

**Department of Education**  
**SPECIAL EDUCATION**  
**Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Request**

**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language .....	I-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	I-4
Amounts Available for Obligation .....	I-9
Obligations by Object Classification .....	I-9
Authorizing Legislation.....	I-10
Appropriations History.....	I-12
Significant Items in FY 2012 Appropriations Reports.....	I-13
Summary of Request .....	I-14
Activities:	
State grants:	
Grants to States .....	I-17
Preschool grants .....	I-36
Grants for infants and families .....	I-48
National activities:	
State personnel development.....	I-58
Technical assistance and dissemination.....	I-66
Personnel preparation .....	I-77
Parent information centers.....	I-92
Technology and media services .....	I-103
Other activities:	
Special Olympics education programs.....	I-115
PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI .....	I-118
State Tables.....	I-124

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

For carrying out the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (“IDEA”) and the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004, [\$12,647,066,000] \$12,687,307,000, of which [\$3,115,716,000] \$2,289,108,000 shall become available on July 1, [2012] 2013, and shall remain available through September 30, [2013] 2014, and of which [\$9,283,383,000] \$10,124,103,000 shall become available on October 1, [2012] 2013, and shall remain available through September 30, [2013] 2014, for academic year [2012-2013] 2013-2014: <sup>1</sup> *Provided*, 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 [2011] 2012, 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 [2011] 2012: <sup>2</sup> *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, without regard to section 611(d) of the IDEA, distribute to all other States (as that term is defined in section 611(g)(2)), subject to the third proviso, any amount by which a State's allocation under section 611(d), from funds appropriated under this heading, is reduced under section 612(a)(18)(B), according to the following: 85 percent on the basis of the States' relative populations of children aged 3 through 21 who are of the same age as children with disabilities for whom the State ensures the availability of a free appropriate public education under this part, and 15 percent to States on the basis of the States' relative populations of those children who are living in poverty: <sup>3</sup> *Provided further*, That the Secretary may not distribute any funds under the previous proviso to any State whose reduction in allocation from funds appropriated under this heading made funds available for such a distribution: <sup>4</sup> *Provided further*, That the States shall allocate such funds distributed under the second proviso to local educational agencies in accordance with section 611(f): <sup>5</sup> *Provided further*, That the amount by which a State's allocation under section 611(d) of the IDEA is reduced under section 612(a)(18)(B) and the amounts distributed to States under

the previous provisos in fiscal year 2012 or any subsequent year shall not be considered in calculating the awards under section 611(d) for fiscal year 2013 or for any subsequent fiscal years:<sup>6</sup> Provided further, That the Secretary may, notwithstanding section 643(e)(1) of the IDEA, reserve up to \$2,710,000 of the amount provided under section 644 for incentive grants to States to carry out section 635(c):<sup>7</sup> Provided further, that funds 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:<sup>8</sup> Provided further, That [\$2,000,000] \$30,000,000, to remain available for obligation through September 30, [2013] 2014, shall be for competitive grants to States, incentive payments, and related activities [aimed at improving the outcomes of children receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and their families, which may include competitive grants to States]as may be necessary to improve the provision and coordination of services and supports for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) child recipients and their families or households in order to achieve improved [health status] outcomes, including both physical and emotional health, [and] education and post-school outcomes, [including completion of] such as completing postsecondary education and job training and obtaining employment, [and to improve services and supports to the families or households of the SSI child recipient, such as education and job training for the parents] that may result in long-term improvements in the SSI child recipient's economic self-sufficiency:<sup>9</sup> Provided further, That States may award subgrants for a portion of the funds to other public and private, non-profit entities<sup>10</sup>: Provided further, That not to exceed \$15,000,000 of amounts provided in the eighth proviso may be used for performance-based awards for Pay for Success projects:<sup>11</sup> Provided further, That, with respect to the previous proviso, any funds obligated for such projects shall remain available for disbursement until expended, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1552(a):<sup>12</sup> Provided further, That, with respect to the tenth proviso, any deobligated

funds from such projects shall immediately be available for section 611 of the IDEA. <sup>13</sup>

*(Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2012)*

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>... [\$12,647,066,000] <u>\$12,687,307,000</u>, of which [\$3,115,716,000] <u>\$2,289,108,000</u> shall become available on July 1, [2012] <u>2013</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2013] <u>2014</u>, and of which [\$9,283,383,000] <u>\$10,124,103,000</u> shall become available on October 1, [2012] <u>2013</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2013] <u>2014</u>, for academic year [2012-2013] <u>2013-2014</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>2</sup> <i>Provided</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 [2011] <u>2012</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 [2011] <u>2012</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 in 2012 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 under the fiscal year 2012 appropriation.</p>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>3</sup> <u>Provided further, That the Secretary shall, without regard to section 611(d) of the IDEA, distribute to all other States (as that term is defined in section 611(g)(2)), subject to the third proviso, any amount by which a State's allocation under section 611(d), from funds appropriated under this heading, is reduced under section 612(a)(18)(B), according to the following: 85 percent on the basis of the States' relative populations of children aged 3 through 21 who are of the same age as children with disabilities for whom the State ensures the availability of a free appropriate public education under this part, and 15 percent to States on the basis of the States' relative populations of those children who are living in poverty:</u></p>	<p>This language authorizes the Department to reallocate funds that are reduced from a State's award as a result of a failure to meet the maintenance of financial support requirements of section 612 of the IDEA and requires that those funds be distributed to other States on the basis of their relative populations of children in the age ranges for which a State ensures a free appropriate public education and those children living in poverty.</p>
<p><sup>4</sup> <u>Provided further, That the Secretary may not distribute any funds under the previous proviso to any State whose reduction in allocation from funds appropriated under this heading made funds available for such a distribution:</u></p>	<p>This language ensures that any State receiving a reduction in their section 611 allocation as a result of not meeting the maintenance of financial support requirements of section 612 of the IDEA does not receive funds redistributed as a result of another State's failure to meet those same requirements.</p>
<p><sup>5</sup> <u>Provided further, That the States shall allocate such funds distributed under the second proviso to local educational agencies in accordance with section 611(f):</u></p>	<p>This language requires States to distribute the funds received under the second proviso to local educational agencies without reserving a portion of those funds for State-level activities.</p>

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes**

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><u><sup>6</sup> <i>Provided further, That the amount by which a State's allocation under section 611(d) of the IDEA is reduced under section 612(a)(18)(B) and the amounts distributed to States under the previous provisos in fiscal year 2012 or any subsequent year shall not be considered in calculating the awards under section 611(d) for fiscal year 2013 or for any subsequent fiscal years:</i></u></p>	<p>This language allows the Department to calculate a State's allocation under section 611(d) in future years without regard to reductions in awards made as a result of a failure to meet the maintenance of financial support requirements in section 612. This language mitigates the potential long-term impact of one-time reductions in awards.</p>
<p><u><sup>7</sup> <i>Provided further, That the Secretary may, notwithstanding section 643(e)(1) of the IDEA, reserve up to \$2,710,000 of the amount provided under section 644 for incentive grants to States to carry out section 635(c):</i></u></p>	<p>This language permits the Secretary to use up to \$2,710,000 of the funds appropriated for Part C of the IDEA for incentive grants for States to serve children 3 years of age until entrance into elementary school.</p>
<p><u><sup>8</sup> <i>Provided further, That funds 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:</i></u></p>	<p>This language authorizes funds made available for the Special Olympics Sports and Empowerment Act of 2004 to be used to support expenses associated with Special Olympics National and World games.</p>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>9</sup> <i>Provided further, That [\$2,000,000] <u>\$30,000,000</u>, to remain available for obligation through September 30, [2013] 2014, shall be for <u>competitive grants to States, incentive payments, and related activities</u> [aimed at improving the outcomes of children receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and their families, which may include competitive grants to States] <u>as may be necessary</u> to improve the provision and coordination of services <u>and supports for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) child recipients and their families or households</u> in order to achieve improved [health status] <u>outcomes</u>, including both physical and emotional health, [and] education and post-school outcomes, [including completion of] <u>such as completing postsecondary education and job training and obtaining employment</u>, [and to improve services and supports to the families or households of the SSI child recipient, such as education and job training for the parents] <u>that may result in long-term improvements in the SSI child recipient's economic self-sufficiency</u>:</i></p>	<p>This language designates \$30,000,000 for competitive grants to States, incentive payments, and related activities to improve the education and employment outcomes of SSI child recipients through the provision and coordination of services and supports for SSI child recipients and their families or households. The language would also make these funds available through September 30, 2014.</p>
<p><sup>10</sup> <i>Provided further, That States may award subgrants for a portion of the funds to other public and private, non-profit entities</i></p>	<p>This language allows States to award as subgrants to private and public, non-profit entities a portion of the competitive awards authorized in the eighth proviso.</p>
<p><sup>11</sup>: <i><u>Provided further, That not to exceed \$15,000,000 of amounts provided in the eighth proviso may be used for performance-based awards for Pay for Success projects:</u></i></p>	<p>This language permits the Secretary to use up to \$15,000,000 of the funds provided for the activities directed at Supplemental Security Income children recipients and their families for performance-based awards under the Pay for Success program.</p>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>12</sup> <u>Provided further, That, with respect to the previous proviso, any funds obligated for such projects shall remain available for disbursement until expended, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1552(a):</u></p>	<p>This language permits funds designated by the Secretary for the Pay for Success projects to remain available until expended.</p>
<p><sup>13</sup> <u>Provided further, That, with respect to the tenth proviso, any deobligated funds from such projects shall immediately be available for section 611 of the IDEA.</u></p>	<p>This language requires any deobligated funds of the Pay for Success projects to be allocated through the Special Education Grants to States program.</p>

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**Amounts Available for Obligation**  
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation and Adjustments	2011	2012	2013
Discretionary appropriation:			
Appropriation.....	\$12,568,048	\$12,647,066	\$12,687,307
Across-the-board reduction (P.L. 112-10) .....	-25,136	0	0
Across-the-board reduction (P.L. 112-74) .....	<u>-16,240</u>	<u>-6,357</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, appropriation .....	12,526,672	12,640,709	12,687,307
Advance for succeeding fiscal year .....	-8,576,143	-9,283,383	-10,124,103
Advance from prior year.....	<u>8,592,383</u>	<u>8,576,143</u>	<u>9,283,383</u>
Subtotal, budget authority.....	12,542,912	11,933,469	11,846,587
Unobligated balance, start of year .....	12,850	19,600	0
Unobligated balance, end of year.....	<u>-19,600</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations.....	12,536,162	11,953,069	11,846,587

**Obligations by Object Classification**  
(dollars in thousands)

Object Class	2011	2012	2013
Contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services.....	\$4,427	\$4,335	\$4,216
Peer review .....	<u>377</u>	<u>653</u>	<u>584</u>
Subtotal.....	4,804	4,988	4,800
Grants .....	<u>12,531,358</u>	<u>11,948,081</u>	<u>11,841,787</u>
Total, obligations .....	12,536,162	11,953,069	11,846,587

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**Authorizing Legislation**

(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2012 Authorized	2012 Estimate	2013 Authorized	2013 Request
State Grants:				
Grants to States ( <i>IDEA-B-611</i> )	Indefinite <sup>1</sup>	\$11,577,855 <sup>2</sup>	Indefinite <sup>1</sup>	\$11,577,855 <sup>2</sup>
Preschool grants ( <i>IDEA-B-619</i> )	Indefinite	372,646	Indefinite	372,646
Grants for infants and families ( <i>IDEA-C</i> )	0 <sup>3</sup>	442,710	0 <sup>3</sup>	462,710
National activities:				
State personnel development ( <i>IDEA-D-1</i> )	0 <sup>3</sup>	43,917	0 <sup>3</sup>	45,011
Technical assistance and dissemination ( <i>IDEA-D-2-663</i> )	0 <sup>3</sup>	46,781 <sup>4</sup>	0 <sup>3</sup>	46,781
Personnel preparation ( <i>IDEA-D-2-662</i> )	0 <sup>3</sup>	88,299	0 <sup>3</sup>	85,799
Parent information centers ( <i>IDEA-D-3-671-673</i> )	0 <sup>3</sup>	28,917	0 <sup>3</sup>	28,917
Technology and media services ( <i>IDEA-D-3-674</i> )	0 <sup>3</sup>	29,588	0 <sup>3</sup>	29,588
Special Olympics education programs ( <i>SOSEA</i> <sup>5</sup> 3(a))	0 <sup>6</sup>	8,000 <sup>4</sup>	0 <sup>6</sup>	8,000
PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI ( <i>IDEA-D-2-663</i> )	<u>0<sup>7</sup></u>	<u>1,996</u>	<u>0<sup>7</sup></u>	<u>30,000</u>
Total definite authorization	0		0	
Total appropriation		12,640,709		12,687,307
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				706,806
Portion of request not authorized				30,000

<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 \$30,597 thousand for fiscal year 2012 and \$31,257 thousand for fiscal year 2013.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$25,000 thousand for technical assistance on State data collection in fiscal years 2012 and 2013.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Authorizing Legislation—continued

(dollars in thousands)

<sup>3</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011; this program is funded in FY 2012 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2013 through appropriations language.

<sup>4</sup> In fiscal year 2012, Special Olympics education programs was funded at \$8,000 thousand with funds from Technical assistance and dissemination.

<sup>5</sup> Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004.

<sup>6</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2010; this program is funded in FY 2012 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2013 through appropriations language.

<sup>7</sup> The program is authorized in FY 2012 through appropriations language; continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2013 through appropriations language.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Appropriations History

(dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
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 (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 (8,592,383)	12,587,035 (8,592,383)
2011 (2011 Advance for 2012) Rescission (P.L. 112-74)	12,846,190 (8,592,383)	12,564,953 <sup>3</sup> (8,592,383)	12,787,035 <sup>4</sup> (8,592,383)	12,526,672 (8,592,383) (16,240)
2012 (2012 Advance for 2013)	12,861,351 (9,433,103)	13,757,844 <sup>5</sup> (8,592,383)	12,553,066 <sup>5</sup> (8,592,383)	12,640,709 (9,283,383)
2013 (2013 Advance for 2014)	12,687,307 (10,124,103)			

<sup>1</sup> This account operated under a fully-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 House allowance reflects the House-passed full-year continuing resolution.

<sup>4</sup> The level for the Senate allowance reflects committee action only.

<sup>5</sup> The levels for the House allowance reflects an introduced bill; the level for the Senate allowances reflects Senate Committee action only.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Significant Items in FY 2012 Appropriations Reports

#### **Technology and Media Services**

Senate: Report 112-84. The Committee is particularly interested in the fiscal year 2012 competition on Educational Materials in Accessible Formats for Students with Visual Impairments and Other Print Disabilities and the recommendation includes no less than the fiscal year 2012 budget request for this activity. The Committee notes that the last competition helped improve SEA and LEA compliance with requirements to provide accessible instructional materials to students with visual impairments and other print disabilities by providing 130,000 students with disabilities with free access to instructional materials and making over 100,000 books digitally available in multiple accessible formats. The Committee expects the fiscal year 2012 competition to continue to improve the speed and ease of access to materials as well as the volume of materials available to such students.

Response: The Department will provide at least \$6 million for the fiscal year 2012 competition on Educational Materials in Accessible Formats for Students with Visual Impairments and Other Print Disabilities.

#### **PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI**

Senate: Report 112-84. The Committee expects the Administration to update the Committees on Appropriations, Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, and Finance of its activities related to the PROMISE program. Such notification and consultation shall occur no later than 30 days after conclusion of the review of relevant research and engagement with stakeholders. If the Administration determines, based on stakeholder input, that legislation is required to allow waivers of statutory barriers, the Administration will request legislative authority to grant such waivers at least 60 days prior to their proposed issuance or announcement in notices of priorities or funding availability. Such requests should also explain the full range of administrative, regulatory and legislative flexibilities that would be granted by Federal agencies and the safeguards that would be instituted to protect program beneficiaries and taxpayers.

Response: The Department will provide the committees with updates on the PROMISE program within 30 days after the conclusion of its review of pertinent research and its outreach to stakeholders. If the Administration determines, based on stakeholder input, that waivers of statutory barriers are necessary, the Administration will promptly notify the committee of its intent to seek legislative waiver authority.

[Click here for accessible version](#)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2013 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(in thousands of dollars)						
Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2011 Appropriation	2012 Appropriation	2013 President's Budget	2013 President's Budget Compared to 2012 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent
<b>Special Education</b>						
1. State grants:						
(a) Grants to States (IDEA B-611)						
Annual appropriation	D	2,889,817	2,294,472	1,453,752	(840,720)	-36.641%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year <sup>1</sup>	D	8,576,143	9,283,383	10,124,103	840,720	9.056%
Subtotal		11,465,960	11,577,855	11,577,855	0	0.000%
(b) Preschool grants (IDEA B-619)	D	373,351	372,646	372,646	0	0.000%
(c) Grants for infants and families (IDEA C)	D	438,548	442,710	462,710	20,000	4.518%
Subtotal, State grants		12,277,859	12,393,211	12,413,211	20,000	0.161%
2. National activities (IDEA D):						
(a) State personnel development (Subpart 1)	D	46,846	43,917	45,011	1,094	2.491%
(b) Technical assistance and dissemination (section 663) <sup>2</sup>	D	48,806	46,781	46,781	0	0.000%
(c) Personnel preparation (section 662)	D	88,466	88,299	85,799	(2,500)	-2.831%
(d) Parent information centers (sections 671-673)	D	27,972	28,917	28,917	0	0.000%
(e) Technology and media services (section 674)	D	28,644	29,588	29,588	0	0.000%
Subtotal		240,734	237,502	236,096	(1,406)	-0.592%
3. Special Olympics education programs (Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act) <sup>2</sup>	D	8,079	8,000	8,000	0	0.000%
4. PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI (IDEA D-663)	D	0	1,996	30,000	28,004	1403.006%
Total, Appropriation	D	12,526,672	12,640,709	12,687,307	46,598	0.369%
Total, Budget authority	D	12,542,912	11,933,469	11,846,587	(86,882)	-0.728%
Current <sup>3</sup>		3,950,529	3,357,326	2,563,204	(794,122)	-23.653%
Prior year's advance		8,592,383	8,576,143	9,283,383	707,240	8.247%

NOTES: -Category Codes are as follows: D = discretionary program; M = mandatory program.  
 -Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> Under the terms of the FY 2012 appropriations bill, a 0.189 percent across-the-board rescission is applied to budget authority available in FY 2012. As a result, FY 2011 advance appropriations available in FY 2012 are reduced by \$8,576 thousand.

<sup>2</sup> In FY 2012, funding for Special Olympics Education programs was provided under Technical Assistance and Dissemination.

<sup>3</sup> Excludes advance appropriations that become available on October 1 of the following fiscal year. Advance appropriations are \$8,576,143 thousand in fiscal year 2011, \$9,283,383 thousand in fiscal year 2012, and \$10,124,103 thousand in the fiscal year 2013 President's Budget request. The FY 2013 amount for advances is increased to account for the proposed consolidation of Teacher Quality State grants into the Innovation and Instructional Teams account, which does not have advances.

## 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 2013 budget request for Special Education of \$12.7 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 \$11.6 billion for the **Grants to States** program, the same as the FY 2012 level, 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. The request would provide an average of \$1,762 for each of the 6.558 million children with disabilities who are estimated to be served for 2013. The Federal contribution toward meeting the excess cost of special education and related services would be approximately 16 percent of the national average per pupil expenditures under this request.

