<u>17,153</u>
Subtotal	21,413	22,193	22,395

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) (continued)

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Community parent resource centers:			
New	\$992	\$1,000	\$1,000
Continuations	<u>1,999</u>	<u>1,992</u>	<u>1,992</u>
Subtotal	2,991	2,992	2,992
Technical assistance:			
New	0	240	0
Continuations	<u>2,375</u>	<u>2,363</u>	<u>2,400</u>
Subtotal	2,375	2,603	2,400
Other (contracts):			
New	135	0	0
Continuations	<u>52</u>	<u>177</u>	<u>177</u>
Subtotal	188	177	177
Peer review of new award applications	60	63	63
Total:			
New	6,090	4,344	6,242
Continuations	20,878	23,621	21,722
Peer review of new award applications	<u>60</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>63</u>
Total	27,028	28,028	28,028

#### Number of projects:

Parent training and information centers:			
New	17	12	19
Continuations	<u>53</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>53</u>
Subtotal	70	70	72
Community parent information centers:			
New	10	10	10
Continuations	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>
Subtotal	30	30	30
Technical assistance:			
New	0	0	0
Continuations	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>
Subtotal	7	7	7
Other (contracts):			
New	2	0	0
Continuations	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>
Subtotal	3	3	3

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) (continued)

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Total Number of Projects:			
New	29	22	29
Continuations	<u>81</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>83</u>
Total	110	110	112

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

**Goal:** To provide training and information to parents of children with disabilities.

**Objective 1:** *Improve the quality of parent training and information projects.*

**Objective 2:** *Parents served by Special Education Parent Information Centers will be knowledgeable about their IDEA rights and responsibilities.*

**Objective 3:** *Parents served by Special Education Parent Information Centers will be able to advocate for scientifically- or evidence-based practices for their child.*

Six performance measures have been developed for the Parent Information Centers (PIC) program. There are three annual measures, two long-term measures, and one efficiency measure.

Annual Measures: The three annual measures deal with the quality, relevance, and usefulness of products and services provided by the program. These measures were developed as part of a cross-Departmental effort to make measures relating to technical assistance and dissemination activities more consistent Department-wide. However, the measures have been adapted to reflect the unique purposes of the Parent Information Centers program. Targets for 2009 through 2011 have been established based on performance data from 2007 and 2008. The measures are:

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of materials used by Parent Information Centers projects that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2007	42	70
2008	72	58
2009	60	84
2010	63	
2011	65	

**Assessment of progress:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using expert panels of reviewers who assess grant implementation by reviewing a randomly selected sample of materials disseminated by centers for the purpose of training and informing parents. In an effort to ensure that the sample materials reviewed in 2009 were representative, they were drawn from all centers receiving funds in 2008.

All products and services are reviewed and scored on the basis of a rubric, developed by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), that is designed to yield ratings on the extent to which the content of submitted materials is: evidence-based, valid, complete, and up-to-date. Specifically, the rubric is designed to yield ratings on the basis of the following two quality dimensions: (1) Substance (Does the product reflect the best of current research and theory or policy guidance, as demonstrated by a scientifically- or evidence-based approach, a solid conceptual framework, appropriate citations and other evidence of conceptual soundness?); and (2) Communication (Does the product have clarity in its presentation, as evidenced by being free of editorial errors, appropriately formatted, and well organized?). The total score for any individual product or service reviewed is the sum of the two quality dimension sub-scores. High quality for any individual product or service is defined as a total score of 6 or higher of 9 possible points.

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of individual products and services that received an average quality rating of 6 or better (61 in 2009) by the total number of products and services reviewed (73 in 2009), multiplied by 100 percent. For 2009, this score was 83.6 percent ( $61/73 = .8356 \times 100\% = 83.6\%$ ).

