

**Department of Education**  
**SPECIAL EDUCATION**  
**Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request**

**CONTENTS**

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Appropriations Language .....                                  | I-1         |
| Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....               | I-3         |
| Amounts Available for Obligation .....                         | I-6         |
| Obligations by Object Classification .....                     | I-6         |
| Authorizing Legislation.....                                   | I-7         |
| Appropriations History.....                                    | I-9         |
| Significant Items in FY 2011 Appropriations Reports.....       | I-10        |
| Summary of Request .....                                       | I-11        |
| State grants:  |             |
| Grants to States.....  | I-13        |
| Preschool grants.....  | I-31        |
| Grants for infants and families .....                          | I-42        |
| National activities:   |             |
| State personnel development .....                              | I-50        |
| Technical assistance and dissemination .....                   | I-57        |
| Personnel preparation.....                                     | I-67        |
| Parent information centers.....                                | I-81        |
| Technology and media services.....                             | I-91        |
| Other activities:  |             |
| Special Olympics education programs .....                      | I-102       |
| Mentoring for individuals with intellectual disabilities ..... | I-105       |
| PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI.....             | I-107       |
| State Tables.....  | I-111       |

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

For carrying out the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act ("IDEA") and the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004, \$12,856,351,000, of which \$3,135,634,000 shall become available on July 1, 2012, and shall remain available through September 30, 2013, and of which \$9,433,103,000 shall become available on October 1, 2012, and shall remain available through September 30, 2013, for academic year 2012-2013: <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, 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: <sup>2</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>3</sup> *Provided further*, That \$30,000,000 shall be for activities aimed at improving the outcomes of children receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and their families, of which at least \$24,000,000 shall be for competitive grants to States to improve the provision and coordination of services for SSI child recipients in order to achieve improved health status, including both physical and emotional health, and education and post-school outcomes, including completion of postsecondary education and employment, and to improve services and supports to the family or households of the SSI child recipient, such as education and job training for the parents: <sup>4</sup> *Provided further*, That States may award subgrants for a portion of the funds to other public and private, non-profit entities: <sup>5</sup> *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$6,000,000 of amounts provided in the third proviso may be used for performance-based awards for Pay for Success projects: <sup>6</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>7</sup> *Provided further*, That, with respect to the fifth

proviso, any deobligated funds from such projects shall immediately be available for section 611 of the IDEA. <sup>8</sup>

## NOTES

A regular 2011 appropriation for this account had not been enacted at the time the budget was prepared; therefore, this account is operating under a continuing resolution (P.L. 111-322, Dec. 22, 2010; 124 Stat 3518) that provides funding through March 4, 2011. The amounts included for fiscal year 2011 in this budget reflect the annualized levels provided by the continuing resolution.

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> <u>... \$12,856,351,000, of which \$3,135,634,000 shall become available on July 1, 2012, and shall remain available through September 30, 2013, and of which \$9,433,103,000 shall become available on October 1, 2012, and shall remain available through September 30, 2013, for academic year 2012-2013:</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> <u>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, 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></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 under the fiscal year 2011 annualized CR 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 2011 annualized CR.</p> |
| <p><sup>3</sup> <u>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:</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>4</sup> <u>Provided further, That \$30,000,000 shall be for activities aimed at improving the outcomes of children receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and their families, of which at least \$24,000,000 shall be for competitive grants to States to improve the provision and coordination of services for SSI child recipients in order to achieve improved health status, including both physical and emotional health, and education and post-school outcomes, including completion of postsecondary education and employment, and to improve services and supports to the family or households of the SSI child recipient, such as education and job training for the parents:</u></p> | <p>This language designates \$30,000,000 for programs directed at children receiving Supplemental Security Income and their families, at least \$24,000,000 of which will be for competitive awards to States to develop pilot demonstration programs. This language authorizes the use of funds appropriated under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to be used to provide services for the families of children receiving Supplemental Security Income.</p> |
| <p><sup>5</sup> <u>Provided further, That States may award subgrants for a portion of the funds to other public and private, non-profit entities:</u></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 third proviso.</p>  |
| <p><sup>6</sup> <u>Provided further, That not to exceed \$6,000,000 of amounts provided in the third proviso may be used for performance-based awards for Pay for Success projects:</u></p>  | <p>This language permits the Secretary to use up to \$6,000,000 of the funds for the activities directed at Supplemental Security Income children recipients and their families for performance-based awards under the Pay for Success program.</p>   |
| <p><sup>7</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>   |