The request of \$372.6 million for **Preschool Grants** is the same as the FY 2012 level and the request of \$462.7 million for **Grants for Infants and Families** is an increase of \$20 million. 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 \$236.1 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.

**Parent Information Centers** and **Technology and Media Services** would be funded at the FY 2012 levels of \$28.9 million and \$29.6 million, respectively. The **State Personnel Development** program would be funded at \$45.0 million, \$1.1 million more than in FY 2012. The **Technical Assistance and Dissemination** program would be funded at \$46.8 million, the same Technical Assistance and Dissemination program funding level as in FY 2012. The **Personnel Preparation** program would be funded at \$85.8 million, \$2.5 million less than in FY 2012.

The **Special Olympics Education Programs** would be funded at \$8 million. In FY 2012, activities carried out by this program were funded under the **Technical Assistance and Dissemination** program. Funding of \$30 million is also requested for an initiative, **PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI**, a joint effort with the Social Security Administration and the Departments of Health and Human Services and Labor. This is an increase of \$28.0 million over the FY 2012 funding level. Pilot demonstrations in a select number of States would seek to improve outcomes including education, health, and employment for children with disabilities who are recipients under the Supplemental Security Income program and their families by improving the coordination and increasing the use of existing services.

In addition, the Department of Education will participate in a Governmentwide review of ways to improve the effectiveness of disability programs through better coordination and alignment of priorities and strategies. This will build on previous efforts that have sought to better coordinate policies and programs across Federal, State, and local governments, the service provider

## **SPECIAL EDUCATION**

### **Summary of Request—continued**

community, and employers to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of programs serving individuals with disabilities.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### State grants: Grants to States

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: Indefinite <sup>1,2</sup>

Budget Authority:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$2,294,472 <sup>3</sup>	\$1,453,752 <sup>3</sup>	-\$840,720
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	<u>9,283,383</u>	<u>10,124,103</u>	<u>+840,720</u>
Total	11,577,855	11,577,855	0

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 611(c) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act limits technical assistance activities to \$25,000 thousand, increased by the amount of inflation from year to year. It is estimated that the maximum amount authorized for fiscal year 2013 would be \$31,048 thousand.

<sup>2</sup> Section 611(b)(2) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act requires that from the funds appropriated for Grants to States, 1.226 percent shall be set aside for the Department of the Interior. It is estimated that the maximum amount authorized for fiscal year 2013 would be \$143,221 thousand.

<sup>3</sup> Includes \$25,000 thousand for technical assistance activities.

---

## 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 a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 cannot receive base payment funds attributable to this age group or any 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 that are triggered when the amount available for distribution to

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

States increases.<sup>1</sup> If the amount available for allocation to States remains the same from one year to 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.

Most of the Federal funds provided to States must be passed on to 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 2013, the latter amount is estimated to be \$1,002,061.

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 is 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 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.

Maintenance of Effort – The IDEA also requires each State to maintain its level of State financial support for special education and related services from one year to the next. This requirement is commonly referred to as the State “maintenance of effort.” However, the 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

---

<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 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

---

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, as amended. Also, if a State educational agency (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.

Early Intervening Services – 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>

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 the same amounts that they received from the fiscal year 2003 appropriation.

The 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.

This is a forward-funded program that includes advance appropriations. In a typical year, a portion of the funds – the forward-funded portion – becomes available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year of the appropriation and remains 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

---

<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

---

2013, school districts will use both the forward- and advance-funded amounts primarily during the 2013-2014 school year.

Both forward-funded and advance funds remain available for obligation at State and local levels for an additional year. Hence, States and local educational agencies (LEAs) will have until September 30, 2015, to obligate their fiscal year 2013 awards.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
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>
2011 .....	11,465,960 <sup>2</sup>
2012 .....	11,577,855 <sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$15,000 thousand for technical assistance.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$25,000 thousand for technical assistance.

### **FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$11.6 billion for Grants to States to assist in covering the excess costs associated with providing special education and related services to children with disabilities. This request is level with the fiscal year 2012 level.

The 2013 budget request would provide an average of \$1,762 per child. This is equal to the \$1,762 per child provided in 2012. 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 2011 level of 6.558 million. The request level would maintain the Federal contribution toward offsetting the cost of special education and related services for children with disabilities at approximately 16 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure (APPE).

From 1975, when the 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, from 2006 to 2009, the count of children with disabilities reported by States decreased slightly each year from the prior fiscal year. Fiscal year 2010 represented the first increase in this population of students in 5 years, but the population declined again in fiscal year 2011. Fiscal year 2010 may be an outlier and the population of children with disabilities may continue to trend downward in future years, but in the absence of more certain information we have projected the numbers of children with disabilities expected to be served for fiscal years 2012 and 2013 at 6.558 million children, the same level as reported by States for fiscal year 2011.

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

## **SPECIAL EDUCATION**

### **State grants: Grants to States**

---

education curriculum, meet the same rigorous standards that have been established for all children to help prepare them for college and a career, and be prepared to lead productive, independent adult lives.

#### **Department of the Interior Set-Aside**

As in previous years, we are proposing that the fiscal year 2013 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 prior year's funding level plus the lesser of 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 or deflation, the amount of funds to be transferred to Interior would remain level with the amount Interior received in the prior fiscal year. The 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 \$20,871 for each child with a disability it serves, which is approximately 11.9 times the average amount per child that States would receive. At the request level with the cap, Interior would receive about 7.8 times the average amount per child that States would receive, which translates into an average of \$13,661 for each child with a disability, or about 122 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure (APPE) compared to 16 percent of the APPE for States overall.

#### **State Maintenance of Effort**

As noted in the Program Description, the IDEA requires each State to make available for special education and related services at least as much funding as it did in the prior year. If a State fails to maintain its fiscal support for special education and related services and does not receive a waiver of the requirement, the IDEA directs the Department to reduce that State's award under the Special Education Grants to States program. Beginning in 2012, the Department expects to reduce a State's award under this provision for the first time. As such, we are proposing language that would (a) allow the Department to redistribute the reduction to other States and (b) mitigate the ongoing impact of the reduction on a State's future year awards. Without the language, any funds reduced from a State's award would revert to Treasury at the end of the period of availability. The proposed language would allow the Department to provide these funds to other States who have not had their awards reduced as a result of a failure to maintain financial support for special education and related services so that these funds are used to offset the additional costs of providing services to students who qualify for services under the IDEA. Additionally, because of the way that the formula for determining State allocations operates, a State's award in any year depends, in part, on the amount the State received in the prior year. Without this additional language, a reduction in a State's award taken in any one year could have long-lasting impacts on that State's award, depending on the growth in the Grants to States appropriation and the size of the reduction in the individual State's award.

#### **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: free

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

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 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 the IDEA are met. State performance data are collected through Annual Performance Reports.

The 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 amount to be set aside in fiscal year 2012. The full amount of the request would be used for continuation costs, including support for two consortia of States to develop high-quality alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards that will fit coherently with the State assessment systems developed under the Race to the Top Assessment Program (see Innovation and Instructional Teams). Funds would also support the continuation of two multi-year awards the Department plans to make in fiscal year 2012 – one to help States in developing and using their early childhood data systems and another that would provide technical assistance to States and local educational agencies on improving their data collection and analytic processes in order to promote use of data to drive program improvement.

### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
<b>Program funding:</b>			
Formula grants to States	\$11,308,451	\$11,419,116	\$11,419,447
Formula grants to Outlying Areas	33,919	34,250	33,919
Grants to Freely Associated States	6,579	6,579	6,579
Department of the Interior	92,012	92,910	92,910
Technical assistance	24,930	24,930	24,930
Peer review of new Technical Assistance award applications	70	70	70
<b>Total</b>	<b>11,465,961</b>	<b>11,577,855</b>	<b>11,577,855</b>
Number of children with disabilities served ages 3 through 21	6,558,000	6,558,000 <sup>1</sup>	6,558,000 <sup>1</sup>
Average Federal share per child (whole dollars)	\$1,730	\$1,762 <sup>1</sup>	\$1,762 <sup>1</sup>
Average per pupil expenditure (APPE) (whole dollars)	\$10,660	\$10,785 <sup>1</sup>	\$11,165 <sup>1</sup>
Federal funding as a percentage of APPE	16%	16% <sup>1</sup>	16% <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Estimate, based on State-reported cumulative total for children served in the Fall of 2010.

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

<u>Basis:</u>	<u>School</u> <u>Year</u> <u>2007-2008</u>	<u>School</u> <u>Year</u> <u>2007-2008</u>	<u>School</u> <u>Year</u> <u>2008-2009</u>	<u>School</u> <u>Year</u> <u>2008-2009</u>	<u>School</u> <u>Year</u> <u>2009-2010</u>	<u>School</u> <u>Year</u> <u>2009-2010</u>
	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>
Graduating with regular diploma	34.4%	217,905	35.7%	247,299	37.9%	256,102
Graduating through certification	8.4%	53,260	8.9%	61,508	8.9%	60,001
Transferred to regular education	8.2%	51,786	9.6%	66,364	9.9%	66,920
Dropped out, or moved but not known to have continued in education	14.3%	90,766	13.2%	91,318	12.8%	86,327
Moved, but known to have continued in education	33.5%	212,337	31.6%	219,020	29.6%	199,899
Reaching maximum age for services and other reasons	<u>1.1%</u>	<u>7,187</u>	<u>0.9%</u>	<u>6,112</u>	<u>0.8%</u>	<u>5,071</u>
TOTAL	100.0%	633,241	100.0%	693,282	100.0%	675,877

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.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

#### History of Children Served and Program Funding

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Children Served</u> (thousands)	<u>Appropriation</u> (dollars in thousands)	<u>Federal</u> <u>Share Per Child</u> <sup>1</sup> (whole dollars)	<u>Percentage</u> <u>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>2</sup>	1,558	18%
2006	6,814	10,582,961 <sup>2</sup>	1,551	18%
2007	6,796	10,782,961 <sup>2</sup>	1,584	17%
2008	6,718	10,947,511 <sup>2</sup>	1,609	17%
2009	6,599	22,805,211 <sup>2,3</sup>	3,453 <sup>3</sup>	33% <sup>3</sup>
2010	6,614	11,505,211 <sup>2</sup>	1,736	16%
2011	6,558	11,465,960 <sup>2</sup>	1,730	16%
2012	6,558 <sup>4</sup>	11,577,855 <sup>2,4</sup>	1,762 <sup>4</sup>	16% <sup>4</sup>
2013	6,558 <sup>4</sup>	11,577,855 <sup>2,4</sup>	1,762 <sup>4</sup>	16% <sup>4</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> Includes \$10 million for technical assistance activities in 2005, \$15 million in 2006 through 2009 and \$25 million in 2010 through 2013.

<sup>3</sup> Includes funds available in fiscal year 2009 under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (P.L. 111-5).

<sup>4</sup> Estimate.

## 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 2013 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**

**Measure:** The percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2003</b>	25	29
<b>2005</b>	35	33
<b>2007</b>	35	36
<b>2009</b>	37	34
<b>2011</b>	39	32
<b>2013</b>	40	

NOTES: As defined for purposes of NAEP, "students with disabilities" includes any student 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."

No comparable NAEP assessments are scheduled for reading in 2012.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

**Measure:** The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in mathematics.

Year	Target	Actual
2003	23	29
2005	32	31
2007	33	33
2009	35	36
2011	37	36
2013	38	

NOTES: As defined for purposes of NAEP, "students with disabilities" includes any student 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."

No comparable NAEP assessments are scheduled for mathematics in 2012.

**Additional information:** Fourth-grade Reading: NAEP defines "Basic" for students participating in the fourth-grade reading assessment as follows: "Fourth-grade students performing at the *Basic* level should be able to locate relevant information, make simple inferences, and use their understanding of the text to identify details that support a given interpretation or conclusion. Students should be able to interpret the meaning of a word as it is used in the text."

Reading scores decreased from 2009 to 2011, marking 4 years of modest decline after moderate increases over the course of the previous 4 years. The 2011 reading scores fell short of the 2011 target. The data 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. Likewise, students with disabilities score well below other students. On the 2011 fourth-grade reading assessment, only 32 percent of students with disabilities scored at or above Basic, while 71 percent of students without a disability scored at or above Basic.

The National Center for Education Statistics collects data on the percentage of students 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 students with disabilities because increases in performance accompanied by reductions in students with disabilities tested might simply reflect higher exclusion rates among lower functioning students. Between 1998 and 2011, the exclusion rate for students with disabilities on fourth-grade reading assessments dropped from 41 percent to 23 percent. It should be noted that these percentages only include students with disabilities who have been included in the NAEP testing sample. Students in schools specifically for children with disabilities are not included in the NAEP sample.

The use of accommodations for students with disabilities, such as testing in small groups and extended time, has increased substantially. The share of the overall population that is students with disabilities who receive accommodations increased from 2 percent to 7 percent from 2000

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

to 2011. Among fourth-grade students with disabilities assessed in reading in 2011, 57 percent received accommodations.

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

Eighth-grade Mathematics: NAEP defines “Basic” for students participating in the eighth-grade mathematics assessment as follows: “Eighth-graders performing at the *Basic* level should complete problems correctly with the help of structural prompts such as diagrams, charts, and graphs. They should be able to solve problems in all NAEP content areas through the appropriate selection and use of strategies and technological tools—including calculators, computers, and geometric shapes. Students at this level also should be able to use fundamental algebraic and informal geometric concepts in problem solving. As they approach the *Proficient* level, students at the *Basic* level should be able to determine which of the available data are necessary and sufficient for correct solutions and use them in problem solving. However, these eighth-graders show limited skill in communicating mathematically.”

NAEP data for mathematics are encouraging. The performance of students with disabilities has improved steadily over baseline years and was just shy of the 2011 target. However, the data 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. Likewise, students with disabilities score well below other students. On the 2011 math assessment, only 36 percent of eighth-graders with disabilities scored at or above Basic, while 78 percent of eighth-grade students without a disability scored at or above Basic.

The National Center for Education Statistics collects data on the percentage of students 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 students with disabilities because increases in performance accompanied by reductions in students with disabilities tested might simply reflect higher exclusion rates among lower functioning students. Between 2000 and 2011, the exclusion rate on eighth-grade mathematics assessments dropped from 30 percent to 19 percent. It should be noted that these percentages only include students with disabilities who have been included in the NAEP testing sample. Students in schools specifically for children with disabilities are not included in the NAEP sample.

The use of accommodations for students with disabilities, such as testing in small groups and extended time, has increased substantially. For example, whereas less than one quarter of the eighth-grade students with disabilities assessed in mathematics in 2000 received accommodations, 68 percent received accommodations in 2011.

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

### Elementary and Secondary Education Measures

The Department has adopted four measures for the Special Education Grants to States program that are parallel with those used for the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program. Data on the measures are collected annually through the Education Data Exchange

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

Network (EDEN) and made available through EDFacts. Targets are based on a straight-line trajectory toward the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) 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 2012 were revised based on the more comprehensive 2006 data.

The first 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.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2008	54.0	40.8
2009	61.7	43.8
2010	69.4	43.9
2011	77.0	
2012	84.7	
2013	92.4	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2008	53.3	42.1
2009	61.1	45.2
2010	68.9	46.3
2011	76.7	
2012	84.4	
2013	92.2	

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

**Measure:** 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	Target	Actual
2008	22.2	29.7
2009	18.5	28.8
2010	14.8	28.3
2011	11.1	
2012	7.4	
2013	3.6	

**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	Target	Actual
2008	20.5	27.5
2009	17.0	26.1
2010	13.6	25.3
2011	10.2	
2012	6.9	
2013	3.4	

**Additional information:** As seen in the first two tables, States improved their performance with respect to students with disabilities on State reading and mathematics assessments between 2009 and 2010. The data suggest States are making some progress in ensuring that students with disabilities who participate in State reading and math assessments are reasonably well-equipped to perform on these assessments, but that progress is not substantial enough to keep up with the increasing targets that would bring all students with disabilities to proficiency by 2014. 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 (43.9 percent and 46.3 percent, respectively).

The last two tables indicate that there continue to be significant gaps between the percent of students 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 (28.3 percent and 25.3 percent, respectively). The improvement in scores among students with disabilities over the past few years has not been sufficient to significantly close those gaps, though progress is being made.

Because definitions of proficient and advanced vary across States, the national data presented here, which simply aggregates State data, may not give a clear or entirely meaningful picture of

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

student achievement. In addition, students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, and students with disabilities whose disability has precluded them from achieving grade-level proficiency may take alternate assessments based on modified academic achievement standards. States may include scores from these assessments for the purposes of adequate yearly progress (AYP) decisions, but only up to a cap of 3 percent of the total population tested, a maximum of 2 percent from alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards and a maximum of 1 percent from alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards. In 2010, approximately 19 percent of students with disabilities in grades 3 through 8 and high school were tested in math and reading using an alternate assessment (including those based on modified achievement standards and alternate achievement standards).

**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	Target	Actual
2008	58.0	59.0
2009	59.0	60.6
2010	60.0	62.6
2011	61.0	
2012	62.0	
2013	63.0	

**Measure:** The percentage of students with disabilities who drop out of school.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	27.0	24.6
2009	26.0	22.4
2010	25.0	21.1
2011	24.0	
2012	23.0	
2013	22.0	

**Additional information:** Between 2009 and 2010, States successfully increased their graduation rates and lowered dropout rates among students with disabilities. Three years of data demonstrate steady progress in both of these areas. States have exceeded the targets for the dropout rate the past 6 years and the graduation rate the past 5 years.

The instructions States received for calculating and submitting their graduation and dropout rates changed substantially in 2009. Previously, States used various methods of defining and calculating graduates and dropouts. Beginning in 2009, through their Annual Performance Reports (APR), States were asked to report using the calculation and timeline required under

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

ESEA. The graduation rate under ESEA is a cohort rate that defines a graduate as someone who receives a diploma in 4 years and adjusts for transfers in and out of the school. Students who receive modified diplomas or GEDs do not count as graduates in this calculation. States may receive permission from the Department to report data on cohorts of different lengths of time (such as a 5- or 6-year cohort). The dropout rate under ESEA is an annual event school dropout rate for students leaving school in a single year, using National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

The new graduation rate calculation requires States to track students using a longitudinal data system, which not all States have fully implemented. Most States did comply with the new requirements for reporting graduation rate data in 2009. Only nine States reported graduation rates using previous methods with data compiled under Section 618 of the IDEA. Forty-nine States used the NCES event rate for their dropout calculation in 2009. In 2010, all States used the new methods for calculating both their graduation and dropout rates.

### Postsecondary Outcomes

One of the purposes of the 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 1 year of leaving high school; b) enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within 1 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 1 year of leaving high school. Data for this indicator will be collected directly from the States on an annual basis. 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 collected baseline data in fall 2011, but since this was the first year States reported these data, the Department will not report these data until it receives additional data in fall 2012, to ensure that the data are reliable and a proper baseline can be established.

### Efficiency Measure

**Measure:** 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
2008	95	104
2009	90	87
2010	88	66
2011	86	
2012	86	
2013	86	

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

**Additional information:** In 2010, the most recent year for which data are available, the Department completed 16 site visits. OSEP responded to States, on average, within 66 days of a site visit. This result surpasses the target for this measure in 2010 and is an improvement over the prior 2 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 remaining eight reports were issued between 49 and 100 days. The 2009 data were more in line with the 2007 result and support the notion that the 2008 result is an outlier.