Based on just a few years of data it appears that program grantees have made progress in ensuring that program services and products are of high quality. However, it is too soon to tell if this level of performance will be maintained. One possible reason for the substantial increase between 2008 and 2009 was that the sample size increased from 19 to 73 and the sample expanded beyond the Regional PTI Technical Assistance Centers to include Parent Information Centers and Community Parent Resource Centers. If data in future years are consistent with the 2009 data, the Department will make appropriate adjustments to the targets. The Department is currently exploring the feasibility of monitoring individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Parent Information Centers products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified members of the Parent Information Centers target audience.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2007	49	96
2008	96	95
2009	96	89
2010	96	
2011	96	

**Assessment of progress:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using panels of special education parent stakeholders to review a randomly selected sample of materials disseminated by centers for the purpose of training and informing parents. In an effort to ensure that the sample materials were representative, the materials reviewed in 2009 were drawn from all centers receiving funds in 2008.

All materials are reviewed and scored on the basis of a rubric, developed by OSEP, that is designed to yield ratings on the extent to which the content of materials is responsive to priority issues and challenges confronting the target groups. Specifically, the rubric is designed to yield ratings on the basis of the following three dimensions related to relevance: (1) Need (Does the content of the material attempt to solve an important problem or critical issue?); (2) Pertinence (Does the content of the material match the problem or issue facing the target group or groups?); and (3) Reach (To what extent is the content of the material applicable to diverse populations within the target group?). The total score for any individual product or service reviewed is the sum of the three quality dimension sub-scores. High relevance for any individual product or service is defined as a total score of 6 or higher of 9 possible points.

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of individual products and services that received an average relevance rating of 6 or better (65 in 2009) by the total number of products and services reviewed (73 in 2009), multiplied by 100 percent. For FY 2009, this score was 89 percent. ( $65/73 = .8904 \times 100\% = 89.0\%$ ).

Based on just a few years of data it appears that program grantees do a reasonably good job of ensuring that products and services are of high relevance to education and early intervention policy or practice. One possible reason for the substantial decrease in high relevance ratings between 2008 and 2009 was that the sample size increased from 21 to 73 and the sample expanded beyond the Regional PTI Technical Assistance Centers to include Parent Information Centers and Community Parent Resource Centers. The Department is currently exploring the feasibility of monitoring individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of all Parent Information Centers products and services deemed to be useful by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2007	29	96
2008	95	95
2009	95	86
2010	95	
2011	95	

**Assessment of progress:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using a panel of six parent stakeholders who assess grant implementation by reviewing a randomly selected sample of materials (n=73) disseminated by the centers. The publications reviewed in 2009 were drawn from a sample that included all centers receiving funds in 2008 to ensure that the materials were representative of the entire program.

All materials are reviewed and scored on the basis of a rubric, developed by OSEP, that is designed to yield ratings on the extent to which the content can be easily and quickly adopted or adapted by the target group, and the likelihood that the product or service, if adopted, will produce the desired result. Specifically, the rubric is designed to yield ratings on the basis of the following three dimensions related to usefulness: (1) Ease (Does the content of the product or service description address a problem or issue in an easily understood way, with directions or guidance regarding how a problem or issue can be addressed?); (2) Replicability (Is it likely that the information derived from the product or service will eventually be used by the target group to achieve the benefit intended?); and (3) Sustainability (Is it likely that the information derived from the product or service will eventually be used in more than one setting successfully over and over again to achieve the intended benefit?). The total score for any individual product or service reviewed is the sum of the three quality dimension sub-scores. High usefulness for any individual product or service is defined as a total score of 6 or higher of 9 possible points.

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of individual products and services that received an average usefulness rating of 6 or better (63 in 2009) by the total number of products and services reviewed (73 in 2009), multiplied by 100 percent. For FY 2009, this score was 86.3 percent. ( $63/73 = .8630 \times 100\% = 86.3\%$ ).