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

| Language Provision  | Explanation  |
|---|--|
| <sup>8</sup> <u>Provided further, That, with respect to the fifth proviso, any deobligated funds from such projects shall immediately be available for section 611 of the IDEA.</u> | This language requires any deobligated funds of the Pay for Success projects to be allocated through the Special Education Grants to States program. |

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

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

|   | 2010             | 2011 CR             | 2012             |
|---|------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Discretionary appropriation:                          |                  |                     |                  |
| Appropriation .....                                   | \$12,587,035     | 0                   | \$12,861,351     |
| Across-the-board reduction .....                      | 0                | 0                   | 0                |
| Annualized CR (PL 111-322) .....                      | <u>0</u>         | <u>\$12,587,035</u> | <u>0</u>         |
| Total, discretionary appropriation .....              | 12,587,035       | 12,587,035          | 12,861,351       |
| Advance for succeeding fiscal year .....              | -8,592,383       | -8,592,383          | -9,433,103       |
| Advance from prior year .....                         | <u>8,592,383</u> | <u>8,592,383</u>    | <u>8,592,383</u> |
| Subtotal, comparable budget authority .....           | 12,587,035       | 12,587,035          | 12,020,631       |
| Unobligated balance, start of year .....              | 13,594           | 12,850              | 0                |
| Recovery Act unobligated balance, start of year ..... | 173              | 0                   | 0                |
| Unobligated balance, end of year .....                | <u>-12,850</u>   | <u>0</u>            | <u>0</u>         |
| Total, direct obligations .....                       | 12,587,952       | 12,599,885          | 12,020,631       |

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

|  | 2010       | 2011 CR    | 2012       |
|--|------------|------------|------------|
| Other contractual services:            |            |            |            |
| Advisory and assistance services ..... | \$3,998    | \$4,400    | \$4,000    |
| Peer review .....                      | <u>621</u> | <u>600</u> | <u>600</u> |
| Subtotal .....                         | 4,619      | 5,000      | 4,600      |
| Grants .....                           | 12,583,160 | 12,594,885 | 12,016,031 |
| Grants, Recovery .....                 | <u>173</u> | <u>0</u>   | <u>0</u>   |
| Total, obligations .....               | 12,587,951 | 12,599,885 | 12,020,631 |

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

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

| Activity  | 2011<br>Authorized        | 2011 CR                   | 2012<br>Authorized            | 2012<br>Request           |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>State Grants:</b>  |                           |                           |                               |                           |
| Grants to States ( <i>IDEA-B-611</i> )  | \$26,100,000 <sup>1</sup> | \$11,505,211 <sup>2</sup> | Indefinite <sup>1</sup>       | \$11,705,211 <sup>2</sup> |
| Preschool grants ( <i>IDEA-B-619</i> )  | Indefinite                | 374,099                   | Indefinite                    | 374,099                   |
| Grants for infants and families ( <i>IDEA-C</i> )   | Indefinite                | 439,427                   | Indefinite                    | 489,427                   |
| <b>National activities:</b>   |                           |                           |                               |                           |
| State personnel development ( <i>IDEA-D-1</i> )   | Indefinite                | 48,000                    | 0 <sup>3</sup>                | 48,000                    |
| Technical assistance and dissemination ( <i>IDEA-D-2-663</i> )  | Indefinite                | 49,549                    | 0 <sup>3</sup>                | 49,549                    |
| Personnel preparation ( <i>IDEA-D-2-662</i> )   | Indefinite                | 90,653                    | 0 <sup>3</sup>                | 90,653                    |
| Parent information centers ( <i>IDEA-D-3-671-673</i> )  | Indefinite                | 28,028                    | 0 <sup>3</sup>                | 28,028                    |
| Technology and media services ( <i>IDEA-D-3-674</i> )   | Indefinite                | 43,973                    | 0 <sup>3</sup>                | 33,289                    |
| Special Olympics education programs ( <i>SOSEA<sup>4</sup> 3(a)</i> )   | Indefinite                | 8,095                     | 0 <sup>5</sup>                | 8,095                     |
| Mentoring for individuals with intellectual disabilities<br>( <i>Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965,<br/>Title V, Part D, Subpart 1</i> ) | 0                         | 0                         | To be determined <sup>6</sup> | 5,000                     |
| PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI<br>( <i>IDEA-D-2-663</i> )  | 0                         | 0                         | 0 <sup>7</sup>                | 30,000                    |
| <b><u>Unfunded authorizations</u></b>   |                           |                           |                               |                           |
| Safe learning environments ( <i>IDEA-D-2-665</i> )  | <u>Indefinite</u>         | <u>0</u>                  | <u>Indefinite</u>             | <u>0</u>                  |
| Total definite authorization  | 26,100,000                |                           | 0                             |                           |