### 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.** A report published in January 2010 provided a synthesis of existing evidence and new analyses of extant data sources to address research questions for the IDEA National Assessment targeting three topic areas: (1) identification of children for early intervention and special education, (2) declassification of children for early intervention and special education services, and (3) developmental and academic outcomes for children with disabilities. Among the data sources used for the study are the National Assessment of Educational 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).

From 1997 to 2005, the percent of children aged 6 to 17 served under IDEA increased from 12.3 to 12.9. The percentage varies by race/ethnicity, with a low of 6.3 percent of Asian children served under IDEA up to 16.7 percent of black children. There is also variation by State, ranging from 9.9 percent of all children served under IDEA to 18.6 percent. From 1997 to 2005, the largest increases in disability types were autism, a 400 percent increase among children 10 to 17 years old, and developmental delay, almost a 2000 percent increase among children 3 to 9 years old. The study cited research on declassification (Holt, McGrath, and Herring 2007) that showed almost 50 percent of children eligible in kindergarten were no longer eligible for services by third grade. Children with speech/language impairment are the most likely to be declassified within 2 years (34 percent). Declassified children had higher literacy and math outcomes than children who continued to receive services under IDEA.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

The study confirms data presented above that children with disabilities are performing increasingly well on NAEP tests, but that they are still far behind their non-disabled peers. Children with disabilities also have a much larger range of performance on the NAEP exam than do children without disabilities. State assessment data point to a wide array of outcomes and standards for proficiency. In 4th grade math and reading, the percent of children with disabilities who scored proficient or above on a State's assessment ranged from just less than 10 percent up to 80 percent.

Implementation Study. The final report for the IDEA National Assessment Implementation Study was published in July 2011. This study collected data from State agencies and school districts to address implementation questions for the IDEA National Assessment in four broad areas targeted for this study: (1) services to young children with disabilities; (2) identification of children and youth with disabilities; (3) efforts to promote positive developmental and educational outcomes for children and youth with disabilities; and (4) dispute resolution and mediation. Data collection included three surveys of State administrators: (1) IDEA Part B administrators responsible for programs providing special education services to school-aged children with disabilities ages 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 collected 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.

The study specifically focused on implementation related to new or revised provisions from the 2004 reauthorization of IDEA. One such provision, Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS), allows districts to use up to 15 percent of their Part B funds to provide services to children not yet identified as in need of special education. Three percent of districts are required to use CEIS due to significant disproportionality and 11 percent of districts are voluntarily implementing CEIS. Of the districts that implement CEIS, it is used at the elementary school level in 93 percent of districts and focuses on literacy instruction in 84 percent of districts. The study found that the use of Response to Intervention (RTI) is also widespread, and is being used in 71 percent of districts nationally. Similar to CEIS, RTI is most commonly used in elementary schools and in reading/language arts. However, only 41 percent of districts reported using IDEA funds for RTI, while 80 percent of districts reported using their own general funds.

The study looked at qualifications and distribution of "highly qualified" special education personnel. Almost 90 percent of special education teachers meet their State's definition of highly qualified, but States range from 56 percent to 100 percent. Districts reported that the most difficult areas to find quality personnel were in secondary schools, particularly math, and in working with students with emotional disturbances and with autism. The most common method districts use to increase the qualifications of their staff, implemented by 64 percent of all districts and 76 percent of districts facing routine shortages of quality applicants, is to provide professional development. No other approach was used by more than 25 percent of districts.

Finally, the study found that dispute resolution events are very infrequent, with 23 or fewer events for every 10,000 students served between 2004 and 2008. The number of due process hearing requests over that time has been steady at about 21 requests per 10,000 students, but the frequency of due process hearings completed has decreased from 3.36 hearings in 2004 to 1.61 hearings in 2008.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

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?

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. Reports are scheduled for release in early 2012 and early 2013.

National Longitudinal Transition Study: The Department sponsored the National Longitudinal Transition Study (NLTS) and the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2) to provide nationally representative information about secondary-school-age youth who were receiving special education services in 1985 and 2000, respectively. Data collection consisted of telephone interviews or mail surveys with youth or the youth's parents if the youth were not able to respond themselves. The National Center for Special Education Research (NCSE), in a September 2010 report, "Comparisons Across Time of the Outcomes of Youth With Disabilities up to 4 Years After High School," compared the changes in outcomes among youth in the NLTS and NLTS2 who had been out of high school for up to 4 years. The report focused on changes in rates of postsecondary education, employment, engagement in either postsecondary education or employment, household circumstances and community integration. Researchers also compared outcomes of youth with disabilities to the general population and across subgroups including disability category, gender, race/ethnicity, household income, high school completion status, and length of time since leaving high school.

According to the NCSE report, youth with disabilities were more likely to have enrolled in postsecondary education within 4 years of leaving high school in 2005 than in 1990. Almost half (46 percent) of all youth with disabilities had spent some time in postsecondary education in 2005. The rate of youth with disabilities who were currently enrolled in postsecondary education and/or employed was 86 percent in 2005, a 21 percentage-point increase over 1990. This increase is likely attributable to an increase in youth who were concurrently enrolled in postsecondary education and employed, given that rates of engagement in only one of these

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

activities did not change significantly over that period of time. The report also illustrated the increasingly important connection between high school completion and postsecondary outcomes, as high school completers had significant and positive changes between 1990 and 2005 in a greater number of outcome measures than non-completers. Youth with disabilities from low-income households increased their postsecondary enrollment rate by 16 percentage points to 35 percent in 2005, but a significant enrollment gap remains between the highest and lowest income households. Similarly, in 2005, youth with disabilities enrolled in postsecondary education at a rate well below the general population, specifically 46 percent compared to 63 percent.

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 relied 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. Reports are scheduled for release in early 2013.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

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

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: Indefinite

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$372,646	\$372,646	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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

received in the prior year. In addition, every State must receive an increase equal to the higher 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 increased from 731,832 in fiscal year 2010 to 735,245 in fiscal year 2011. This is the second consecutive increase after steadily declining child counts since fiscal year 2007. Despite more children than ever receiving services under this program in fiscal year 2011, children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 still constitute a smaller percentage of the overall population aged 3 through 5 than every other year, except 2009, since fiscal year 2005. The recent reversal of the downward trend in the total number of children served makes it difficult to forecast the number of children being served in future fiscal years. In the absence of better information, the Department predicts that the number of children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 will remain at the 2011 level for fiscal years 2012 and 2013.

This is a forward funded program. Funds become available for obligation on 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: Preschool grants

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2008 .....	\$374,099
2009 .....	374,099
Recovery Act .....	400,000
2010 .....	374,099
2011 .....	373,351
2012 .....	372,646

### **FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$372.6 million for the Preschool Grants program. The request would maintain funding for this program at the fiscal year 2012 level. This amount would provide an average of \$507 per child, level with the amount provided in 2012 and \$1 less than the amount provided in 2011. These averages are based on the assumption that the number of children aged 3 through 5 who will be served will remain constant at the 2011 level of 735,245. The Department believes this request provides an appropriate level of resources to support activities for young children with disabilities, given that these funds are paired with those available under the Grants to States program under IDEA, Part B.

For the Grants to States program, \$11.6 billion is requested for fiscal year 2013, level with the 2012 amount. Preschool Grants funding supplements the 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.

The Administration believes high quality early childhood education is critical to the future success of all children, including children with disabilities, and that improved coordination among Federal early childhood programs will lead to improved services and results. 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 ensure that children with disabilities are included in State early childhood programs and programs operated or supported by other Federal programs. The Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC), for which the Department awarded \$497 million in fiscal year 2011 funds, provided States with additional incentives and opportunities to more effectively serve children with disabilities in inclusive, high quality early childhood programs. The RTT-ELC funds supported competitive grants to States for the development of a statewide infrastructure of integrated high-quality early learning supports and services for children from birth through age 5, with a focus on children with high needs, including those with disabilities.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
Children Served <sup>1</sup>	735,245	735,245 <sup>2</sup>	735,245 <sup>2</sup>
Share per child (whole dollars)	\$508	\$507 <sup>2</sup>	\$507 <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</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>2</sup> Estimate, based on State-reported cumulative total for children served in the Fall of 2010.

#### History of Children Served and Program Funding

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Children Served</u> (thousands)	<u>Appropriation</u> (dollars in thousands)	<u>Federal Share per Child</u> (whole dollars)
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> (thousands)	<u>Appropriation</u> (dollars in thousands)	<u>Federal Share per Child</u> (whole dollars)
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	709	774,099 <sup>3</sup>	1,092 <sup>3</sup>
2010	732	374,099	511
2011	735 <sup>4</sup>	373,351	508
2012	735 <sup>4,5</sup>	372,646	507 <sup>5</sup>
2013	735 <sup>4,5</sup>	372,646 <sup>5</sup>	507 <sup>5</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> These figures include funds provided under the Recovery Act in FY 2009.

<sup>4</sup> Beginning in fiscal year 2011, this table reports the number of children served by the 50 States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Prior fiscal years also include the number of children served in the Outlying Areas, Freely Associated States, and the Bureau of Indian Education, which do not receive Preschool Grant awards.

<sup>5</sup> Estimates.

## 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 2013 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.*

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

**Measure:** The percentage of children who entered the program below age expectations in positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.

Year	Target	Actual
2010		80
2011	80	
2012	81	
2013	82	

**Measure:** The percentage of children who entered the program below age expectations in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.

Year	Target	Actual
2010		78
2011	80	
2012	81	
2013	82	

**Measure:** The percentage of children who entered the program below age expectations in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.

Year	Target	Actual
2010		78
2011	80	
2012	81	
2013	82	

**Additional information:** Through their Annual Performance Reports (APRs), States report on the cognitive, social-emotional, and behavioral development of children with disabilities served through the preschool program. The Department, with the assistance of its grantee, the Early Childhood Outcomes Center, uses these data to assess outcomes for children served through this program. Measuring growth in these outcomes, especially for preschool aged children, is a complicated endeavor that requires a significant investment of time and technical assistance at both the Federal and State levels to ensure that the data collected are valid, reliable, and meaningful. The Department has been deliberate in developing this measure due to the challenges of assessing program performance based on growth in early childhood outcomes, especially for children with disabilities. In 2005, States began developing systems for collecting entry and exit data on children with disabilities who receive services through the preschool program and remain in the program for at least 6 months. While four States have received approval from the Department to collect data for a representative sample of the children they serve through the Preschool Grants program, all other States are responsible for reporting data

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

on all children served. The APRs submitted by States in February 2010 were to include, for the first time, complete entry and exit data for a full cohort of children with disabilities aged 3 through 5, but the Department did not publish these data because a large number of States had high percentages of missing data or other data quality concerns.

However, the quality of the data States reported in their APRs in February 2011 demonstrated marked improvement. The sample of 33 States with the highest quality data exhibits particularly encouraging outcomes for these measures. States were excluded from this sample if they had high proportions of missing data, anomalous outcomes, or if the State was known to have other data quality or collection issues. The weighted data showed that over 80 percent of preschoolers substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program in each category: 83 percent increased their rate of growth in positive social-emotional skills, 82 percent in the acquisition and use of knowledge, and 82 percent in the use of appropriate behavior. The targets for this measure were based, in part, on the outcomes of this subset of higher quality data States. As States have improved their data collection, the number of children served by this program for whom outcome data are reported has increased substantially each year. Since outcomes have not declined as data are reported for more children, the Department is optimistic that, within the next few years, the national data will demonstrate that the children served by the program are improving at levels similar to children in States with the best data quality.

States have indicated that they believe the data will be useful in their program improvement efforts. States are engaged in implementing quality control systems to identify and improve the accuracy of local data. However, some data quality issues still exist, particularly with regards to missing data. The extent of missing data is difficult to determine precisely because States do not report on the number of children exiting the program. Furthermore, States may be unable to collect exit data for all children (e.g., due to a move to another State, withdrawal from the program without prior notice, or death). Through its technical assistance investments, the Department continues to work with the States to resolve implementation issues, improve the validity and reliability of reported data, and use these data to inform program improvements.

**Measure:** 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.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	43	50
2009	43	51
2010	43	53
2011	48	
2012	48	
2013	50	

**Additional information:** Actual performance in fiscal year 2010 increased slightly from fiscal year 2009, and exceeded the target for this measure for the third year in a row.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

This measure was developed to replace a previous measure on the extent to which children with disabilities receive their special education services in regular education settings. The earlier measure – used through September 2006 – 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.

States began using a revised data collection between October 1 and December 1, 2006, inclusive. These data were reported and are reflected in the fiscal year 2007 data. 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 setting: (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).

In July 2007, the Department published a Federal Register notice requesting comments on a proposal to add another reporting category that would disaggregate the data so as to report on children with disabilities 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 States to provide information on the percentage of time children with disabilities were spending in the regular early childhood setting (i.e. Head Start, kindergartens, child care, etc.). The form now will only require States to indicate the number of children for whom the child's usual daily routine includes attending a regular early childhood program and, if so, if such attendance 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 2013.

The Department is using technical assistance providers such as the Data Accountability Center, the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance 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>).

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

**Measure:** The number of States with at least 90 percent of special education teachers of children with disabilities aged 3 to 5 who are fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	39	38
2009	40	39
2010	40	43
2011	41	
2012	41	
2013	44	

**Additional information:** The Department exceeded its target for fiscal year 2010, the most recent year for which data are available. States have made moderate progress since 2007 in ensuring their special education teachers are fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching. This measure includes the 50 States, D.C., Puerto Rico, the Outlying Areas and the Bureau of Indian Education.

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has a number of investments designed to assist States in preparing a sufficient number of qualified preschool special education personnel. In fiscal year 2007, OSEP funded the IRIS Center for Training Enhancements. The focus of this center is on assisting higher education faculty and professional development programs that train early interventionists, early childhood educators, related services providers, and childcare personnel to improve and expand their programs through the development and dissemination of evidence-based resources. OSEP also currently funds The Center to Mobilize Early Childhood Knowledge (CONNECT), which develops resources and modules on effective instruction practices for use by professional development providers, aimed at building practitioners' abilities to make evidence-based decisions. The two centers help address State-identified needs for highly qualified special education personnel and help ensure that those personnel have the skills and knowledge needed to serve children with disabilities birth through age 5. New investments in fiscal year 2012 may include work with States to develop and implement personnel standards and infrastructures to support comprehensive systems of personnel development across early childhood programs serving young children with disabilities and their families.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

#### Efficiency Measure

**Measure:** 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
2008	95	104
2009	90	87
2010	88	66
2011	86	
2012	86	
2013	86	

**Additional information:** In 2010, the most recent year for which data are available, the Department completed 16 site visits. OSEP responded to States, on average, within 66 days of a site visit. This result surpasses the target for this measure in 2010 and is an improvement over the prior 2 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 remaining eight reports were issued between 49 and 100 days. The 2009 data were more in line with the 2007 result and support the notion that the 2008 result is an outlier.

#### 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?

The latest report from this study, "Access to Educational and Community Activities for Young Children with Disabilities," was released in October 2010. According to parent interviews, participation in community activities such as sports, organized clubs, art, and music varied

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

significantly by type of disability and by household income. Children from households with incomes greater than \$40,000 annually participated in sports with greater frequency than children from households with lower incomes. Children of parents who perceived their neighborhood to be unsafe or who reported that their transportation did not meet their families' needs were significantly less likely to participate in extracurricular activities. Parents also reported on educational settings, and 69 percent said they sent their children to full day kindergarten. Children from high wealth districts and those from suburban settings were less likely to attend full-day kindergarten than their peers.

In a survey of kindergarten teachers, 73 percent of teachers reported that the regular education classroom was the main setting for children receiving special education services. This inclusion rate was significantly higher in very large districts (91 percent) than districts of other sizes, and significantly higher in rural districts (86 percent) than in suburban or urban districts. Children in very low wealth districts were less likely to have regular classrooms as their main setting (59 percent) compared to all other districts. On average, children spent 17.1 hours per week in regular classrooms and 7.1 hours in special education settings.

Teachers also reported on modifications and accommodations provided to children with disabilities. Overall, teachers reported using unmodified grade-level materials in 44 percent of cases, while 14 percent of children received specialized materials or curricula. There was no significant variation in these data across district size or wealth. The study also found that children who received special education services in a regular classroom were in classrooms in which an average of 82 percent of students were nondisabled (<http://www.peels.org>).

Early Childhood Longitudinal Study: The Department also is conducting the "Early Childhood Longitudinal Study" through the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). This program involves two complementary cohort studies, a "Birth Cohort" (ECLS-B) and a "Kindergarten Cohort" (ECLS-K), 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.

OSEP, 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,

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

Kindergarten Class of 2010-11" (ECLS-K:2011) replaces the ECLS-K and will be an ongoing study sponsored by 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: 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)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0 <sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$442,710	\$462,710	+\$20,000

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011; continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2013 through appropriations language.

---

### **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 beyond their third birthday and continued to do so in 2010 and 2011. No additional States elected to implement this option in fiscal years 2010 or 2011.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

In any fiscal year in which the appropriation for Part C exceeds \$460 million, the statute also includes authority for the Secretary to reserve 15 percent of the amount above \$460 million 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, or for a portion of this period. No State can receive more than 20 percent of the amount available for State Incentive Grants in a fiscal year. In fiscal year 2009, due to the addition of funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the total of funds appropriated for Part C exceeded the \$460 million level. The States that opted to extend their provision of Part C services beyond age 3 received additional funds through this program, and had until September 30, 2011, to expend these funds. The appropriation for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 did not exceed \$460 million, so the Department did not have the authority to award State Incentive Grants in either of these fiscal years.

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 (6) 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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

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 on 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 as follows:

	(dollars in thousands)
2008 .....	\$435,654
2009 .....	439,427
Recovery Act.....	500,000
2010 .....	439,427
2011 .....	438,548
2012 .....	442,710

### **FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$462.7 million for the Grants for Infants and Families program for fiscal year 2013, an increase of \$20 million over 2012. The requested increase would provide critical support for the Administration's commitment to increase access to high-quality early childhood programs for all children. At the request level, the average State allocation would increase by \$324,940, enabling States to maintain or expand their provision of high quality early intervention services that are appropriate to the needs of infants and toddlers with disabilities. 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.

The Administration expects that the requested increase would also help States enhance their systems for identifying infants and toddlers with disabilities and determining appropriate services, and facilitate better coordination with other programs serving young children. The Administration anticipates that the Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC), for which the Department awarded \$500 million in fiscal year 2011 funds, will provide States with additional incentives and opportunities to more effectively serve children with disabilities in high-quality early learning programs. The RTT-ELC provides competitive grants to States for the development of a statewide infrastructure of integrated high-quality early learning supports and services for children from birth through age 5, with a focus on children with high needs, including those with disabilities. The requested increase for the Part C program could support improved coordination between State lead agencies and early learning programs, including those participating in RTT-ELC grant projects, to help ensure that the needs of infants and toddlers with disabilities are addressed appropriately through these programs.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

IDEA provides authority for a State Incentive Grant program in years for which the funds available under Part C exceed \$460 million. State Incentive Grants are intended to facilitate a seamless system of services for children with disabilities from birth up to age 5, thereby increasing access to and continuity of service provision through high-quality early childhood programs. In fiscal year 2009, due to the addition of funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the Department awarded incentive grants to two States, Maryland and New Mexico, that elected to extend eligibility for Part C services to children with disabilities beyond their third birthday. These funds were available to States for obligation until September 30, 2011. The requested increase for 2013 would enable the Department to reserve funds to resume support for these activities in Maryland and New Mexico, as well as for additional States that might elect to extend eligibility for Part C services.