Based on just a few years of data it appears that program grantees do a reasonably good job of ensuring that products and services are useful to target audiences. One possible reason for the substantial decrease in high usefulness ratings between 2008 and 2009 was that the sample size increased from 21 to 73 and the sample expanded beyond the Regional PTI Technical Assistance Centers to include Parent Information Centers and Community Parent Resource Centers. The Department is currently exploring the feasibility of monitoring individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

Long-term Measures: Two long-term measures have been developed for the program for which data are collected every 2 years through an OSEP-supported survey of parents. In 2009, a separate survey of the same parents confirmed the accuracy of the survey data used for the following long term measures:

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of parents receiving Special Education Parent Information Centers services who promote scientifically- or evidence-based practices for their infants, toddlers, children and youth.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2007</b>		73
<b>2009</b>	74	79
<b>2011</b>	75	
<b>2013</b>	76	

**Assessment of progress:** Data are collected by the parent centers, using telephone interviews with 25 randomly selected parent stakeholders per center. The National PTI Technical Assistance Center developed the survey. To calculate the measure, a weighted sum of the number of parents whose answers displayed an enhanced knowledge of evidence-based practices is divided by the total number of parents who responded to four relevant survey questions (n=10,925). Baseline data for this relatively new measure were first collected in 2007 and used to establish targets for later years.

Based on just a few years of data it appears that program grantees do a reasonably good job of ensuring that parents receiving parent information centers services promote sound practices for their children. The Department is currently exploring the feasibility of monitoring individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of parents receiving Special Education Parent Information Centers services who report enhanced knowledge of IDEA rights and responsibilities.		
Year	Target	Actual
<b>2009</b>	85	91
<b>2011</b>	87	
<b>2013</b>	89	

**Assessment of progress:** Data are collected for this new measure by the parent centers, using telephone interviews with 25 randomly selected parent stakeholders per center. The National PTI Technical Assistance Center developed the survey. To calculate the measure, a weighted sum of the number of parents whose answers displayed an enhanced knowledge of IDEA rights and responsibilities is divided by the total number of parents who responded to three relevant survey questions (n=7,806). The targets were established based on pilot data collected in 2007.

Initial data for this measure suggest that most of the parents receiving services from the grantees believe they enhanced their understanding of their rights and responsibilities under IDEA. However, it is too soon to tell if this level of performance will be maintained. If data in future years are consistent with 2009 data, the Department will make appropriate adjustments to the targets. The Department is also currently exploring the feasibility of monitoring individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

#### Efficiency Measures

<b>Measure:</b> The Federal cost per unit of output provided by the Special Education Parent Training and Information Centers, by category.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		\$2.24
2008	\$2.24	1.10
2009	2.24	1.06
2010	2.24	
2011	2.24	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department has developed a common efficiency measure for technical assistance and dissemination programs, including Parent Information Centers. As adapted for the Parent Information Centers program, this measure is “the cost per output, by category, weighted by an intensity rating.” The data for this measure are collected by a survey developed by National PTI Technical Assistance Center. The measure is calculated by dividing the total value of all Federal grants in the Parent Information Centers program by the number of parents reported to be served under the program weighted by an index reflecting the intensity of the services provided. That intensity weight represents the amount of interaction and support required to render each service. For example, IEP facilitation meetings received heavier weights than parent visits to websites. In 2009, the cost per unit of technical assistance for the program was \$1.06.

However, a comparison between the 2009 data and similar data from previous years suggests that there are still methodological issues that need to be addressed in this measure before consistent results are obtained. For example, while the intensity ratings (used in the denominator) are slightly lower than in previous fiscal years, the final cost per unit of technical assistance produced by this measure improved dramatically over the last few years. The cost per unit of technical assistance in FY 2007 was \$2.24, while the same cost in FY 2009 is just \$1.06. This dramatic change in cost per unit of technical assistance between 2007 and 2009 was attributable to the fact that the “total units of technical assistance” included in the denominator increased by over 5 million when the definition of technical expanded to include outputs such as hits on website materials and newsletters mailed. The Department is currently considering alternative definitions of a “unit of technical assistance” that can better account for the differing levels of intensity associated with the various types of technical assistance. This ongoing review will help ensure that the results of the efficiency measure are more directly associated with core program outcomes.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### **National activities: Technology and media services**

(Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part D, Subpart 3, Section 674)

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite <sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$43,973	\$41,223	-\$2,750

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2011.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Technology and Media Services program is the primary source of support for technology and media-related activities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Technology activities promote the development, demonstration, and use of technology, including technology with universal design features. It includes activities such as research on using technology to improve learning and provide access to curricula, and technical assistance and dissemination activities to enhance the use of technology by parents and teachers. Media Services include closed captioning, video description, the provision of written materials in accessible formats, and other activities that either improve education through the use of media or improve access to education.