In order to ensure that sufficient funding is available to support the extension of Part C services in States that elect to do this, the Administration is proposing appropriations language that would allow the Department to reserve up to \$2,710,000 for State Incentive Grants. Based on requests for technical assistance on extending Part C services and expressed interest by States, the Administration expects as many as eight States to apply for these funds. At the requested level, no State would receive more than \$542,000 through a State Incentive Grant. Without this language, only \$406,500 would be available for State Incentive Grants with no State receiving more than \$81,300.

### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u> <sup>2</sup>
Range in size of awards to States:			
Smallest State regular Part C award <sup>3,4</sup>	\$2,150	\$2,170	\$2,255
Average State regular Part C award <sup>3</sup>	\$8,270	\$8,348	\$8,673
Largest State regular Part C award <sup>3</sup>	\$53,575	\$54,039	\$54,376
Estimated number of State Incentive Grant awards	0	0	8
Maximum State Incentive Grant award amount	0	0	\$542
Children served <sup>1</sup>	355,000	360,000	370,000

---

<sup>1</sup> Estimates.

<sup>2</sup> Allocations in fiscal year 2013 would depend on the number and size of State Incentive Grant awards. Since we do not yet know how many States will apply for State Incentive Grants, estimates of smallest, average, and largest Part C awards do not include the funds set aside for State Incentive Grants.

<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 1/2 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

---

#### 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 2013 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:** The percentage of infants and toddlers who entered the program below age expectations in positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.

Year	Target	Actual
2010		64
2011	65	
2012	67	
2013	69	

**Measure:** The percentage of infants and toddlers who entered the program below age expectations in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.

Year	Target	Actual
2010		68
2011	69	
2012	71	
2013	73	

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

**Measure:** The percentage of infants and toddlers who entered the program below age expectations in the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.

Year	Target	Actual
2010		68
2011	69	
2012	71	
2013	73	

**Additional information:** Through their Annual Performance Reports (APRs), States report on the cognitive, social-emotional, and behavioral development of children with disabilities served through the Part C program. The Department, with the assistance of its grantee, the Early Childhood Outcomes Center, uses these data to assess outcomes for children served through this program. Measuring growth in these outcomes, especially for infants and toddlers, is a complicated endeavor that requires a significant investment of time and technical assistance at both the Federal and State levels to ensure that the data collected are valid, reliable, and meaningful. The Department has been deliberate in developing this measure due to the challenges of assessing program performance based on growth in early childhood outcomes, especially for children with disabilities. In 2005, States began developing systems for collecting entry and exit data on children with disabilities who receive services through the Part C program and remain in the program for at least 6 months. While three States have received approval from the Department to collect data for a representative sample of the children they serve through the Part C program, all other States are responsible for reporting data on all children served. The APRs submitted by States in February 2010 included the first opportunity for States to have a set of complete entry and exit data for a full cohort of infants and toddlers, but the Department did not publish these data because a large number of States had high percentages of missing data or other data quality concerns.

However, the quality of the data States reported in their APRs in February 2011 demonstrated marked improvement. A sample of 29 States with the highest quality data exhibits particularly encouraging outcomes for these measures. States were excluded from this sample if they had high proportions of missing data, anomalous outcomes, or if the State was known to have other data quality or collection issues. The weighted data showed that over 70 percent of infants and toddlers served under Part C substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program in each category: 71 percent increased their rate of growth in positive social-emotional skills, 74 percent in the acquisition and use of knowledge, and 76 percent in the use of appropriate behavior. The targets for this measure were based, in part, on the outcomes of this subset of higher quality data States. As States have improved their data collection, the number of infants and toddlers served by this program for whom outcome data are reported has increased substantially each year. Since outcomes have not declined as data are reported for more children, the Department is optimistic that, within the next few years, the national data will demonstrate that the children served by the program are improving at levels similar to the children in States with the best data quality.

States have indicated that they believe the data will be useful in their program improvement efforts. States are engaged in implementing quality control systems to identify and improve the accuracy of local data. The Department acknowledges that some data quality issues persist,

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

particularly concerning missing data. In some instances, States may be unable to collect exit data for all children (e.g., due to a move to another State, withdrawal from the program without prior notice, or death). Through its technical assistance investments, the Department continues to work with the States to resolve implementation issues, improve the validity and reliability of reported data, and use these data to inform program improvements.

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

**Measure:** 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
2008	27	25
2009	27	25
2010	27	25
2011	27	26
2012	27	
2013	27	

**Additional information:** 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. Although the program did not meet its target in 2011, it made progress. The 1 percent threshold for this measure is based on data collected by the U.S. Census bureau on prevalence rates for 5 conditions: 0.4 percent - severe mental retardation<sup>1</sup>; 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. State lead agencies responsible for the implementation of these programs report data annually to the Department through their APRs on numbers of infants and toddlers with disabilities served under the Grants for Infants and Families program. Through its monitoring and technical assistance efforts, the Department is working with States to ensure that they are appropriately identifying and serving all eligible infants with disabilities and expects the number of States serving at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under age one to increase further as a result.

---

<sup>1</sup> Consistent with P.L. 111-256, the Department uses the term “intellectual disabilities” instead of “mental retardation,” but we have retained the term here to permit verification of the data that were used to set the threshold.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

**Measure:** 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
2008	31	31
2009	31	35
2010	31	37
2011	32	42
2012	32	
2013	37	

**Additional information:** The State lead agencies responsible for the implementation of these programs report data on the numbers of infants and toddlers with disabilities served under the Grants for Infants and Families program annually to the Department through their APRs. The Department sets the 2 percent threshold for this measure using data from the U.S. Census bureau on the percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities in the general population. Through its monitoring and technical assistance efforts, the Department helps States enhance their child find systems to ensure that they are appropriately identifying and serving eligible toddlers with disabilities. The Department believes that these efforts are partially responsible for the improved performance of States under this measure and will consider raising the targets for 2012 and 2013 to reflect the actual performance for the past 3 years.

**Measure:** The percentage of children receiving age-appropriate early intervention services in the home or in programs designed for typically developing peers.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	86	92
2009	87	93
2010	87	94
2011	93	
2012	93	
2013	94	

**Additional information:** State lead agencies report annually to the Department on the settings in which children receive services provided under the Part C program. In 2001, States reported that only 76 percent of children receiving early intervention services through the Part C program were served in the home or in programs designed for typically developing peers, so performance on this indicator has improved dramatically in the past 10 years (by 18 percentage points). 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. Actual data for 2011 will be available in October 2012.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

#### Efficiency Measures

**Measure:** 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
2008		82
2009	79	80
2010	79	60
2011	79	
2012	79	
2013	79	

**Additional information:** The Department collects data for this measure through its program monitoring files. The Department reduced the number of days to issue responses in 2009 and further reduced the number of days in 2010, far exceeding its target of 79 days, by revising its reporting format to remove extraneous descriptions and text that is not relevant to the findings. This ensures that the written responses are issued in a reasonable period of time and are meaningful to the public. Actual data for 2011 will be available in October 2012.

#### Other Performance Information

Through the "Early Childhood Longitudinal Study - Birth Cohort" (ECLS-B), the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) collected longitudinal data on a nationally representative sample of 14,000 children from their birth in 2001 through their entry into kindergarten. Approximately 75 percent of the sample entered kindergarten in fall 2006, with the remaining 25 percent entering in the following year. The ECLS-B study provides data on the early development of these children, their preparation for school, and key transitions experienced by these children during the early childhood years. The study includes detailed data on the physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development of these children.

Analyses of the data collected through this study have provided important demographic information on 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 was believed to be associated with developmental issues, including a variety of disabilities. This relationship was confirmed by the study. The Department anticipates that further analyses associated with the study may provide additional information about children's health and development that is relevant to children with disabilities. More information on this study is available on the NCES Web site at: <http://nces.ed.gov/ECLS/birth.asp>.

In July 2011, IES published the final report for the "IDEA National Assessment Implementation Study." The report from the congressionally mandated study provides a national picture of State agency implementation of early intervention programs for infants and toddlers under Part C of IDEA, and both State and school district implementation of special education programs for preschool- and school-age children under Part B of IDEA.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

The study was based on surveys of State agency directors and a nationally representative sample of district special education directors conducted in 2009. The key findings relating to the Part C program include:

- Referral and identification—The most common outreach activity reported by States was the development and/or dissemination of written materials for pediatricians and other health care providers, followed by Web-based dissemination and outreach to child care providers. States reported family members and primary healthcare providers as the most frequent sources of referral to the Part C program.
- Coordination and transition between IDEA programs—At the time the surveys were conducted, States reported supporting the transition of young children with disabilities from the Part C program to preschool services under section 619 of Part B, but no States reported expanding Part C services to serve eligible children with disabilities until they enter kindergarten. 46 States reported having different coordinators for the Part C and Preschool programs, but 67 percent of Part C coordinators reported meeting at least monthly with the coordinator for the Preschool program.
- Financing—For the 37 States that provided this information, the average percentage of early intervention services funding that came from the Part C program in FY 2009 was 21 percent. 23 States indicated that State early intervention services funding represented the largest source of funding for early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities. The largest sources of funding in other States were: Part C (8 States), Medicaid/Title XIX (8 States), local municipality or county funds (4 States), and Part B (1 State).

The final report for the “IDEA National Assessment Implementation Study” is available on the IES Web site at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20114026/index.asp>.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

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

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0 <sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$43,917	\$45,011	+\$1,094

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011; continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2013 through appropriations language.

---

### **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. Each State must spend at least 90 percent of its funds on professional development activities, including the recruitment and retention of highly qualified special education teachers. No more than 10 percent of the State's funds 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 the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (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 of IDEA. 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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

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 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:

	(dollars in thousands)
2008 .....	\$22,598
2009 .....	48,000
2010 .....	48,000
2011 .....	46,846
2012 .....	43,917

### **FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$45.011 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 effective and highly qualified personnel. A \$1.09 million increase is requested to help cover the cost of approximately 42 continuation 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 the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (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 institutions of higher education, 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 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), who are prepared to deliver scientific research-based or evidence-based instruction, and who are effective in improving outcomes for children with disabilities. States must develop SPD activities in a collaborative fashion and seek the input of teachers, principals, parents, administrators, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel.

To improve the outcomes of children with disabilities, the Department plans to focus the program's available resources in FY 2012 to support projects that provide evidence-based professional development activities that increase implementation of effective practices and that provide on-going assistance to personnel who have received SPD-supported professional development, including assisting local educational agencies (LEAs) to build upon systems that support implementation of effective practices. Such activities would ensure that personnel

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

receive the necessary support to use the acquired knowledge and skills to implement practices with fidelity. New projects funded in FY 2012 would also be required to use technology to more efficiently and effectively provide ongoing professional development, including to personnel in rural areas and to other populations that are less likely to receive comprehensive professional development. The SPD program has had a technology initiative that has been helping the projects to learn about technologies that can assist them to become more effective and efficient in their delivery of professional development. With the increased emphasis on ongoing professional development and coaching, increased use of technology is necessary if SPD grantees are to work with more than a few sites and/or work with schools in rural areas.

In addition, the Department is considering awarding competitive preference points to projects that are designed to provide professional development that is targeted to (1) meeting professional development needs that have been identified through teacher evaluation and support systems that take into account student growth, and (2) decreasing disproportionality by race/ethnicity in placement, disciplinary removals, and special education referrals.

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. 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, such as response to intervention (RTI).

The SPD program also supports States in developing and implementing strategies that are effective in promoting the recruitment and retention of effective and 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 a few examples of how States are using SPD funds to improve the knowledge and skills of teachers serving children with disabilities.

- Georgia has used its SPD funds to provide professional development in connection with the implementation of interventions to increase school completion and reduce dropout rates for students with disabilities and the implementation of student-led IEPs. Georgia developed interventions for school completion and dropout intervention and requested districts to choose to participate in SPD professional development for these interventions as part of two cohorts of high schools. For the first cohort, Cohort I, there was an overall gain of 9.8 points in the percentage of students with disabilities who graduated in the 2009-2010 school year as compared to the baseline year. Eleven of the 12 Cohort I high schools reported increases in the percentage of students with disabilities graduating in the

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

2009-2010 school year as compared to the baseline year, with the increase ranging from 2.2 to 23.1 percentage points. Another of Georgia's projects, Project ASPIRE (Active Student Participation Inspires Real Engagement) was initiated in order to implement student-led IEPs as a way of improving the quality of IEPs, including transition plans. Project ASPIRE has been implemented for 72 students in 12 schools. Five ASPIRE introductory trainings and five 4-hour student led IEP trainings were held for the participating schools in September and October 2010. A total of 87 special education administrators, professional learning coaches, collaboration coaches, counselors, transition coordinators, parent mentors, principals/assistants, inclusion teachers, special education teachers, and a Project Search coordinator attended these trainings on student-led IEPs. As of the end of the Georgia SPD's fourth reporting period, all 12 schools were implementing student-led IEPs and utilizing the Project ASPIRE assessment procedures.

- Utah has used SPD funds to provide personnel development for 64 school teams on scientifically-based principles of reading. These school teams included a representative sample of staff including an administrator, grade level general education teachers, special education teachers, Title I staff, and related services staff (e.g., school psychologist). During the 2010-2011 school year, 26 school teams also received training and support in recording and using curriculum-based measurement data, including data collection, analysis, and intervention selection. Of this sample, 92 percent (n=24) showed an increase in the percentage of students reading at or above the benchmark level (e.g., benchmark level = on track to becoming a fluent reader). The percentage increase across schools ranged from 1 percent to 40 percent. Overall, schools participating in this SPD-supported project demonstrated an average increase of 8 percent in the number of students who were on track for reading.

Utah has also used its SPD funds to provide intensive personnel development and coaching (Running Start) each summer since 2008 to improve the retention of new special education teachers so they are better prepared and ready to start the first day of school. Of the 71 teachers who participated in the first cohort of this project, 79 percent (n=56) were still teaching after 3 years. This rate is 9 percent higher than the non-Running Start teachers (70%, n = 175) after 3 years. The Utah SPD has also used its funds to assist LEAs with training 30 induction coaches who are providing ongoing support at the school level.

- Delaware has used its SPD funds to provide professional development in reducing the achievement gaps in reading and in math between students with and without disabilities at the middle and high school levels. To increase the math and literacy/reading achievement of children with disabilities from preschool through grade 12, the Delaware project provided PD in connection with the implementation of scientifically-based teaching/intervention strategies. These interventions/curricular strategies are carried out within a RTI framework led by general and special education leadership at the Delaware Department of Education. From 2007 to 2009, district and charter office teams from all 39 LEAs were trained (46 PD sessions with 4,269 leadership personnel) in five specific RTI modules aligned to State regulation requirements for reading in elementary schools. Seventy schools participated in "Learning Focused Strategies" training to build capacity for higher quality core instruction in Tier 1 for LEA leadership and school-based teams in 2009-2010. In progressing to the requirements for elementary math and secondary RTI, professional development was expanded to school leadership teams for years 2009

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

through 2011 with a total of 1,740 professionals trained. In particular, SPD funds were used to support collaborative measures with the project's IHE for the development of universal screening tools and five LEAs to pilot three different intervention tools/materials.

- Michigan has used its SPD funds to provide professional development in connection with the implementation of its Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi) to increase the quantity and improve the quality of professional personnel providing leadership and instruction for the statewide educational program for students with disabilities. SPD funds have enabled MiBLSi to fund 8 regional coordinators who manage technical assistance and training for over 600 participating Michigan schools. In 2010-2011, MiBLSi conducted 552 days of training across the State on evidence-based practices around behavior and reading supports, which represents an increase since 2009-2010 (393 days of training). In addition, 75 coaching meetings were held during 2010-2011 to support implementation of research-based practices beyond initial training. Outcomes for the four student cohorts (2004 to 2010) in the participating elementary schools include: an average increase of 9 percentage points over 3 years of participation in students scoring at grade level based on Curriculum-Based Measurement reading assessments; an average reduction of 6 percentage points over 3 years in students requiring intensive reading supports; a 16 percent average reduction in the rate of major discipline referrals per year over 3 years of participation. In addition between 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 schools showed a 13 percent reduction in referrals for special education evaluations, and a 9 percent reduction in students determined eligible for special education services.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
Project funding:			
New SPD awards	\$8,195 <sup>1</sup>	\$26,426	0
Continuation SPD awards	38,641 <sup>2</sup>	17,480 <sup>3</sup>	\$45,011
Peer review of new award applications	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>0</u>
Total funding	46,846	43,917	45,011
Average annual project funds	\$1,078	\$1,080	\$1,085
Number of awards:			
New awards	8	24	0
Continuation awards	<u>35</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>42</u> <sup>4</sup>
Total awards	43	43	42

<sup>1</sup> About \$500 thousand of these funds were used to support FY 2012 continuation costs.

<sup>2</sup> About \$2,613 thousand of these funds were used to support FY 2012 continuation costs.

<sup>3</sup> About \$562 thousand of these funds will be used to support FY 2013 continuation costs.

<sup>4</sup> There are only 42 continuations in FY 2013 because one of the FY 2009 grantees requested only 4 years of funding for its project.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

## PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, and measures.

**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.*

**Program Measures:** Previously-developed measures for this objective were aligned with the priority developed for the SPD fiscal year 2006 competition. This priority, which has been used in awarding grants for the past 5 years, focused the program's resources on providing personnel development on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices in areas such as reading, positive behavior supports, and Response to Intervention. Consistent with the priority, the measures were designed to assess the change in:

- the percentage of personnel receiving professional development on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices,
- the percentage of professional development activities on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices that were carried out by the SPD projects, and
- the percentage of professional development activities focused on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices that are sustained through on-going and comprehensive practices.

**Additional Information:** Grantees who were funded under this priority in grant competitions for fiscal years 2006 through 2010 have been required to report information on these measures in their Annual Performance Report (APR), beginning with the report for the second year of the project, and in their final report. The methodology developed for assessing performance on the program measures and the efficiency measure requires the use of expert panels to review information reported in the APR. However, panel reviews have not been conducted because SPD funds cannot be spent for purposes other than grants to States and to pay the cost of peer review of grant applications, and other resources have not been available.

Although panel reviews were not conducted, an objective assessment of the SPD program's performance data collection and reporting was conducted in fiscal year 2009 as a part of the Department's Data Quality Initiative (DQI). In the first phase of the assessment, the contractor reviewed the procedures in place to assess performance on the SPD measures that use grantee APRs as the data source. In the second phase, the contractor assessed whether the data provided in the APRs are appropriate for comparing and aggregating across grantees, and particularly, whether the APRs provide valid information for analysis and represent an acceptable original data source. To answer this question the contractor examined a sample of

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

19 (of a possible 20) 2009 SPD APR reports for grantees who were funded in 2005, 2006, and 2007. The contractor examined the variability and quality of the data reported on three of the program's annual measures.

In its report, the contractor documented the challenges of implementing the procedures in place to assess performance. They found that grantees included activities under the same measures that vary considerably in their nature and that the level of the detail within the reports is not consistent enough to allow coding and comparison of counts across grantees. For example, descriptions were provided of many different types of activities, including coaching, conferences, BA and MA coursework, distance learning programs, invited speakers, meetings, mentoring, module, multi-day trainings, scholarships and tuition reimbursement, webinars, and workshops. In addition, data reported on the number of personnel trained ranged from 8 in one State to 6,605 in another. Both these States reported that 100 percent of the personnel receiving professional development through the SPD program received training based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices, illustrating how the raw numbers underlying the performance measures may reflect very different levels of effort and scope. Finally, some States did not provide the requested performance data.

In fiscal year 2011, the Department replaced these measures with new ones that we believe are better aligned with the current focus of the professional development provided by the program. The measures are based on the belief that no intervention practice, no matter what its evidence base, is likely to be learned and adopted if the methods and strategies used to teach or train personnel are not themselves effective. The revised measures will assess the extent to which:

- Projects use evidence-based professional development practices to support the attainment of identified competencies.
- Participants in SPD professional development demonstrate improvement in implementation of SPD-supported practices over time.
- Projects use SPD professional development funds to provide follow-up activities designed to sustain the use of SPD-supported practices (efficiency measure).

The draft rubric developed for reporting and assessing performance on the first measure is based on the 4 domains of professional development (selection, training, coaching, and performance assessment) and includes 6 components adapted from the work by the National Implementation Research Network, Learning Forward, and Guskey. This rubric will be used by panels of Federal reviewers in evaluating project performance. SPD project directors and evaluators have been involved throughout the process. The new measures are being implemented in the project year that began October 1, 2011. Performance data and other information obtained in the first year will be used to refine the measures, methodology, and scoring, as well as to set performance targets.

**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.*

**Measure:** In States with SPD projects that have special education teacher retention as a goal, the percentage of highly qualified special education teachers who have continued to work in the

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

area(s) for which they were trained for at least 2 years after participating in SPD activities designed to retain highly qualified special education teachers.

**Additional Information:** To assess performance on this measure, SPD projects that have special education teacher retention as a goal were instructed to report retention data in their final performance report. The Department is unable to assess performance on this measure for the first cohort of 8 grants awarded under the SPD authority whose project periods ended in fiscal year 2010. Only three of these eight projects had teacher retention as a goal and only two projects were successful in collecting retention data, one of which is completing its work under a no-cost extension.

The Alaska SPD project that concluded in fiscal year 2010 provided the following information on its teacher retention activities in its final performance report. The SPD-supported Alaska Special Educators Mentoring Project (ASMP) recruited and trained mentor teachers to provide professional development support to early career special education teachers during their first 2 years of teaching. Of the first cohort of highly qualified early career special education teachers that began their participation in the ASMP in the 2005-2006 school year, 69 percent continued teaching special education in the Alaska public school system after 2 years (2007-2008) and 53 percent were still teaching in the Alaska public school system after 4 years (2009-2010). State data indicates that 41 percent of new special education teachers leave the Alaskan school system after 4 years. Alaska plans to continue to follow the later cohorts of teachers who participated in the project.

The Maine SPD project provided the following information on its teacher retention activities in its fiscal year 2011 continuation report. Extended Teacher Education Program (ETEP) Unified is a two-year program leading to dual certification in both regular and special education at the University of Southern Maine. The ETEP program has maintained a list of graduates over the past 5 years who are still working as evidence of retention. Of the thirty-one students who completed the ETEP program in 2007 and 2008, twenty-nine are still employed in educational settings. The Maine SPD project is operating under a no-cost extension until August 31, 2012 and will submit a final report at the end of the project.

The measure for this objective has been slightly revised. The new measure is:

- Highly qualified special education teachers that have participated in SPD supported special education teacher retention activities remain as special education teachers 2 years after their initial participation in these activities.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0 <sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$46,781 <sup>2</sup>	\$46,781	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011; continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2013 through appropriations language.

<sup>2</sup> From the funds provided for this program in FY 2012, the Department is using \$8 million to support the Special Olympics. In 2013, the Administration is requesting funding under a separate line item for Special Olympics. For comparability, the funding for Special Olympics is not shown under the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program for FY 2012.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Technical Assistance and Dissemination program is the Department's primary vehicle under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) for providing educators, policymakers, other service providers, and parents of children with disabilities with information on effective practices for meeting the needs of 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 scientific 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 currently funded under the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program support technical assistance centers that focus on a particular topic, population, or age range, such as early intervening services, dispute resolution, early childhood, college- and career-readiness, and positive behavioral interventions and supports. Most centers use a service model that provides three levels of technical assistance: intensive/sustained, targeted/specific, and general/universal. At the intensive/sustained level, a handful of States receive on-site, ongoing planned assistance designed to reach an outcome desired by the recipient. Through targeted/specific services, centers support activities based on the topical or technical needs common to multiple recipients and can be one-time or short-term events such as consultation services or presentations at conferences. The centers also provide general/universal technical assistance services that permit a broader audience to access information and services through presentations, newsletters, or research syntheses that are made available on center websites. Most activities supported through this program are designed 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.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

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.

The technical assistance and dissemination activities supported through this program 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.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2008 .....	\$48,049
2009 .....	48,549
2010 .....	49,549
2011 .....	48,806
2012 .....	46,781 <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The amount shown for FY 2012 does not include \$8 million to support the Special Olympics, for which funds are requested in FY 2013 under a separate line item.

### **FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2013, the Administration requests \$46.8 million for the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program, the same as the fiscal year 2012 level without the funds provided for Special Olympics. The request includes about \$14.4 million (including peer review costs) for new technical assistance and dissemination projects, and \$32.4 million for continuation projects.

These technical assistance and dissemination activities support the application of knowledge to improve practices among professionals and others involved in providing services that promote academic achievement and improve results for children with disabilities. The requested funds would be used not only to identify and disseminate evidence-based practices, but also to build State and local capacity to implement, sustain, and scale up these practices. As an example, the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program supported model demonstration projects involving positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS) that were used to inform implementation and scale-up activities that have resulted in the adoption and implementation of PBIS in over 16,000 schools nationwide. The funds requested for new awards would support technical assistance to help States and local educational agencies (LEAs) effectively resolve special education disputes and to promote collaboration among stakeholders to share lessons and to engage them in the work of States.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

In 2013, the Administration's request would support its ongoing efforts to ensure that these investments produce the greatest impact by focusing on fewer but larger awards in areas of greatest need. For example, the Administration would consolidate the work of four previous centers (Project Forum, IDEA Partnership, National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities, and the Technical Assistance Coordination Center) into two new centers that would provide a range of services to other technical assistance and dissemination centers and to stakeholders, such as coordination and dissemination of work done by the centers and facilitating collaboration and sharing of knowledge among stakeholders. In making new awards to meet the statutory requirement to address the needs of children with deaf-blindness, the Administration would explore whether a revamping of the current State project structure could lead to a more efficient use of resources and a greater impact on improving outcomes for these students.

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

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

- Early Childhood – In fiscal year 2012, OSEP will award one or more grants for technical assistance centers to support States in providing high-quality, effective special education services to infants, toddlers, and preschool children with disabilities and their families. Since young children with disabilities receive services through multiple early childhood programs administered by different public and private agencies, this technical assistance will focus not only on State lead agencies that administer the Grants for Infants and Families and Preschool Grants programs but also on coordinating with other early childhood programs to support comprehensive early childhood systems that are equipped to implement and sustain evidence-based practices to improve outcomes at the child, family, and program level.
- Transition to College and Careers Center – This center provides technical assistance to assist States and LEAs with developing appropriate, measurable postsecondary goals and implementing transition services that result in improved academic and functional achievement by students with disabilities and their successful transition to college (or other postsecondary education and training) and the workforce.

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

- National Assessment Center – This center supports States in the implementation of appropriate, high-quality assessments for students with disabilities, and works with States to explore emerging issues such as growth models, universal design, and technology-based assessments for students with disabilities.
- Support for the Comprehensive Centers administered by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) – OSEP will provide \$1 million for activities related to the Comprehensive Centers in 2012 and 2013. A portion of the funds will be used to supplement the Comprehensive Center on Effective Teachers and Leaders that will be awarded in fiscal year 2012. The Comprehensive Center on Effective Teachers and Leaders will use the OSEP funds to support the Center's work on developing effective teacher evaluation systems for special education personnel in the overall teacher evaluation effort. The remainder of the funds will be used to supplement the OSEP Technical

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

Assistance Coordinating Center to link both the Comprehensive Centers and the Equity assistance Centers with the OSEP technical assistance and dissemination resources.

*Projects focusing on children with particular needs:*

- National Center for Students with Disabilities Who Require Intensive Interventions – This center provides technical assistance on and dissemination of evidence-based intensive interventions for students with persistent learning or behavioral difficulties. This center also works with LEAs to identify and enhance the system components that promote the implementation and sustainability of such interventions.

### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
<u>Program Funding:</u>			
Specialized technical assistance and dissemination			
New	\$2,500	TBD	TBD
Continuation	<u>10,079</u>	<u>\$5,181</u>	<u>\$8,985</u> <sup>1</sup>
Subtotal	12,579	TBD	TBD
Model demonstration centers			
New	1,200	TBD	TBD
Continuation	<u>1,887</u>	<u>2,500</u>	<u>1,739</u> <sup>1</sup>
Subtotal	3,087	TBD	TBD
Regional/Federal Resource Centers			
New	0	0	0
Continuation	<u>7,710</u>	<u>7,735</u>	<u>7,756</u>
Subtotal	7,710	7,735	7,756
Early childhood technical assistance			
New	0	TBD	TBD
Continuation	<u>4,500</u>	<u>800</u>	<u>TBD</u>
Subtotal	4,500	TBD	TBD
Secondary, transition and postsecondary technical assistance			
New	2,400	0	0
Continuation	<u>1,500</u>	<u>3,900</u>	<u>3,200</u>
Subtotal	3,900	3,900	3,200

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
Technical assistance for children who are both deaf and blind			
New	0	0	\$11,350
Continuation	<u>\$11,350</u>	<u>\$11,350</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	11,350	11,350	11,350
Federal technical assistance, technical assistance on data analysis, State, and Federal information exchange, other			
New	0	TBD	0
Continuation	<u>2,605</u>	<u>976</u>	<u>TBD</u>
Subtotal	2,605	3,576	TBD
Activities related to the Comprehensive Centers	3,000	1,000	1,000
Program totals, New	6,100	14,250	16,207
Program totals, Continuations	42,631	32,442	30,489 <sup>2</sup>
Peer review of new award applications	<u>75</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>85</u>
Total	48,806	46,781	46,781

NOTE: Amounts listed as "TBD" reflect topical areas for which decisions on FY 2012 or 2013 competitions are not yet final.

<sup>1</sup> FY 2013 continuation amounts shown for Specialized technical assistance and dissemination and Model demonstration center projects include only the continuation costs for awards made in FY 2011 and prior years. Actual continuation costs for these topical areas will depend on the level of new awards made in FY 2012.

<sup>2</sup> The total continuation costs shown include the projected 2013 continuation costs for grants and contracts awarded in 2012.

## 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 2013 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.**

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

**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 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 an 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 this program. Targets for 2011 and beyond were revised in 2010 to reflect strong performance that exceeded targets.

The actual data and targets for these measures were adjusted in the FY 2012 Congressional Justification from prior year Congressional Justifications to more accurately reflect the performance in the year that the activity took place, in this case the year the product or service was developed or delivered. In previous years, the Department reported data by the year in which those data were collected.

The measures are:

**Measure:** The percentage of Technical Assistance and Dissemination products and services deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of experts qualified to review the substantive content of the products and services.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	76	94
2009	77	87
2010	78	85
2011	90	
2012	92	
2013	94	

**Additional information:** 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 evidence-based practices in key target areas that have been identified by the Department as critical. The sample of grantees included in this

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

measure for each year consists of approximately 26 technical assistance and dissemination centers and 10 State Deaf-Blind programs. Each technical assistance and dissemination center included in the sample is asked to submit its best product or service, and the Department's Office of Special Education Programs 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.

The expert panels review all products and services and score them based on a rubric that was designed by OSEP to assess the extent to which the content of these materials is: evidence-based, valid, complete, and up-to-date. Specifically, the panels assess the quality of the materials on the following 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. The Department considers any individual product or service that receives a total score of 6 or higher out of 9 possible points to be of high quality.

The Department calculates the data for this indicator by dividing the number of technical assistance and dissemination center products and services that received an average quality rating of 6 or better by the total number of products and services reviewed. The Department performs the same calculation for the State Deaf-Blind grantees, assigns weights to each of these calculations to correspond to the proportion of total program funds expended in each area, and then adds the figures together to produce an overall quality rating for the program.

Although performance has varied over the past 3 years, grantees have made progress overall in ensuring that the products and services supported through this program are of reasonably high quality. In light of this progress, the Department increased performance targets for this program for 2011 and subsequent years.

Prior to 2009, grantees had not been fully compliant in submitting products for review. In 2009, the first year in which all sampled grantees submitted products and services for review, previously non-compliant grantees that may have had, on average, lower quality products and services were included in the sample, which may explain the decrease in 2009 and 2010 from the 2008 performance. The Department monitors individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

**Measure:** The percentage of Technical Assistance and Dissemination products and services deemed by an independent review panel of qualified experts to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	94	94
2009	94	96
2010	94	100
2011	94	
2012	95	
2013	95	

**Additional information:** 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 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 technical assistance and dissemination centers and 10 State Deaf-Blind programs. Each technical assistance and dissemination 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.

The expert panels review the products and services and score them based on a rubric that was designed by OSEP to assess 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.

The Department calculates the data for this indicator by dividing the number of technical assistance center products and services that received an average relevance rating of 6 or better by the total number of products and services reviewed. The Department then performs the same calculation for the State Deaf-Blind grantees, assigns weights to these calculations that correspond with the proportion of total program funds expended in each area, and adds them together to provide a single overall rating for the program.

Overall performance under this measure has been strong in every year for which data have been collected. Since the performance data for 2010 indicate that all products and services are relevant to the needs of practitioners, the Department seeks to maintain current levels of performance for this measure and will monitor any individuals grantees that receive lower

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

scores more aggressively to ensure that these grantees to steps to improve the relevance of their products and services.

**Measure:** The percentage of all Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination products and services deemed by an independent review panel of qualified experts to be useful to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	50	82
2009	52	85
2010	80	88
2011	85	
2012	87	
2013	89	

**Additional information:** 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 technical assistance and dissemination centers and 10 State Deaf-Blind programs. Each technical assistance and dissemination 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.

The expert panels review the products and services and score them based on a rubric that was designed by OSEP to assess the extent to which the content of materials 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.

The Department calculates the data for this indicator by dividing the number of technical assistance center products and services that received an average usefulness rating of 6 or better by the total number of products and services reviewed. The Department then performs the same calculation for the State Deaf-Blind grantees, assigns weights to these calculations

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

that correspond with the proportion of total program funds expended in each area, and adds them together to provide a single overall rating for the program.

Actual performance at the program level far exceeded established targets through 2009 and suggests that grantees have made substantial progress in ensuring that the products and services they provide are useful. Targets for 2011 and subsequent years have been set to take into account this high level of performance. To ensure that grantees continue to improve their performance under this indicator, the Department will monitor more aggressively any individual grantees that receive relatively lower scores to ensure that they take steps to improve over time.

### **Long-term Measures**

The Department has established two long-term measures for this program. Data for the following measures will be collected every 2 years:

- The percentage of school districts and service agencies receiving technical assistance and dissemination services regarding scientifically- or evidence-based practices for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities that implement those practices. In 2009, the first year data were collected for this measure, 79 percent of districts and agencies sampled were implementing evidence-based practices. In 2011, this figure increased to 86 percent of districts and agencies sampled. The Department will use these baseline data to develop targets for future years and report them in the FY 2014 budget.
- Of the technical assistance and dissemination projects responsible for developing models, the percentage of projects that identify, implement, and evaluate effective models. In 2009, the first year data were collected for this measure, 88 percent of projects responsible for developing models were actively engaged in identifying, implementing, and evaluating effective models. When additional data are available in 2012, the Department will use the baseline data for 2009 and 2012 to set targets for future years.

### **Efficiency Measures**

The Department has developed a common efficiency measure for OSEP programs that provide technical assistance. The measure is “the cost per unit of technical assistance.” The technical assistance and dissemination program uses a slightly modified “cost per unit of target audience,” which divides the total cost of a product or service by the number of target audience units that receive the technical assistance. A target audience unit may be an individual, such as a teacher, or an organization, such as a State educational agency. To calculate this measure, the Department uses the cost per unit data of a product and a service developed in the most recent fiscal year from a sample of approximately 26 technical assistance and dissemination centers and 10 State Deaf-Blind programs each year.

For 2008, the first year of data collection, the Department calculated a cost per unit of target audience of \$1,096. Due to concerns about the quality of the data reported in 2008, OSEP provided enhanced guidance on its data collection form for 2009 reporting. In 2009, the cost per unit was \$1,556 and rose to \$5,789 in 2010. Beginning in 2009, the Department realized that aggregate data were not useful because the cost of providing technical assistance varies significantly based on the sample and decided instead to disaggregate the cost per unit based on three levels of intensity of technical assistance (intensive/sustained, targeted/specific, and general/universal). When disaggregated per unit cost data are available for 2010, the

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

Department will use the 2009 and 2010 data to develop ambitious targets for future years and report these targets in the FY 2014 budget.

#### Other Performance Information

In connection with the ongoing National Assessment of IDEA, the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) awarded a 5-year contract for an evaluation of the Technical Assistance and Dissemination 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 study includes descriptive research on the technical assistance needs identified by SEAs and LEAs and the types of technical assistance SEA and LEA officials receive from grantees supported with Technical Assistance and Dissemination funds. The Department expects that the findings from this evaluation will inform policymakers and practitioners about (a) the nature of the technical assistance services provided by Technical Assistance and Dissemination grantees, (b) the experiences of SEAs and LEAs that interact with such grantees, (c) how the implementation of special education and related practices at the local level varies with the receipt of technical assistance, and (d) whether the implementation of practices recommended through this technical assistance 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 Technical Assistance and Dissemination grantees, SEA officials responsible for IDEA implementation, and school district special education directors. The final report is scheduled to be published in 2014.

---

<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 and 662)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$88,299	\$85,799	-\$2,500

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011; continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2013 through appropriations language.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Personnel Preparation program helps meet State-identified needs for 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 and preparing beginning special educators, personnel serving children with low incidence disabilities, and leadership personnel.

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 to 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 clinical learning opportunity, field experience, or supervised practicum (e.g., an additional 5<sup>th</sup> year), 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 intellectual disabilities. In carrying out this authority, the Secretary is required to support activities that benefit children with low incidence disabilities, such as: preparing 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 preparing 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) for student support (e.g. tuition, stipends, and payment of fees). Students who receive financial assistance 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. In recent years, approximately half of the program’s total appropriations have been used to support student scholarships.

A large majority of grants awarded through this program goes to IHEs to provide scholarships to train additional special education personnel. However, the Department also makes awards to

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

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.

Additional support for personnel preparation activities is provided through the State Personnel Development 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 improve the effectiveness of teachers, including special education personnel.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2008 .....	\$88,153
2009 .....	90,653
2010 .....	90,653
2011 .....	88,466
2012 .....	88,299

### **FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2013, the Administration requests \$85.8 million for the Personnel Preparation program, \$2.5 million less than the fiscal year 2012 level. Of this amount, approximately \$15.0 million would be used for new projects (including peer review costs of approximately \$344,000) and \$70.4 million would support the continuation of grants made in prior years.