Closed captions for deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals are encoded into television transmissions and can be displayed by viewers, at their discretion, with televisions equipped with special decoders. The Television Decoder Circuitry Act of 1990 required that by July 1, 1993 all televisions 13 inches or larger sold in the United States contain circuitry to display closed captions. As directed by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has adopted rules requiring closed captioning of most, though not all, television programming. Under these rules, closed-captioned television programming was required to be increased in stages until January 1, 2010. Examples of exempted programming include programming from providers that have revenues of less than \$3 million dollars per year, programs that are in languages other than English or Spanish, and programs that have mainly non-vocal music, such as symphony performances.

Video description consists of verbal depictions of key visual elements in a video or television program that are inserted into natural pauses in the spoken dialogue. These descriptions supplement the regular audio track of the program. They provide individuals with visual impairments access to television and other media that include visual images. Neither Federal law or regulations require video description for television programming.

The IDEA requires that description and captioning funds be used only for programs that are suitable for use in a classroom setting. These funds may not be used to describe or caption news programs even when they are suitable for use in classrooms.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **National activities: Technology and media services**

---

Awards are made for projects throughout the fiscal year. The initial project periods of most awards start at the beginning of the fiscal year following the year of the appropriation. The duration of awards typically varies from 3 to 5 years.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2006.....	\$38,428
2007.....	38,428
2008.....	39,301
2009.....	38,615
2010.....	43,973

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's request for the Technology and Media Services program is \$41.2 million, which is \$2.8 million less than the fiscal year 2010 appropriation level. We estimate that the fiscal year 2011 request would provide approximately \$20.1 million for new competitions, as described below, and approximately \$21.1 million for continuation projects. The request does not include funds for earmarked grants to the Greater Washington Educational Television Association (GWETA) and Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Inc. (RFB&D), and these amounts are not included in the estimates of funds available for new and continuation projects. These programs provide assistance to a specific entity, and the Administration believes that competing funds rather than earmarking them will lead to higher-quality programs and improved student outcomes

Projects funded under the Technology and Media Services program help improve access to and participation in the general education curriculum, developmentally appropriate activities for preschool children, and statewide assessments. We believe that improved access and participation ultimately result in improved performance by children with disabilities.

#### **Technology**

The request includes \$21.2 million for Technology activities, which promote the development, demonstration, and use of technology. This is accomplished primarily through research, for which \$15.3 million is proposed. Of the \$9.3 million available for new awards, \$2.5 million would be used to support 11 new Steppingstones of Technology Innovation for Students with Disabilities projects. These projects are awarded in two phases: development of technology-based interventions and research on effectiveness. Projects focus on curriculum materials and instructional methodologies that use innovative and emerging technology to improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities. In addition, approximately \$3 million would support 13 continuation awards for the Steppingstones program.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

The Technology request includes \$5 million for new priorities. Potential projects include:

- (1) Improving access to new and emerging technologies. This Center would enhance learning opportunities for children with disabilities by supporting the development and demonstration of advances in technology; developing enhanced web, DVD, televised, or computer delivery of programming to the student or classroom; and expanded descriptions, definitions of captioned material, real-time simulations, clarification of program content, or other enhancements that may benefit students with disabilities. A critical aspect of this investment would be to explore how to best incorporate these technologies into the development phase of products, e.g., integrating video description prepublication rather than as an “add-on.” Enhancing incorporation of technology applications into the initial development of instructional media products provides greater and more efficient access to materials, including the integration of descriptions and captions into instructional products and programs.
- (2) Technology-based assessments to increase accessibility for students with disabilities. Through the Assessing Achievement program, the Department is providing support to States to develop high quality assessments that are aligned to college and career-ready standards and that are able to measure student growth. This project would provide technical assistance and evidence-based research to States to ensure that any technology-based assessments that are developed (e.g. computer-adaptive testing, computer delivery of assessment materials, computer-based formative assessments) are fully accessible for students with disabilities.
- (3) Early learning demonstration projects. This priority would support a model demonstration project on the use of technology to enhance the development of communication, socialization, fine and gross motor, and other critical skills for children with disabilities from birth through age 5. This might include web-based delivery of services to remote or underserved areas, use of low-technology devices (e.g. adaptive toys, furniture) in the home, and development of higher-technology devices (e.g. adapted computers, hand-held devices).
- (4) Accessible instructional materials (AIM). Many students with learning disabilities and students with disabilities who qualify for services under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act could benefit from accessible instructional materials, but do not qualify for these materials under current eligibility requirements. A “market model” may ultimately be the most efficient and effective method for distributing AIM to these students and all students with disabilities. In a market model, instructional materials are distributed for purchase in various formats, including conventional and accessible formats, and revenue streams are maintained for the publishers. This Center would work with publishers and States to explore the viability of a market model for AIM and serve as a research and technical assistance resource as instructional materials make the transition from hard copy to digital formats (e.g. web-based or e-reader based materials).

Other potential topics include: (a) reducing the disparity in technology access for low-income, rural, and inner city students with disabilities; (b) ensuring access to, and the effectiveness of,

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **National activities: Technology and media services**

---

online learning for students with disabilities; and (c) developing technology to increase the effectiveness of instruction for students with disabilities.

The request for Technology activities also includes \$4.8 million for technical assistance and dissemination projects. Of this amount, \$4 million would support continuations and \$800,000 would be used for a competition to fund a new technology innovation center. The purpose of the center would be to develop and implement a national collaborative network of researchers seeking innovative solutions to technology challenges; promote the distribution and use of technology-related products and approaches; track technology innovation developments and needs; and engage in communication and evaluation activities.

IDEA section 682(d)(1)(B) requires that the Secretary use at least \$4.0 million of the funds provided for programs authorized under subparts 2 and 3 of Part D of IDEA “to address the postsecondary, vocational, technical, continuing, and adult education needs of individuals with deafness.” Starting in fiscal year 2006, the Department has addressed this requirement through a combination of funding from the Technical Assistance and Dissemination, Personnel Preparation, and Technology and Media Services programs. In fiscal year 2011, the Department will conduct a new competition to address these needs. The Technology and Media Services request includes \$1 million for this program that will be used to address the technology needs of postsecondary institutions related to recruiting, enrolling, retaining, and instructing students who are deaf, and addressing the varying communication needs of and methods used by individuals who are deaf.

The remaining \$4.8 million in the Technology area would support continuation awards for projects such as the National Instructional Materials Access Standard (NIMAS) Technical Assistance, Images and Graphics, Technology Implementation, and Mathematics Instructional Technology Centers and the Steppingstones projects.

### **Media Services**

Media Services includes a variety of activities targeted toward providing educational materials for individuals with disabilities, particularly deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals and blind and other visually impaired individuals. The majority of the funding for Technology and Media services, \$19.6 million, would be allocated to these activities in fiscal year 2011.

Educational Materials in Accessible Formats - The request proposes a total of \$14.6 million for activities related to providing instructional materials in accessible formats. This amount includes \$7.5 million for a new competition to support the development, production, and distribution of educational materials in accessible formats to students with visual impairments and other print disabilities. The fiscal year 2011 request also includes \$6.5 million in continuation funds for Bookshare for Education (Bookshare.org). This project has transformed the provision of educational materials in accessible formats by providing free educational materials, including textbooks, much less expensively and more quickly than was previously possible. Bookshare.org is using technology in a variety of creative ways to not only increase the volume of available materials and speed at which materials are made available, but also to make it easier to access materials (<http://www.bookshare.org/web/Welcome.html>).

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

The IDEA requires the Department to support the National Instructional Materials Access Center (NIMAC), which is noncompetitively awarded to the American Printing House for the Blind. (<http://www.nimac.us/>) The NIMAC is a national electronic file repository that makes electronic files that comply with the National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard (NIMAS) available for the production of print instructional materials in specialized formats. NIMAC receives source files in NIMAS format from textbook publishers and provides these files to State and local educational agencies for use in producing materials in accessible media such as braille, audio, and digital text. The request includes \$585,000 for a new award for this project in fiscal year 2011.