The Administration is currently exploring how funds available to support new activities under this program can be better targeted to support human capital systems that effectively prepare, recruit, support, evaluate, compensate and retain effective educators, and to address Administration priorities relating to the special education personnel workforce. Administration priorities in this area include: addressing the inequities in the distribution of effective and highly qualified teachers (consistent with Section 14005(d)(2) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act)); implementing high quality teacher evaluation and support systems that take into account student growth and provide useful feedback to inform instruction and professional development; alleviating ongoing 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 improving the quality of teacher pre-service preparation programs through the use of data on the effectiveness of graduates in the classroom.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

To address these priorities, beginning in fiscal year 2010, the Department included provisions in its two largest competitions in this program to encourage grantees to provide scholar practicum experiences in high-poverty schools and track and evaluate program graduates to ensure that they possessed the knowledge and skills to meet the needs of students with disabilities in high-need schools. In the Program Improvement Grants competition, grantees were required to incorporate evidence-based practices into their curricula; provide field-based training in high-need local educational agencies, high-poverty schools, or low-performing schools; track graduates after they leave the program; and collect data on their students' outcomes. Grantees were also encouraged to develop partnerships with other academic departments on campus to promote dual certification of special educators.

The Administration continued these efforts to bolster highly-effective human capital systems in fiscal year 2011 in a number of different grant areas by requiring preparation programs supported under this program to track the impact that program completers had on students after they completed their training and entered the field. Specifically, grantees were required to track impacts on student growth and social, emotional, and academic development, as appropriate.

Additionally, while the funds available through this program are by no means sufficient to resolve ongoing 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, including State-reported data outlining 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 1975. While States and local educational agencies across the country experience personnel shortages, recruiting and retaining special educators is particularly challenging for schools in high-poverty districts. Data from "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 special education teachers in the 2006-2007 school year, while 90 percent of high-poverty districts reported the same difficulty (see <http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/teaching/nclb-final/index.html>). In order to address shortages of highly qualified personnel, States often issue certification waivers to increase the pool of eligible teachers. According to data that States are required to report pursuant to Title II of the Higher Education Act (HEA), through the 2006-2007 academic year, a higher percentage of certification waivers were issued to special education teachers (4 percent of all special education teachers) than teachers in any other subject area, indicating a larger shortage in special education than in other fields. Additionally, nationwide, teachers who receive waivers of certification requirements are more likely to be employed in high-poverty districts (see <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/teachprep/t2r7.pdf>). These data show that there is a particularly significant need for qualified special education teachers in high-poverty districts. The National Assessment of IDEA also found that 51 percent of district Part B special education administrators reported that their districts routinely had difficulty finding

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

qualified special application applicants over the past 3 years, and approximately 5 percent of preschool-age and school-age special education teacher full-time positions were left vacant in the 2008-2009 academic year (see <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20114026/pdf/20114026.pdf>).

Beyond the difficulties noted above associated with hiring special educators, a continuing challenge for States under IDEA has been to ensure that all special educators meet the definition of “highly qualified teacher” outlined in the statute. According to the AIR study cited above, despite large gains in the overall proportion of special educators nationwide who reported being highly qualified, they were still over five times more likely to report that they were not highly qualified when compared to their general education counterparts. Nationally, only 72 percent of special education teachers reported that they were highly qualified in the 2006-2007 academic year. Comparatively, 84 percent of general education teachers reported being highly qualified. These problems are only compounded at the high school level, where only 56 percent of special education teachers reported being highly qualified, compared with 83 percent of those in elementary schools and 71 percent of those in middle schools.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
<u>Program Funding:</u>			
Low incidence disabilities grants:			
New	\$4,363	\$2,966	\$2,873
Continuations	<u>11,725</u>	<u>12,257</u>	<u>11,915</u>
Subtotal	16,088	15,223	14,788
Leadership training grants:			
New	4,399	5,250	4,000
Continuations	<u>15,363</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>11,677</u>	<u>15,864</u>
Subtotal	19,762	16,927	19,864
Minority institution grants: <sup>2</sup>			
New	2,288	2,003	3,645
Continuations	<u>9,139</u>	<u>9,219</u>	<u>7,242</u>
Subtotal	11,427	11,222	10,887
Program improvement grants:			
New	3,870	4,700	0
Continuations	<u>9,271</u>	<u>10,999</u>	<u>13,523</u>
Subtotal	13,141	15,699	13,523
Early childhood grants:			
New	4,306	5,019	4,522
Continuations	<u>15,533</u>	<u>15,098</u>	<u>15,364</u>
Subtotal	19,839	20,117	19,886

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
Other personnel development grants:			
New	\$1,633	\$1,347	0
Continuations	<u>4,807</u>	<u>5,191</u>	<u>\$4,869</u>
Subtotal	6,440	6,538	4,869
National Activities:			
New	0	780	0
Continuations	<u>1,649</u>	<u>1,449</u>	<u>1,638</u>
Subtotal	1,649	2,229	1,638
Peer review of new award applications	120	344	344
<u>Program Totals:</u>			
New	20,859	22,065	15,040
Continuations	67,487	65,890	70,415
Peer review of new award applications	<u>120</u>	<u>344</u>	<u>344</u>
Total	88,466	88,299	85,799

<sup>1</sup> The FY 2011 continuation awards total includes approximately \$4,452 thousand used to cover FY 2012 continuation costs.

<sup>2</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.

## 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 the effectiveness of particular personnel or training programs. 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 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 2013 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

**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.

**Measure:** 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.

Year	Target	Actual
2008		91
2009	91	65
2010	93	
2011	95	
2012	35	
2013	35	

**Additional Information:** Through 2009, the Department collected data for this measure using a temporary collection methodology that involved surveying a small sample of the largest IHEs that receive program funds to support student training. This measure was 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 (n=280), and the denominator is the total number of degree recipients graduating from these 9 institutions in 2004 (n=431). Because these data were collected from only 9 grantees, they are not comparable to the data presented in the other program performance measures.

Beginning in 2010, the Department began obtaining data from all currently funded program grantees through the National Center for Service Obligation (NCSO). NCSO is the Office of Special Education Programs(OSEP)-supported contractor that tracks scholars post-graduation to determine whether they comply with the program's service obligation requirement. NCSO began tracking graduates from institutions receiving grants in FY 2005, shortly after the Department assumed responsibility for this task under the Individuals with Disabilities Education

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

Improvement Act (P.L. 108-446). However, because the NCSO did not have data on 2005 graduates eligible for inclusion in this measure, data available for 2010 may not have been an accurate representation of the actual proportion of scholars who maintain employment for 3 or more years in the area for which they were trained.

Ideally, the Department would calculate this measure by determining the total number of scholars who had completed 3 or more years of acceptable service within 5 years of their graduation. However, because NCSO does not have data on 2005 graduates eligible for inclusion in this measure, the Department calculated the 2010 measure using the percentage of 2006 graduates completing 3 or more years of service by the time of collection. As such, graduates had only 4 years to complete the 3 years of service as opposed to the 5-year window used in prior data collection cycles and in 2011. For 2010, no graduates reported having maintained employment for 3 or more years within the 4-year period and only one graduate reported having at least a 3-year service obligation, but data were not available for 154 graduates.

For 2011, data reported to NCSO indicated that 2 percent of the program graduates maintained acceptable employment for 3 or more years in the area for which they were trained and were fully qualified under IDEA. This measure was calculated by dividing the number of degree recipients who have reported to NCSO that they have maintained 3 or more years of acceptable employment in the areas for which they were trained and are fully qualified under IDEA (n=1) by the total number of degree recipients in 2006 who had service obligations of at least 3 years in length – including those who reported 3 or more years of acceptable service (n=1), those who reported less than 3 years of acceptable service (n=1), those who reported no acceptable service (n=0), and those for whom no data are available (n=42).

The Department believes that the data for 2011 underestimate actual performance on this measure given performance on other measures for this program (e.g. percent of graduates working in the field for which they were trained and are highly qualified under the IDEA), the small number of graduates eligible to be included in this measure, and the fact that project directors did not report any data for 19 percent of 2006 completers. From Annual Performance Report data, the Department has determined that 73 percent of the 2,232 program completers from 2006 were working in the area for which they were trained upon program completion, and the Department believes it is highly unlikely that such a large percentage of graduates would fail to maintain employment for 3 or more years. Additionally, given that 2011 estimates are based on 2006 program completers and fiscal year 2005 grantees were the first whose program completers were tracked by the Department, there are only a small number who actually have service obligations of at least 3 years (approximately 1 percent of the 181 completers who had data reported to NCSO). Additionally, given that the NCSO system was not able to collect data on program graduates until fiscal year 2008, there were a number of program completers in fiscal year 2006 who did not have any data in the Service Obligation Tracking System (approximately 19 percent of the 223 completers).

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

**Measure:** Percentage of scholars completing Special Education Personnel Preparation funded training programs who are knowledgeable and skilled in evidence-based practices for children with disabilities.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	49	40
2009	45	85
2010	48	
2011	51	
2012	85	
2013	85	

**Additional Information:** Grantees submit data annually through the Department Personnel Preparation Data Report (PPD) Web-based data collection (see: <http://www.oseppdp.ed.gov>). 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 graduated in a given year and pass an exam demonstrating knowledge and skills in evidence-based practices for children with disabilities (2,255 students in fiscal year 2009) by the total number of students who completed training programs – including students who passed a test (2,255 students), students who did not pass a test (30 students), students who did not take a test (171 students), students for whom grantees did not know if they took a test (34 students), and students for whom test data was missing (165 students).

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. Historically, actual data and targets for this measure have been unusually low because, while all scholars receiving program funds are included in the denominator, a substantial number of those scholars (approximately 908 out of 2,712, or 33 percent, in fiscal year 2008) did not participate in independent assessments according to grantees. While these scholars attend programs at IHEs located in States that did not require graduates to pass an independent assessment to measure the knowledge and skills of graduates, the Department has worked closely with grantees to improve data collection on graduates who take other, non-required assessments and to ensure that data on non-standardized measures of knowledge and skills are reported by grantees (such as an oral examination administered by faculty at the IHE).

### Annual Performance Measures

The program 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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

actual data changed substantially, new targets also had to be established. These measures are:

**Measure:** Percentage of projects that incorporate scientifically- or evidence-based practices in their curricula.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	60	49
2009	65	91
2010	80	100
2011	90	
2012	95	
2013	95	

**Additional Information:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor using a panel of 7 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 for the inclusion 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 the fiscal year 2011 review, 36 syllabi from fiscal year 2010 grantees were included from the following types of projects: early childhood (6 syllabi scored), leadership (11 syllabi scored), low incidence (5 syllabi scored), minority institutions (5 syllabi scored), secondary transition (3 syllabi scored) and program improvement (6 syllabi scored).

The dramatic increase in performance under this measure is due, in part, to a concerted effort by the Department both to ensure adequate technical assistance to grantees and sufficient instructions to reviewers. In 2010 and 2011, the Department provided substantial guidance to reviewers to assist them in systematic evaluation of the curricula to ensure that all evidence-based practices were recognized and properly credited. Additionally, the Department worked closely with grantees to ensure that syllabi were properly updated and reflected the most current practice and evidence base used in their courses.

The Department will continue to provide technical assistance to grantees regarding the incorporation of evidence-based practices into their syllabi and to reviewers regarding the evaluation process. Should this marked increase in performance continue, the Department will revisit targets for this measure to more accurately reflect the new baseline that has been established.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

**Measure:** Percentage of scholars who exit training programs prior to completion due to poor academic performance.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	0.99	1.6
2009	1.9	2.0
2010	1.9	
2011	1.9	
2012	1.9	
2013	1.9	

**Additional Information:** Grantees submit data annually through the Department Personnel Preparation Data Report (PPD) Web-based data collection (see: <http://www.oseppdp.ed.gov>). No calculation is necessary. The data are taken directly from the PPD data collection. Approximately 2.0 percent of all scholars receiving program funds exited their training programs early due to poor academic performance in 2009, up from 1.4 percent in 2007 and 1.6 percent in 2008. This measure is calculated by dividing the total number of scholars exiting their training program in fiscal year 2009 due to poor academic performance (n=66) and dividing it by the total number of scholars completing a training program in fiscal year 2009 (n=2,678) and the number of scholars exiting their training program prior to completion for any reason (n=701).

A low number of scholars exiting their training programs early could reflect either a strong recruitment effort by IHEs to ensure high quality students receive Federal scholarship funds or a strong student support network in programs receiving Federal funds. While there is still room for improvement, IHEs on average seem to be adequately ensuring that scholars do not exit training programs prior to completion due to poor academic performance. However, despite the reasonably strong performance of grantees on this measure, the Department believes that this measure is essential to maintain to ensure that grantees continue to maintain high standards when recruiting scholars.

**Measure:** Percentage of degree/certification recipients who are working in the area(s) for which they are trained upon program completion.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	78	69
2009	78	77
2010	81	
2011	84	
2012	84	
2013	85	

**Additional Information:** 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 who were working in the area(s) for which they received training at the completion of the program (1,875 in fiscal year 2009) by all degree and certification recipients who were employed in their area of training (1,875 in 2009), recipients who were not employed in their

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

area of training (230 in 2009), recipients for whom grantees did not know if they were employed upon program completion (185 in 2009), recipients who were not employed (142 in 2009), and recipients for whom employment data were missing (15 in 2009). Individuals who received only an endorsement are excluded from all calculations.

Approximately three-fourths of degree/certification recipients funded through this program work in the area for which they were trained upon graduation. However, it is difficult to determine the ultimate driver of this trend. The program has in place a service obligation requirement that mandates that degree recipients work in the field in which they were trained upon graduation or pay back the full amount of support received. Additionally, teaching assignments are not wholly at the discretion of the program's graduates, but are instead largely at the discretion of LEAs and schools that may opt to place a teacher in an assignment that is out of area. Given the continuing impacts of the recession, shrinking local and State government tax bases, and the increased number of teacher layoffs, we are likely to see a number of teachers placed "out-of-field" as LEAs attempt to cope with smaller numbers of personnel. With smaller local budgets and fewer LEAs hiring, program graduates may accept teaching positions outside of their field of training in order to secure employment with a view to transition to their area of expertise in a number of years. The Department is currently conducting a review to determine if those graduates who are not working in the area for which they were trained are employed in special education or if they are working in non-special education placements. The Department is also considering additional steps to ensure that grantees more effectively recruit and train students who will work in the area for which they received training; to improve training courses and curricula to ensure that graduates are competitive in the market; and to promote high quality residency programs that help graduates build relationships with LEAs and increase their competitiveness.

**Measure:** 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.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	72	65
2009	74	73
2010	77	
2011	80	
2012	83	
2013	83	

**Additional Information:** 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 (1,632 for fiscal year 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 (2,232 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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

students working in positions for which the State has no licensure or certification requirements. Additionally, 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.

As noted in the discussion of the previous measure, there are a number of reasons why degree/certification recipients funded through this program may not work in the area for which they were trained upon program completion. More importantly, the comparison of this measure to the previous one provides an important insight into the alignment of training programs supported under this program and the certification standards outlined in IDEA. Consistently, this measure has lagged behind the previous one by 4 to 5 percentage points, indicating that, even of those individuals who obtain employment in the area for which they were trained, a consistent subset do not meet the certification standards of the field despite program regulations that require program graduates to meet State certification and licensure standards. The Department is currently taking several steps to determine the full extent and cause of this shortfall and address it. Through updated data collection instruments employed in fiscal year 2011, the Department seeks to gather more information about the subset of scholars who do not meet State certification and licensure standards and the specific causes (e.g., not taking or failing State licensure exams, or a lack of appropriate coursework). In its grant application review process, the Department has provided greater direction to reviewers and applicants to ensure a more thorough review of course syllabi submitted by applicants to ensure that program funds are used to support high quality programs. Additionally, through the program's Preservice Training Improvement grants, the Department is providing support to a number of teacher and paraprofessional training programs to restructure their curricula to align with State standards for certification and accreditation.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department established one efficiency measure for the Personnel Preparation program. This measure is:

**Measure:** The Federal cost per degree or certification program recipient working in the area(s) in which they were trained upon program completion.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	\$25,000	\$24,418
2009	25,000	27,398
2010	25,000	
2011	25,000	
2012	25,000	
2013	25,000	

**Additional Information:** 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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

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 grantees by dividing the sum of all project costs supported with Federal funds (across all years of each individual scholar's training) (\$72,961,033 in fiscal year 2009) by the number of degree recipients who successfully completed funded training programs closing in that year and who are fully qualified (2,663 in 2009). Given the historical trends in this measure, the Department believes that 2009 represents an outlier, but will be unable to confirm this belief until data from subsequent years are available.

### Other Performance Information

At the end of fiscal year 2007, the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) awarded a \$2.8 million, 4-year contract for the evaluation of the Personnel Development Program. The evaluation includes two separate components. The first is a study of IHEs that have applied for funds to train personnel 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 (approximately 185 funded and 265 non-funded), and (2) document changes to the funded applicants' courses of study.

A Web survey of Project Directors was conducted in 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) enrollment and completion information; (6) standardized exit exam scores; (7) allocation of Personnel Preparation program grant funds; (8) information about program completers, and (9) changes to the funded course of study since the time of the application. A sample of changes made to funded courses of study is currently being rated by an expert panel. These changes include: (1) syllabi and assessments from newly created or substantially modified courses; (2) materials documenting new training units, modules, or fieldwork; (3) new mentoring programs; and (4) curriculum vitae of new faculty members. Members of the expert panel will review the documents representing each change and rate the quality of those changes.

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.

Following initial telephone interviews with center staff, an inventory was completed by center staff that cataloged the cumulative accomplishments of each center. Data from the inventory of products and services served as the basis for selecting a sample of each center's products for review by an expert review panel, comprised of individuals with expertise relevant to the work of each center. Centers designated up to 10 percent of their products as *signature works*, which were sampled in a separate stratum. Once the products were sampled, center staff were asked to provide descriptive information about each and to submit all available materials relevant to

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

the sampled products or services. Three experts are currently reviewing each product or service for quality, relevance, and usefulness. The expected release date of the report is spring 2012.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

**National activities: Parent information centers**

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$28,917	\$28,917	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011; continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2013 through appropriations language.

---

### **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. 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 that serve designated counties. One center specifically serves the unique

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **National activities: Parent information centers**

---

needs of military families and another center serves Native American families across the country.

The Department allocates funds to parent centers through a formula based on three weighted indicators of need: State population of ages 0 to 26 (85 percent), child poverty (10 percent), and rural school enrollment (5 percent), with all centers receiving at least the amount of their fiscal year 2007 grant. When the appropriation for the program increases, this formula ensures that centers in States with the greatest need and the lowest per capita funding receive more funds.

Community parent resource centers are parent training and information centers, operated by local parent organizations, that help ensure that underserved parents of children with disabilities, including low-income parents, parents of children who are English Learners, 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 the effective use of technology. These technical assistance services enhance the capacity of parent centers to serve parents effectively. The parent technical assistance center network maintains a Web site with a wide variety of information and materials for parents and professionals, as well directory of the parent centers (<http://www.parentcenternetwork.org/>).

In order to receive an award for a parent center, the IDEA requires that applicant must be a parent organization that has a board of directors, the majority of which must consist 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, or 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 English Learners.

While parent centers serve as direct resources for parents and families, they also act 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 program 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 periods for all three project types start on October 1 of the fiscal year following the award. Awards for community parent resource centers and parent training and information centers are made typically for a period of 3 to 5 years.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2008 .....	\$26,528
2009 .....	27,028
2010 .....	28,028
2011 .....	27,972
2012 .....	28,917

### **FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration's request for the Parent Information Centers program is \$28.917 million, the same as the fiscal year 2012 level. 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 families about and involve families in their children's learning. Studies show that all families can take concrete steps that significantly help their children succeed in school, regardless of their income, education, disability status, 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 assisting parents to 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). Parent centers also serve as sources of information and training for hundreds of thousands of teachers and other professionals each year.