Video Description and Closed Captioning - The request includes \$1 million for new projects and \$2.5 million for continuation projects that provide support for video description of educational television programming. The support for video description of educational programming is particularly important for individuals with visual impairments since, unlike closed captioning, there are no Federal requirements for providing video descriptions. In addition, the Department would provide \$1.5 million for a new competition to support the captioning and distribution of educational videos for use in classroom settings. The distribution system for these videos currently includes local and regional depositories. These local and regional depositories are in the process of being phased out in favor of more efficient distribution methods that use new and emerging technologies. These technologies would be the focus of the new competition. Information on the current project is available at <http://www.dcmp.org>.

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<u>Program funding:</u>			
<b>Technology:</b>			
Research:			
New	\$5,269	\$4,500	\$7,500
Continuations	<u>1,131</u>	<u>5,831</u>	<u>7,824</u>
Subtotal	6,400	10,331	15,324
Technical assistance and dissemination:			
New	1,000	2,000	800
Continuations	<u>2,104</u>	<u>2,566</u>	<u>4,035</u>
Subtotal	3,104	4,566	4,835
State System Improvement Grants			
New	0	3,000	0
Continuations	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	0	3,000	0

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**National activities: Technology and media services**

---

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) (continued)

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Projects to address the postsecondary, vocational, technical, continuing, and adult education needs of individuals with deafness:			
Continuations	0	0	\$1,000
New	<u>\$1,000</u>	<u>\$1,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	1,000	1,000	1,000
Appropriation earmark for Greater Washington Educational Television Association (GWETA):	737	737	0
<b>Subtotal, Technology:</b>			
New	6,269	6,500	9,300
Continuations	4,235	9,397	11,859
Earmarks	<u>737</u>	<u>737</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	<u>11,241</u>	<u>16,634</u>	<u>21,159</u>
<b>Media services:</b>			
Free educational materials in accessible formats – competitive awards:			
New	0	0	7,500
Continuations	<u>6,515</u>	<u>6,515</u>	<u>6,515</u>
Subtotal	6,515	6,515	14,015
Appropriation earmark for Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Inc.	13,250	13,250	0
National Instructional Materials Access Center (NIMAC) – Statutory earmark			
New	0	0	585
Continuations	<u>576</u>	<u>585</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	576	585	585
Video description and other accessible media and technology demonstrations:			
New	0	2,500	1,000
Continuations	<u>3,630</u>	<u>1,130</u>	<u>2,500</u>
Subtotal	3,630	3,630	3,500

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) (continued)

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Educational video captioning and distribution:			
New	0	0	\$1,500
Continuations	<u>\$3,000<sup>5</sup></u>	<u>0<sup>3</sup></u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	3,000	0	1,500
<b>Subtotal, Media services:</b>			
New	0	\$5,500	10,585
Continuations	13,821	8,230	9,015
Earmarks	<u>13,250</u>	<u>13,250</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	27,071	26,980	19,600
<b>Other</b> (e.g. program evaluation, project meeting costs):			
New	200	30	95
Continuations	<u>49</u>	<u>242</u>	<u>272</u>
Subtotal	249	272	367
<b>Peer review of new award applications</b>	54	87	97
<b>Total:</b>			
New	6,523	12,117	20,077
Continuations	18,105	17,869	21,146
Appropriation earmarks	<u>13,987</u>	<u>13,987</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	38,615	43,973	41,223

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2011 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Six performance measures have been developed for the Technology and Media Services program. Three of these measures are annual measures, two are long-term, and the last is a measure of efficiency.

---

<sup>5</sup> The fiscal year 2009 awards cover activities in fiscal years 2009 and 2010.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

Annual Measures: The three annual measures deal with the relevance, quality, and usefulness of products and services provided by the program.

**Goal: To promote the development, demonstration, and use of technology and media services to improve results for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities.**

**Objective:** *The percentage of Special Education Technology and Media Services projects judged to be of high quality.*

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Technology and Media Services projects judged to be of high quality.		
Year	Targets	Actual
<b>2007</b>		80
<b>2008</b>		83
<b>2009</b>	82	100
<b>2010</b>	83	
<b>2011</b>	84	

**Assessment of progress:** The actual far exceeded the target for fiscal year 2009. The Department set the targets for fiscal years 2009 through 2011 based on the first 2 years of data under this program. It is not clear whether the fiscal year 2009 results represent a level of performance that can be sustained; therefore the target for fiscal year 2010 is unchanged. We will reevaluate the targets for fiscal years 2011 and beyond following a review of fiscal year 2010 data, expected in October 2010.

The scores appearing in the actual data column were produced by a panel of five to seven special education scientists, who reviewed a sample of products from 11 Technology and Media projects. From each project included in the sample, the best product or service is submitted, and OSEP randomly selects a typical product or service from a database containing all products and services. All products are reviewed and scored on whether the product content is evidence-based, valid, complete, and up-to-date. The quality dimensions measured are (1) Substance--Does the product/service description reflect the best of current research and theory or policy guidance, as demonstrated by a scientifically- or evidence-based approach, a solid conceptual framework, appropriate citations and other evidence of conceptual soundness?; and (2) Communication - Does the product/service description have clarity in its presentation, as evidenced by being free of editorial errors, appropriately formatted, and well organized?

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Technology and Media Services projects judged to be of high relevance to improving outcomes of infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.		
Year	Targets	Actual
<b>2006</b>		43
<b>2007</b>		91
<b>2008</b>	91	100
<b>2009</b>	93	100
<b>2010</b>	95	
<b>2011</b>	95	

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

**Assessment of progress:** Baseline data for this measure first became available in fiscal year 2006. However, both the quality and completeness of the fiscal year 2006 data were not high. The Department believes that the data for fiscal years 2007 through 2009 reflect more accurate measurements of program activities. The targets were set based on this data. In fiscal year 2010, projects funded under this authority scored 100 percent on this measure for the second year in a row. It is not clear whether the results for these years represent a level of performance that can be sustained. Data for fiscal year 2010 are expected in October 2010.

The scores appearing in the actual data column were produced by a panel of five to seven technology and media stakeholders, who reviewed a sample of products from 11 Technology and Media Services projects. Each project included in the sample is asked to submit its best product or service, and OSEP randomly selects a typical product or service from a database containing all products and services. All of the products were assessed on whether the product content was responsive to priority issues and challenges confronting the target groups and judged on three dimensions of relevance: (1) Need – Does the content of the material attempt to solve an important problem or critical issue?; (2) Pertinence – Does the content of the material match the problem or issue facing the target group or groups?; and (3) Reach – To what extent is the content of the material applicable to diverse populations within the target group?

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Special Education Technology and Media Services projects that produce findings, products, and/or services that contribute to improving results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.		
Year	Targets	Actual
<b>2007</b>		82
<b>2008</b>		82
<b>2009</b>	83	100
<b>2010</b>	84	
<b>2011</b>	85	

**Assessment of progress:** The actual figure for fiscal year 2009 far exceeds the target and the performance in the two prior years. However, it is not clear if this level of performance can be sustained. The Department will reevaluate the targets for this measure following receipt of data for fiscal year 2010. Data for fiscal year 2010 are expected in October 2010.

The scores appearing in the actual data column were produced by a panel of five to seven technology and media stakeholders, who reviewed nine samples of technology products. Each project included in the sample is asked to submit its best product or service, and OSEP randomly selects a typical product or service from a database containing all products and services. All products were reviewed and scored on whether the product content could be easily and quickly adopted or adapted by the target group and produce the desired result. The products were judged on three dimensions of usefulness: (1) Ease – Does the content of the product or service description address a problem or issue in an easily understood way, with directions or guidance regarding how a problem or issue can be addressed?; (2) Replicability – Is it likely that the information derived from the product or service will eventually be used by the target group to achieve the benefit intended?; and (3) Sustainability – Is it likely that the information derived from the product or service will eventually be used in more than one setting successfully over and over again to achieve the intended benefit?