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, educational options, 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/parentinguid.doc>. The Administration's proposal for the reauthorization of ESEA would further strengthen family engagement by requiring districts to develop and implement comprehensive family engagement plans, and allowing States to fund programs that support family engagement and identify and disseminate best practices.

Parent centers use a variety of mechanisms for providing information to parents and professionals. These include websites, one-on-one support, telephone call-in numbers, training workshops, and dissemination of written materials. In recent years, the Office of Special Education Programs has worked with parent centers to make their resources available in

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

languages other than English, particularly Spanish (<http://www.neparentcenters.org/glossary/index.html>).

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. Parent center staff attended or facilitated over 1,000 alternative dispute resolution sessions last year. These alternative methods of dispute resolution can help avoid costly litigation. As part of that role, parent centers are required, if State educational agencies choose, to contract with those State educational agencies to provide individuals who will meet with parents to explain the IDEA-mandated mediation process.

The 2013 request includes \$23.3 million for awards to parent training and information centers, \$3.0 million for new and continuing community parent resource centers, and \$2.4 million to fund new awards to provide technical assistance to centers. Together, these 109 centers provide training and information to over a million parents and professionals each year.

### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
<u>Program Funding:</u>			
Parent Training & Information Centers:			
New	\$6,465	\$10,470	0
Continuations	<u>15,860</u>	<u>12,901</u>	<u>\$23,274</u>
Subtotal	22,325	23,371	23,274
Community Parent Resource Centers:			
New	900	1,100	1,000
Continuations	<u>1,998</u>	<u>1,900</u>	<u>2,000</u>
Subtotal	2,898	3,000	3,000
Technical Assistance Centers:			
New	0	0	2,400
Continuations	<u>2,557</u>	<u>2,302</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	2,557	2,302	2,400
Other (contracts):			
Continuations	<u>177</u>	<u>178</u>	<u>178</u>
Subtotal	177	178	178
Peer Review for new award applications:	15	65	65
Total:			
New	7,365	11,570	3,400
Continuations	20,592	17,282	25,452
Peer Review	<u>15</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>
Total	<u>27,972</u>	<u>28,917</u>	<u>28,917</u>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (continued)**

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
<u>Number of Projects</u>			
Parent Training & Information Centers:			
New	20	25	0
Continuations	51	47	72
Community Parent Resource Centers:			
New	9	11	10
Continuations	20	19	20
Technical Assistance Centers:			
New	0	0	7
Continuations	7	7	0
Other (contracts):			
Continuations	4	4	4
Total number of Projects:			
New	29	36	17
Continuations	<u>82</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>96</u>
Total	111	113	113

#### **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 2013 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.*

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

Six performance measures have been developed for the Parent Information Centers 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 Departmentwide. However, the measures have been adapted to reflect the unique purposes of the Parent Information Centers program. Targets for 2011 through 2013 have been established based on performance data from 2007 to 2010. The measures are:

**Measure:** 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	Target	Actual
2008	72	58
2009	60	84
2010	63	76
2011	76	89
2012	78	
2013	80	

**Additional Information:** 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 2011 were representative of all grantees, 1 product and 1 service were drawn from a stratified random sample of community parent resource centers (CPRCs) and parent training and information centers (PTIs), for a total of 33 products and 33 services reviewed.

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.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of individual products and services that received an average quality rating of 6 or better (59) by the total number of products and services reviewed (66), multiplied by 100 percent. For 2011, this score was 89.4 percent ( $59/66 = .894 \times 100\% = 89.4\%$ ), which is an increase compared to 2010 and exceeds the target level. The Department is using the feedback from the expert panel to work with grantees to improve their products and services. Data for fiscal year 2012 will be available in October 2012.

**Measure:** 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	Target	Actual
2008	96	95
2009	96	89
2010	96	98
2011	96	99
2012	96	
2013	96	

**Additional Information:** 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 reviewed in 2011 were representative, 1 product and 1 service were drawn from a stratified random sample of CPRCs and PTIs, for a total of 33 products and 33 services reviewed.

All materials are reviewed and scored on the basis of a rubric, developed by OSEP, that is designed to yield ratings on the materials' responsiveness 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) by the total number of products and services reviewed (66), multiplied by 100 percent. For FY 2011, this score was 98.5 percent. ( $65/66 = .985 \times 100\% = 98.5\%$ ).

Based on the most recent years of data it appears that program grantees do a good job of ensuring that products and services are of high relevance to education and early intervention policy or practice. The actual percentage of materials judged to be of high relevance exceeded

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

the target. The Department is using the feedback from the expert panel to work with grantees to improve their products and services. Data for fiscal year 2012 will be available in October 2012.

**Measure:** 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	Target	Actual
2008	95	95
2009	95	86
2010	95	95
2011	95	92
2012	95	
2013	96	

**Additional Information:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using a panel of six to eight parent stakeholders who assess grant implementation by reviewing a randomly selected sample of materials (n = 66) disseminated by the centers. In an effort to ensure that the sample materials reviewed in 2011 were representative, 1 product and 1 service were drawn from a stratified random sample of 33 CPRCs and PTIs, for a total of 33 products and 33 services reviewed.

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 in multiple settings to achieve the intended benefit?); and (3) Pertinence (Does the content of the material match the problem or issue facing the target group or groups?). 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 (61) by the total number of products and services reviewed (66), multiplied by 100 percent. For FY 2011, this score was 92 percent. ( $61/66 = .924 \times 100\% = 92\%$ ).

Based on the most recent years of data it appears that most of the program grantees produce products and services that are useful to target audiences. However, the actual percentage of materials judged to be of high relevance decreased from the prior year and did not meet the target. The Department is using the feedback from the expert panel to work with grantees to improve their products and services. Data for fiscal year 2012 will be available in October 2012.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

#### Long-Term Measures

Two long-term measures have been developed for the program. Data are collected every 2 years through an OSEP-supported survey of parents who had received services from the parent centers. In 2009, OSEP conducted an independent survey of the same population to test the validity of these measures. The survey found parents' answers to questions were not significantly different from the original data and confirmed the accuracy of the data collection methods used for the following long term measures:

**Measure:** 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
2009	74	79
2011	75	77
2013	76	

**Additional Information:** Data are collected by the parent centers every 2 years using telephone interviews with 25 randomly selected parent stakeholders per center (n = 3,394). 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. Baseline data for this relatively new measure were first collected in 2007 and used to establish targets for later years.

Based on the most recent 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 uses the results of this measure and the annual quality measure to provide the centers with feedback on how they can better align their products and services with evidence-based practices. Data for fiscal year 2013 will be available in October 2013.

**Measure:** The percentage of parents receiving Special Education Parent Information Centers services who report enhanced knowledge of IDEA rights and responsibilities.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	85	91
2011	87	85
2013	89	

**Additional Information:** Data are collected for this measure by the parent centers every 2 years using telephone interviews with 25 randomly selected parent stakeholders per center (n = 3,294). The National PTI Technical Assistance Center developed the survey. To calculate

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

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. The targets were established based on results from the survey in prior years.

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, the actual percentage of parents who reported enhanced knowledge declined from last year and fell below the target level. Data for fiscal year 2013 will be available in October 2013.

### Efficiency Measure

**Measure:** The Federal cost per unit of output provided by the Special Education Parent Training and Information Centers, by category.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	\$2.24	\$1.10
2009	2.24	1.06
2010	2.24	1.13
2011	1.14	1.13
2012	1.12	
2013	1.10	

**Additional Information:** The efficiency measure for the Parent Information Centers program is “the cost per output, by category, weighted by an intensity rating.” The data for this measure are collected by a survey developed by the 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 ( $\$28,028,000/24,869,724 = \$1.13$ ). The intensity weights represent the amount of interaction and support required to render each type of service. For example, IEP facilitation meetings received heavier weights than parent visits to websites. In 2011, the cost per unit of services for the program was \$1.13, which was below the target level. Targets for 2011 and future years were adjusted downward based on the consistent low level of the cost per unit from 2008 to 2010. Data for fiscal year 2012 will be available in October 2012.

However, a comparison between the 2011 data and similar data from previous years suggests that there are still methodological issues that need to be addressed in this measure before valid and consistent results are obtained. For example, the intensity ratings (used in the denominator) do not reflect a precise estimate of the relative time and resources associated with different levels of service. The Department has sought to incorporate feedback from performance measures specialists and parent center directors as we revise the intensity weights to more accurately reflect the actual effort and costs of each type of service provided by the

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **National activities: Parent information centers**

---

centers. We plan to pilot the revised weights during the upcoming 2012 data collection cycle. This ongoing review will help ensure that the results of the efficiency measure are more indicative of the actual unit costs of providing services and more useful for program management purposes.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### National activities: Technology and media services

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0 <sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$29,588	\$29,588	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011; continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2013 through appropriations language.

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Technology and Media Services program is the primary source of support for accessible 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 books and other written materials in accessible formats, and other activities that either improve education through the use of media or improve access to education for students with disabilities.

The Technology and Media Services program ensures that educational media that are not otherwise required to be made accessible are available to students with disabilities. The Congress recently passed the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010, which expanded the range of media that must be closed captioned, and updated accessibility standards to include emerging Internet technologies. The Act directs the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to promulgate rules that will require nearly all new televisions and mobile devices to be capable of decoding and displaying captions so that they will be accessible to individuals who are deaf or hearing impaired. Television broadcasters must provide closed captioning for all programming, with limited exceptions. However, mandatory captioning does not apply to video produced for classroom viewing rather than broadcast television or to video broadcast exclusively over the Internet.

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. Federal law only requires video description of 4 hours of television programming a week on each broadcast television network and the five most watched cable networks. All other video programming, including increasingly popular Internet media, are not subject to description requirements. The

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

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.

The Department makes awards 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:

	(dollars in thousands)
2008 .....	\$39,301
2009 .....	38,615
2010 .....	43,973
2011 .....	28,644
2012 .....	29,588

### FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's request for the Technology and Media Services program is \$29.6 million, the same as the 2012 level. The fiscal year 2013 request would provide approximately \$3.7 million for about 6 new awards and approximately \$25.9 million for 34 continuation projects. Projects funded under the Technology and Media Services program improve access to, and participation in, the general education curriculum, developmentally appropriate activities for preschool children, and statewide assessments. By supporting research on, and dissemination of, accessible instructional materials and technology, this program helps ensure that students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education guaranteed for them under the IDEA. This program funds innovations in accessible technologies and new understandings of how these technologies can be effectively applied to increase academic achievement. The Administration believes that improved access and participation result in higher expectations and improved outcomes for children with disabilities.

#### Technology

The request includes \$17.2 million for Technology activities, which promote the development, demonstration, and use of technology. This is accomplished primarily through research, for which \$15.2 million is proposed. This includes \$2.5 million that would be available to support a priority for several new model demonstration projects. This competition, first launched in 2012, is a successor to the Steppingstones of Technology Innovation grants. The model demonstration projects build on the development work of the Steppingstones grants by focusing on validating and scaling up technology-based products or interventions such as curriculum materials, accessible products, or instructional methodologies. Projects will receive assistance with technology dissemination and implementation from the Model Demonstration Coordinating Center, which is funded by the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program. The assistance provided to Steppingstones projects by this Center will help ensure that promising technologies can overcome barriers to implementation and mature into widely available

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

interventions and products for special education teachers, families, and students. Funding for new Technology activities also includes \$1.2 million for a new research project. A possible focus area of this activity is developing solutions for areas of unmet need in assistive technology for students with disabilities.

The request would also support continuation funding in fiscal year 2013 for research grants awarded in prior years. Of the \$11.6 million for continuation funding, \$1.5 million will support the Center on Online Learning for Students with Disabilities. This project investigates how the rapid growth of instruction delivered through the Internet affects students with disabilities, both positively and negatively, and develops promising practices for delivering online instruction to these students. The Technology Research and Development Center on Literacy Achievement for Middle School Students with Disabilities would also receive about \$2 million of continuation funding to support its work to expand the research base about technology-based instructional methods that can improve literacy outcomes. Approximately \$1.2 million of the continuation funding would support 4 Steppingstones of Technology Innovation projects and \$5 million would provide continuing funding for technology model demonstration grants first awarded in fiscal year 2012.

In addition to research projects, the request for Technology activities includes \$1 million for a continuation award to support technical assistance and dissemination activities carried out by the Research Center on Accessible and Supported Electronic Text to Improve Mathematics Achievement for Students with Disabilities.

The request would also provide \$1 million for the third year of an award to address the needs of postsecondary institutions related to recruiting, enrolling, retaining, and instructing students who are deaf, and addressing the varying communication and technology needs of and methods used by individuals who are deaf. This project is jointly funded with the Personnel Preparation and Technical Assistance and Dissemination programs. Under IDEA section 682(d)(1)(B), the Department is required to provide at least \$4 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.”

### **Media Services**

Media Services includes a variety of activities targeted toward providing educational materials, such as textbooks, in accessible formats for individuals with disabilities, particularly deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals and blind and other visually impaired individuals. In fiscal year 2013, \$12.1 million would be allocated to these activities, all of which will support continuation funding.

The 2013 request of \$12.1 million for continuation activities in Media Services includes \$5.1 million for an award to support the development, production, and distribution of educational materials in accessible formats to students with visual impairments and other print disabilities (an additional \$1.4 million of funding front-loaded from 2012 will bring this award to a total of \$6.5 million in 2013). Previous grantees under this priority have transformed the provision of educational materials in accessible formats by nationally providing free educational media, including textbooks, much less expensively and more quickly than was previously possible.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

Continuation funds in this area would also support a project that develops and updates the National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard (NIMAS). This standard ensures that publishers, educational agencies, and students with disabilities have clear guidelines for converting educational media into accessible formats. The project would receive approximately \$400,000 to establish, disseminate, and periodically update technical specifications for the NIMAS as technology evolves. The request would also support a \$1 million continuation award to support the Images and Graphic Resources for Accessible Materials (DIAGRAM) Center. The goal of this research and development project is to enhance access for students who are blind or have print disabilities to images and graphics in educational materials. This content is considerably more difficult to make accessible than basic text. The DIAGRAM Center develops innovative accessibility solutions appropriate for a variety of media formats (<http://www.diagramcenter.org/>).

Continuation projects also include \$4 million to support six awards that provide video description and closed captioning of educational television programming. These projects not only close caption and describe educational media, but also efficiently distribute the media to schools via the Internet and other resources. The support for video description of educational programming is particularly important for individuals with visual impairments because, unlike closed captioning, there are very few Federal requirements for providing video descriptions. Information on one of the current captioning and description projects is available at <http://www.dcmp.org>. To help ensure that Department-funded video description is efficient and high quality, the request also supports \$1 million of continuation funding for a center that develops new description technologies, the Video Description Research and Development Center. The request also will provide continuation funding for the National Technical Assistance Center on Accessible Instructional Materials.

The IDEA requires the Department to support the National Instructional Materials Access Center (NIMAC), which is awarded noncompetitively to the American Printing House for the Blind. The NIMAC is a national electronic file repository that makes electronic files that comply with the NIMAS available for the production of print instructional materials in specialized formats (<http://www.nimac.us/>). 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 \$566,945 for a continuation award for this project in fiscal year 2013.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES** (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
<u>Program funding:</u>			
<b>Technology:</b>			
Research:			
New	\$9,047 <sup>1</sup>	\$5,500	\$3,684
Continuations	<u>3,054</u>	<u>5,247<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>11,563</u>
Subtotal	12,101	10,747	15,247
Technical assistance and dissemination:			
New	0	0	0
Continuations	<u>1,035</u>	<u>1,600</u>	<u>1,000</u>
Subtotal	1,035	1,600	1,000
Projects to address the postsecondary, vocational, technical, and adult education needs of individuals with deafness:			
New	1,000	0	0
Continuations	<u>0</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>1,000</u>
Subtotal	1,000	1,000	1,000
<b>Subtotal, Technology:</b>			
New	10,047 <sup>1</sup>	5,500	3,684
Continuations	<u>4,089</u>	<u>7,847<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>13,563</u>
Subtotal	14,136	13,347	17,247
<b>Media services:</b>			
Captioned & described accessible media:			
New	2,499	0	0
Continuations	<u>2,499</u>	<u>4,997</u>	<u>4,000</u>
Subtotal	4,998	4,997	4,000
Books and other instructional materials in accessible formats:			
New	3,000	7,890 <sup>2</sup>	0
Continuations	<u>5,537</u>	<u>2,400</u>	<u>7,509<sup>2</sup></u>
Subtotal	8,537	10,290	7,509

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
National Instructional Materials Access Center (NIMAC) – Statutory earmark			
New	\$541	0	0
Continuations	<u>0</u>	<u>\$533</u>	<u>\$567</u>
Subtotal	541	533	567
<b>Subtotal, Media services:</b>			
New	6,040	7,890 <sup>2</sup>	0
Continuations	<u>8,036</u>	<u>7,930</u>	<u>12,076</u> <sup>2</sup>
Subtotal	14,076	15,820	12,076
<b>Other (e.g. program evaluation contracts):</b>			
Continuations	<u>359</u>	<u>361</u>	<u>246</u>
Subtotal	359	361	246
<b>Peer review of new award applications:</b>			
	73	60	20
<b>Total:</b>			
New	16,160	13,450	3,704
Continuations	<u>12,484</u>	<u>16,138</u>	<u>25,884</u>
Total	28,644	29,588	29,588

<sup>1</sup> Approximately \$2.9 million of the fiscal year 2011 funds for technology research cover a portion of the continuation costs for this activity in fiscal year 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Approximately \$1.4 million of the 2012 funds for books and other instructional materials in accessible formats cover a portion of the continuation costs for this activity in fiscal year 2013.

## 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 2013 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Seven 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 two are measures of efficiency.

## 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 accessible technology and media services to improve results for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities.**

**Objective:** Improve the quality of products produced by projects in the Special Education Technology and Media Services program.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2008		83
2009	82	100
2010	83	97
2011	97	97
2012	97	
2013	98	

**Additional Information:** The percentage of products judged to be of high quality in fiscal year 2011 met the target and remained unchanged from fiscal year 2010. The Department set the targets for fiscal years 2011 through 2013 based on the high percentages achieved in recent years. Fiscal year 2012 data are expected for this program in October 2012.

The scores appearing in the actual data column were produced by a panel of six to eight special education scientists, who reviewed a sample of products from 32 Technology and Media projects. Each project submitted a product or multiple products that represents the primary or typical products/services released by that grantee during the prior fiscal year. All of the selected 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? OSEP reports that the measured inter-rater reliability of the panel members has been excellent during the last few years, indicating substantial agreement among the experts about the quality of the sampled products.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

**Measure:** 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	Target	Actual
2008	91	100
2009	93	100
2010	95	97
2011	97	91
2012	97	
2013	98	

**Additional information:** In fiscal year 2011, the percentage of products judged to be of high relevance for this measure decreased and fell below the target level. However, a high percentage of products were still reported to be of high relevance. The reviewers judged 29 of the 32 products in the sample to be highly relevant for the intended users. The Department set higher targets for this measure starting in fiscal year 2011 based on the consistent results obtained during the 3 prior years of data. In recent years, a large majority of the projects funded under this authority had high scores on this measure.