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **National activities: Technology and media services**

---

Long-term Measures: The objective of the long-term measures is to measure the percentage of Technology and Media Services projects that develop technologies that incorporate evidence-based materials and services and validate these technologies to ensure that there is appropriate evidence that they are based on sound methodology, are effective, and can be replicated. Evidence may take the form of findings from rigorous research studies, evaluations, or data from end users. This measure will focus on six target areas: assessment, literacy, behavior, instructional strategies, early intervention, and inclusive practices. Two long-term measures have been developed for the program for which data will be collected every 2 years. They are:

- The percentage of Technology and Media Services projects that validate their products and services. The first year of data for this measure was submitted for fiscal year 2009 and indicates that 72.7 percent of the projects examined validate their products and services.
- The percentage of Technology and Media Services projects that make technologies that incorporate evidence-based practices available for widespread use. The first year of data for this measure was reported for fiscal year 2009 and indicates that 94.11 percent of the projects examined make validated technologies available for widespread use.

The fiscal year 2009 data represent the first data reported for these measures. The Department will determine whether targets can be set for these measures after we receive and analyze a second year of data. Data for fiscal year 2010 are expected in October 2010.

### **Efficiency Measures**

The Department has developed an efficiency measure for the Technology and Media Services program. This measure is “the Federal cost per unit of technology and media services, by category, weighted by the expert panel quality rating.” The Department has collected data on Technology and Media Services outputs such as hours of media captioned and described and numbers of technology products produced. The Media Services measure is calculated as the amount of funding provided for Media Services activities divided by the numbers of hours of accessible media provided, weighted by an index of the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the materials. The Technology measure is calculated as the total of technology program costs divided by the number of technology products and weighted by an index of the quality, relevance, and usefulness of products. The adjusted cost of a unit of media varied widely among fiscal years 2007, 2008, and 2009. Data for technology products are only available for fiscal years 2008 and 2009 and also vary substantially. The Department has concerns regarding the validity of the data and is reviewing the data and methodology. We anticipate that the methodology used for this measure will be reconciled and that data will be provided for fiscal year 2010 by December 2010.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### Special Olympics education programs

(Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004, section 3(a))

FY 2011 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$8,095	\$10,000	+ \$1,905

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2010. Reauthorizing legislation is sought.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004 authorizes the Secretaries of Education, State, and Health and Human Services to make discretionary grant awards to the Special Olympics to support activities in a number of areas related to the Special Olympics.

Awards made by the Secretary of Education are for:

- 1) Activities to promote the expansion of Special Olympics, including activities to increase the participation of individuals with intellectual disabilities within the United States; and
- 2) The design and implementation of Special Olympics education programs, including character education and volunteer programs that support the purposes of the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004, that can be integrated into classroom instruction and are consistent with academic content standards.

In addition to funds appropriated under this authority, Special Olympics has received over \$5 million in non-competitive grant awards since fiscal year 1999, including funds for national and world games and affiliated programs.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

2006 .....	0
2007 .....	0
2008 .....	\$11,790
2009 .....	8,095
2010 .....	8,095

### FY 2011 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$10 million for Special Olympics education programs, \$1.9 million more than the amount for fiscal year 2010. The Administration's request would support

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Special Olympics education programs

---

activities and programs of the Special Olympics, such as the Special Olympics National Youth Activation Demonstration Project (Project UNIFY) and the 2011 Special Olympics World Summer Games to be held in Athens, Greece. Project UNIFY is an education program designed to bring youth together through sports to develop teamwork skills and increase awareness and social acceptance of individuals with intellectual disabilities. As of December, 2008, Project UNIFY has established partnerships with over 1,000 schools. The Administration believes the activities supported under this program assist individuals with intellectual disabilities in becoming productive members of their communities by dispelling negative stereotypes and promoting positive and supportive learning environments.

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
<b>Project UNIFY</b>			
Number of projects	40	40	40
Number of project participants <sup>1</sup>	150,000	150,000	150,000

---

<sup>1</sup> The number of project participants for 2009 through 2011 is based on recipient reported estimates for fiscal year 2009.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

The Department has developed performance measures for this program that will track the graduation, suspension, and expulsion rates of students participating in Special Olympics projects through project UNIFY partnerships. The Department is currently working to establish baselines and targets for these measures. Data for 2008 and 2009 are expected in January, 2012.