The scores appearing in the actual data column were produced by a panel of six to eight special education external experts who reviewed a sample of products from 32 Technology and Media Services projects, selected so to be representative of the program's topical portfolio of grants. Each project submitted a product or multiple products that represents the primary or typical products/services released by that grantee during the prior fiscal year. All of the selected 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 – Is the content of the material applicable to diverse populations within the target group?

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

**Measure:** 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	Target	Actual
2008		82
2009	83	100
2010	84	97
2011	97	97
2012	97	
2013	98	

**Additional information:** The actual figure for fiscal year 2011 meets the target and remains unchanged from the previous year. Based on several prior years of actual data, the Department raised the targets for fiscal year 2011 and subsequent years. The last few years of data indicate that the projects are doing a reasonably good job of creating useful products or services for their target populations. Data for fiscal year 2012 are expected in October 2012.

The scores in the actual data column were produced by a panel of six to eight special education external experts, who reviewed 32 samples of technology products. Each project submitted a product or multiple products that represents the primary or typical products/services released by that grantee during the prior fiscal year. All selected 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?

### Long-Term Measures

The following two long-term measures have been developed for the program to provide information about the potential impacts of the projects' products and services on the target population.

**Objective:** Investments in the Technology and Media Services program will develop and validate current and emerging technologies that incorporate scientifically- or evidence-based materials and services.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

**Measure:** The percentage of Special Education Technology and Media Services projects that validate their products and services.

Year	Target	Actual
2009		73
2010		63
2011		50
2012	50	
2013	52	

**Additional information:** This is the third year that data have been collected for this measure. The Department set targets for this measure after reviewing trends in data from prior years. For this measure, a panel of six to eight special education external experts reviews evidence submitted by each project that their products or services improve outcomes for the target population, are evidence based, and are validated by empirical findings. This measure only includes projects that have entered the dissemination phase of their grants or completed the final year of their grants and submitted a final report. In fiscal 2011, four of the six projects that were asked to submit evidence responded. Of the four projects that were rated, two submitted acceptable evidence of validity, partially because several projects struggled with collecting sufficient evidence of validity within the one year time frame. Evidence about outcomes of the target population may take more than one year to collect. Fiscal year 2012 data for this long term measure are expected in October 2012.

**Objective:** Investments in the Technology and Media Services program will make validated, evidence-based technologies to improve results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities available for widespread use.

**Measure:** The percentage of Special Education Technology and Media Services projects that make validated technology products and services available for widespread use.

Year	Target	Actual
2009		94
2010		100
2011		100
2012	100	
2013	100	

**Additional information:** This is the third year that data have been collected for this measure. A panel of six to eight special education external experts reviews and scores the extent to which each project rated in the measure above as “validated” has submitted evidence of the availability of, and customer support for, their technology-based products and services. In fiscal year 2011, the panel reviewed evidence from the 2 centers that entered the dissemination phase of their projects or completed the final year of their grants and submitted a final report.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

Both centers that were rated as “validated” submitted sufficient evidence of the availability of their products or services to the target population. Fiscal year 2012 data for this long term measure are expected in October 2012.

#### Efficiency Measures

The Department has established two efficiency measures for the Technology and Media Services program. The two measures provide data on research centers and video captioning and description projects, respectively.

**Measure:** The Federal cost per unit of technology products and services funded by the Technology and Media Services program.

Year	Target	Actual
<b>2008</b>		\$216,878
<b>2009</b>		126,809
<b>2010</b>		156,285
<b>2011</b>		
<b>2012</b>		
<b>2013</b>		

**Additional information:** No data are available for fiscal year 2011 because the Department is changing the methodology for this measure and does not have comparable efficiency data for 2011. In previous years, this measure was calculated as the average Federal cost of technology projects divided by the number of technology products or services developed during the prior fiscal year and included in the expert panel review for the quality, relevance, and usefulness measures of this program. Targets will be established when the Department finishes developing a consistent and valid methodology for this measure.

**Measure:** The Federal cost per hour of video description funded by the Technology and Media Services program.

Year	Target	Actual
<b>2008</b>		\$3,422
<b>2009</b>		1,393
<b>2010</b>		1,781
<b>2011</b>		1,020
<b>2012</b>	\$995	
<b>2013</b>	970	

**Additional information:** The media services measure is calculated as the amount of funding provided for description activities (\$1,129,950 in 2011) divided by the total number of hours of

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

accessible described media produced (1,107.25 hours in 2011). The cost of an hour of media description significantly decreased from fiscal years 2008 to 2011, possibly due to the ongoing rapid advances of technology in this field. Targets for this measure were first developed in 2012 based on initial data collected during prior years. The Department anticipates that data will be available for fiscal year 2012 by October 2012.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### Special Olympics education programs

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$8,000 <sup>2</sup>	\$8,000	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011; continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2013 through appropriations language.

<sup>2</sup> In FY 2012, funding for Special Olympics was provided under Technical Assistance and Dissemination. Funding is shown here for purposes of comparability.

---

## 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 from the Department since fiscal year 1999, including funds for national and world games and affiliated programs.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Special Olympics education programs

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2008 .....	\$11,790
2009 .....	8,095
2010 .....	8,095
2011 .....	8,079
2012 .....	8,000 <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In FY 2012, funding for Special Olympics was provided under Technical Assistance and Dissemination. Funding is shown here for purposes of comparability.

### **FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$8.0 million for Special Olympics education programs, the same as the amount provided for this activity in fiscal year 2012 under the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program. The Administration's request would support efforts to promote the expansion of Special Olympics and the design and implementation of Special Olympics education programs, such as the Special Olympics National Youth Activation Demonstration.

Project (Project UNIFY). Project UNIFY, a national youth sports demonstration program, is the major activity funded by this direct appropriation. Besides sports and physical education in integrated settings, this project also provides opportunities for youth to participate in leadership development, service learning, and structured interpersonal communication and socialization activities. 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 inclusive learning environments.

### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
<b>Project UNIFY</b>			
Number of State projects	42	42	42
Number of schools participating	2,100	2,305	2,510

### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

#### **Performance Measures**

The Department is working to develop measures of student participation in sponsored activities, numbers and types of sponsored activities, the number of new school relationships established and other measures relevant to program objectives such as improving school climate and inclusiveness.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Special Olympics education programs

---

#### Other Performance Information

During Project UNIFY's first year of operation, State and local coordinators were given significant latitude in developing programs. This flexibility resulted in significant differences in the approaches taken to achieving the Project's goals and presented challenges for evaluating project success. For example, the intensity of services offered varied substantially among participating schools. Special Olympics reported difficulty in developing process and outcome measures as planned due to the differences in program implementation. However, survey data included in the first year report indicated that 61 percent of sampled middle and high school students believe that their school does a good job of offering Project UNIFY's activities. In relation to the project's goal of promoting social inclusion, 50 percent of middle school students and 34 percent of high school students indicated that the program does a good job teaching students about respect for individuals with disabilities.

Project UNIFY engaged external evaluators from the University of Massachusetts to conduct a formative evaluation of Project UNIFY's first three years. These researchers found that Project UNIFY had an inconclusive impact on the attitudes and behaviors of participating students toward individuals with intellectual disabilities. The evaluators commented that the effect of Project UNIFY may be limited by the self-selection into the program by students who already had positive attitudes and behaviors. It is difficult to avoid this self-selection effect because participation in Special Olympics activities is voluntary and non-random. The project's impact on academic outcomes was not measured because improving academic achievement was not the primary goal of this program.

The evaluation also found that the majority of school staff involved with the project believed that Project UNIFY helped raise awareness about students with intellectual disabilities, increased interaction between students with and without intellectual disabilities, and increased the confidence of these students. Surveys showed that most participating schools have hosted both inclusive sports programs and youth leadership/activation activities. Schools with the highest levels of involvement generally featured extra-curricular clubs that provided a venue for students with and without intellectual disabilities to participate in sports and social activities that promote inclusive school environments. The evaluator concluded that these clubs are a best practice that can provide a model for other participating schools.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### **PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI**

(Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2012)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2013 Authorization: 0 <sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$1,996	\$30,000	+\$28,004

---

<sup>1</sup> The program is authorized in FY 2012 through appropriations language; the Administration proposes to continue funding this program in FY 2013 through appropriations language.

---

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI (PROMISE) is a joint pilot demonstration program with the Social Security Administration (SSA) and the Departments of Health and Human Services and Labor. The goal of the program is to improve the health, education, and post-school outcomes of children who receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI), including completion of postsecondary education and employment, and to improve family or household outcomes through improved services and supports, such as education and job training for the parents. PROMISE will be implemented in two phases. The first phase will be a planning stage that focuses on knowledge generation, model development, and development of the proposed priority for the grant competition. The second phase will focus on implementing the PROMISE pilot projects, including soliciting grant applications, and reviewing and selecting projects for grant awards.

Competitive grants will be awarded to a small number of States for a period of 5 years. Governors will be invited to submit applications for their States and designate a lead agency to carry out the program. States will use funds to improve the coordination and increase the use of existing services for which children receiving SSI and their families are already eligible, such as those available through the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants program, Medicaid's care coordination services, Job Corps, Head Start, and other Workforce Investment Act programs. Program funds could also be used to provide incentive payments based on the achievement of identified intermediate and long-term outcomes.

PROMISE has a number of distinguishing features. First, the planning stage will involve stakeholder input into the design of the program. Second, the program will entail collaboration among four Federal agencies. Third, it will provide services to both youth and their families. This feature will require the involvement of programs that do not typically serve youth with disabilities. Fourth, it will involve waivers to allow flexible access to services for pilot participants. Fifth, it will use a rigorous evaluation design to guide implementation, gather evidence, and validate incentive payments. Sixth, the incentive payment structure of this

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI**

---

program advances the Administration's efforts to reward innovative efforts resulting in positive outcomes for program beneficiaries.

Finally, the Administration is seeking authority to use program funding to support Pay for Success awards, a multi-agency productivity initiative designed to employ "pay for performance" models to drive better results and greater cost-efficiency from Federal investments. Pay for Success pilots are modeled on Social Impact Bonds, which are being tested in the United Kingdom as an innovative way to attract private sector investment for interventions that will achieve better outcomes and lower government costs. The social investment community in the U.S. has already signaled its interest in experimenting with this model if it can find partners in government and identify early pilots that would have all of the elements necessary for success, which include:

- An intervention that is likely to produce positive outcomes for the target population;
- A strong evaluation methodology for measuring outcomes achieved, using a good comparison group or other credible approach to measuring impacts;
- Pay for performance agreements that provide flexibility for service providers to innovate and adjust their approach to maximize outcomes at the lowest possible cost; and
- A negotiated payment level for outcomes that provide private investors with a sufficient return if the intervention is successful and improves the cost-effectiveness of government investments.

This mechanism would only be used under the PROMISE initiative if social investors, the Federal Government, and a State or local community collectively determine that a Pay for Success pilot could improve outcomes and successfully test this new approach to financing effective interventions.

### **Knowledge Generation and Model Development**

In the first phase of implementation, the Department of Education (ED) and the Social Security Administration (SSA), in collaboration with the Departments of Labor (DOL) and Health and Human Services (HHS), are working to lay the foundation for this program through the generation of knowledge and design/development of the model/parameters for the PROMISE pilots, including the review of existing information and relevant research and the generation of innovative, promising practices that could be rigorously evaluated. Throughout the knowledge generation phase, Federal agencies will draw on their internal expertise and knowledge from previous and current investments that are relevant to the population and issues to be addressed in the PROMISE pilot. For example, in December of 2011, SSA convened a Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) that included program experts, external and Federal researchers, and agency representatives to identify intermediate and longer term outcome measures that could be tracked to measure an individual's progress toward self-sufficiency and to develop preliminary research questions, concepts to be evaluated, and designs that could be used to assess their impact.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI**

---

The fiscal year 2012 appropriation provided \$2 million to support planning, outreach, and other activities needed to implement the PROMISE program. In addition, SSA will use \$2.8 million in research funds in fiscal year 2012 to support start-up activities for administration of the PROMISE evaluation and incentives. The Department is in the process of reviewing and compiling existing research on relevant evidence-based practices and analyzing its implications for the PROMISE pilots. The Department will also review knowledge gained from its research, evaluation, technical assistance, and demonstration investments made by the Institute of Education Sciences, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, and other departmental Offices. Social media, workshops, symposia, and other formats will be used to broaden the dialogue in collaboration with researchers, practitioners, and other experts to:

- Refine the research questions to be tested in 2013 pilots;
- Solicit concepts from State and local governments, non-governmental organizations, researchers, and other experts that would enable achievement of better outcomes with existing resources;
- Identify administrative, regulatory, and legislative barriers that impede effective use of Federal program funds and assess the feasibility of removing those barriers. Where removal of a barrier would create risks for taxpayers or vulnerable individuals, ED will seek suggestions for safeguards to mitigate those risks;
- Build understanding of rigorous measurement and evaluation methodologies that would be necessary to measure the impact of the pilot, provide a sound basis for setting outcome-based incentive payments, and minimize gaming or other unintended consequences; and
- Build a Web-based repository of information that can assist States and local governments in developing strong applications for pilots using the best available research and evaluation tools.

### **FY 2013 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$30 million in fiscal year 2013 for PROMISE. This request would provide funding for pilot demonstration grants in select States to improve the educational, health, and employment outcomes of children receiving SSI, as well as the education and employment outcomes of their families. PROMISE funds would also be used to provide incentive awards for achievement of identified intermediate and long-term outcomes. The fiscal year 2012 appropriations language under the Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research account also allows the Secretary to use amounts that remain unobligated subsequent to the reallocation of funds to States under the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) State Grants program, pursuant to section 110(b) of the Rehabilitation Act, to support PROMISE grants. Depending on the amount of funds that become available from unobligated VR grants to support the first year of PROMISE grant awards, fiscal year 2013 funds would be used to support either additional new awards or the second year of project funding. Similarly, the fiscal year 2013 request includes appropriations language that would allow the Secretary to use remaining funds

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI**

---

subsequent to the reallocation of VR funds to support innovative activities aimed at improving outcomes for individuals with disabilities, including, if needed, funds for improving the outcomes of children receiving SSI and their families through PROMISE. The request also provides authority for PROMISE funds to remain available for Federal obligation until September 30, 2014. While the Department is requesting authority to test the Pay for Success approach under the PROMISE initiative, it will not set aside funds for this purpose unless the necessary conditions described above exist and investors show interest.

SSA, which administers SSI, is an efficient cash benefit provider but does not routinely provide social services. SSI is a means-tested cash assistance program for children with disabilities from low-income families with the assumed purpose of covering the added expenses that a low-income family may incur due to a child's disability. The needs of low-income families with children, and especially children with disabilities, extend beyond cash assistance to family support services.

At age 18, child SSI recipients receive a full eligibility redetermination for adult SSI benefits. About 58 percent of child SSI recipients immediately continue to receive SSI as adults and of those who leave the program, one-fourth return to the program within 4 years. Those who enter the workforce have earnings at a third the level of their peers, demonstrating they are not adequately prepared for competitive employment. Research shows that fewer than a quarter of SSI youth ages 14–17 or their parents know about various work incentives available to them, and less than half of 17- and 18-year-olds receiving SSI had worked during ages 16–17.

Parents and other family members of SSI children are also in need of support services. Roughly one-third of the parents of SSI children have less than a high school education, and almost half of children who receive SSI live in a household with at least one other person with a disability. In addition, SSI may reduce incentives for self-sufficiency for both the child and the family, particularly because the program has the strictest income and asset tests of any Federal means-tested program.

Child recipients of SSI and their families are eligible for a variety of services based on the child's disability and the family income. PROMISE would support States in increasing uptake of these services by enabling the design of a more comprehensive and coordinated service delivery system not currently available under the individual programs. Within the parameters defined in the grant priority, States would be expected to propose a comprehensive and coordinated program of supports and services, including innovative strategies and promising/best practices based on current knowledge and research that have the potential for long-term improvements in the SSI child recipient's economic self-sufficiency. For example, States could propose to include strategies and practices such as case management, program navigators to provide assistance to beneficiaries on navigating the variety of workforce development programs and services, increased coordination with community or advocacy organizations, work-based learning opportunities in high school, and mentoring. The subsequent rigorous evaluation of State pilot demonstrations will complement SSA's Youth Transition Demonstration and inform future efforts to promote improved outcomes of children who receive SSI.

Under Pay for Success, the Federal Government pays primarily for achievement of clearly defined outcomes while private investors, such as philanthropies or social impact investors, help

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI

---

provide up-front funding for program services. Pay for Success pilots sponsored at the State level could achieve better outcomes for a specified target population by attracting private investment to finance new interventions that augment government services and promise better results for individuals. For example, interventions funded by PROMISE could include legal assistance in accessing services or out-of-school time academic enrichment. A specific Pay for Success agreement – which could be developed in partnership among the Department of Education, the State, and potentially an intermediary representing the investors -- would include terms and conditions that clearly state the outcomes to achieve, the method to evaluate their achievement, and the payment amounts for different levels of achievement. The Pay for Success agreement would also commit the State to maintain pre-existing government services for the target population, so as not to disadvantage the recipients nor jeopardize the supplemental service provider's ability to achieve positive outcomes.

If the improved outcomes are achieved as a complement to traditional government services, there would be a proven model that could be scaled up and replicated. To the extent that outcomes are not achieved, Federal payments for outcomes would not be disbursed under the Pay for Success agreement. Any funds that had been obligated could be redirected to the Special Education Grants to States program for allocation under that formula. In order to allow valid measurement of critical outcomes, funds obligated under Pay for Success would remain available until expended—or until, based on the Pay for Success agreement, the outcomes specified have not been achieved and the funds can be redirected.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
<u>Program Funding:</u>		
Funds to support planning, grant awards, and incentive payments	\$2,000 <sup>1,2</sup>	\$29,975 <sup>2,3,4</sup>
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>
Total funding	2,000	30,000
Average award	0	\$6,990
Number of awards	1	4

---

<sup>1</sup> FY 2012 funds will primarily be used to procure assistance with generating knowledge and developing the model on which the proposed grant priority for this program will be based.

<sup>2</sup> Additional funds that become available at the end of the fiscal year from unobligated funds remaining subsequent to the reallocation of State VR Grant funds may be used to award grants to States under PROMISE.

<sup>3</sup> An amount not to exceed \$15 million of the program funding may be used for Pay for Success projects.

<sup>4</sup> The Secretary may reserve a portion of the funds to make incentive payments to States for the achievement of identified outcomes.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI

---

#### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

##### **Performance Measures**

No performance measures have been developed for this program. Performance measures will be developed in the initial year of the pilot and will reflect the breadth of the goals for this program, including intermediate and longer term outcome measures of progress toward self-sufficiency. Education and employment outcomes may be captured through a measure of engagement that reports the percentage of child SSI recipients who are no longer in secondary school, and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within 1 year of leaving secondary school. A similar measure for family or household members may also be developed to measure rates of new enrollment in education or workforce development programs. Intermediate measures of school-based outcomes, such as attendance or student academic growth, may be used if a State has the capacity to track these child SSI recipients through a longitudinal data system. Finally, given the goal of increasing coordination and provision of services, a performance measure related to uptake of other services for which a child SSI recipient is eligible may be appropriate to measure the program's success. Monthly earnings are among the administrative data collected by SSA for individuals receiving SSI, and can be used to measure the short- and long-term economic well-being of children and their families or households for as long as the individual remains on SSI. A measure of the average benefit payment may also be used to capture changes in the income of recipients' households, with increased employment and economic outcomes leading to lower benefit amounts in the long-term.