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

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

---

| Activity                                      | 2011<br>Authorized | 2011 CR      | 2012<br>Authorized | 2012<br>Request |
|---|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Total appropriation                           |                    | \$12,587,035 |                    | \$12,861,351    |
| Portion of request subject to reauthorization |                    |              |                    | 287,614         |
| Portion of request not authorized             |                    |              |                    | 5,000           |

---

<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 \$29,610 thousand for fiscal year 2011 and \$30,045 thousand for fiscal year 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$29,000 thousand for technical assistance on State data collection in fiscal years 2011 and 2012.

<sup>3</sup> The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2011. The Administration proposes to continue funding this program in FY 2012 through appropriations language.

<sup>4</sup> Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004.

<sup>5</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2010. The Administration proposes to continue funding in FY 2012 through appropriations language.

<sup>6</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing language is sought for FY 2012.

<sup>7</sup> The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2011. The Administration proposes to fund this program in FY 2012 through appropriations language.

---

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Appropriations History (\$000s)

|   | Budget<br>Estimate<br>to Congress | House<br>Allowance      | Senate<br>Allowance     | Appropriation           |
|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 2003                                      | \$9,687,804                       | \$9,187,804             | \$11,191,424            | \$10,033,917            |
| 2003 Technical amendment<br>(P.L. 108-83) |                                   |                         |                         | -497                    |
| (2003 Advance for 2004)                   | (5,072,000)                       | (5,072,000)             | (7,572,000)             | (5,672,000)             |
| 2004                                      | 10,690,104                        | 11,049,790              | 12,227,464              | 11,238,832              |
| (2004 Advance for 2005)                   | (5,072,000)                       | (5,072,000)             | (5,402,000)             | (5,413,000)             |
| 2005                                      | 12,176,101                        | 12,176,101              | 12,328,391              | 11,673,606              |
| (2005 Advance for 2006)                   | (5,413,000)                       | (5,413,000)             | (5,413,000)             | (5,413,000)             |
| 2006                                      | 12,126,130                        | 11,813,783              | 11,775,107              | 11,653,013              |
| (2006 Advance for 2007)                   | (6,204,000)                       | (5,413,000)             | (5,424,200)             | (5,424,200)             |
| 2007                                      | 11,697,502                        | N/A <sup>1</sup>        | N/A <sup>1</sup>        | 11,802,867 <sup>1</sup> |
| (2007 Advance for 2008)                   | (6,215,200)                       |                         |                         | (5,424,200)             |
| 2008                                      | 11,485,147                        | 12,362,831              | 12,330,374              | 11,993,684              |
| (2008 Advance for 2009)                   | (6,215,200)                       | (6,641,982)             | (5,924,200)             | (6,856,444)             |
| 2009                                      | 12,335,943                        | 12,587,920 <sup>2</sup> | 12,511,631 <sup>2</sup> | 12,579,677              |
| (2009 Advance for 2010)                   | (7,647,444)                       | (8,592,383)             | (7,647,444)             | (8,592,383)             |
| Recovery Act Supplemental<br>(P.L. 111-5) | 0                                 | 13,600,000              | 13,500,000              | 12,200,000              |
| 2010                                      | 12,579,677                        | 12,579,677              | 12,587,856              | 12,587,035              |
| (2010 Advance for 2011)                   | (8,592,383)                       | (8,592,383)             | (8,592,383)             | (8,592,383)             |
| 2011                                      | 12,846,190                        | 12,587,035 <sup>3</sup> | 13,035,490 <sup>4</sup> | 12,587,035 <sup>5</sup> |
| (2011 Advance for 2012)                   | (8,592,383)                       | (8,592,383)             | (8,592,383)             | (8,592,383)             |
| 2012                                      | 12,861,351                        |                         |                         |                         |
| (2012 Advance for 2013)                   | (9,433,103)                       |                         |                         |                         |

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

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

<sup>3</sup> The level for the 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 level for appropriation reflects the continuing resolution (P.L. 111-322) passed December 22, 2010.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Significant Items in FY 2011 Appropriations Reports

#### Parent Information Centers

Senate: Report 111-243. The Committee recommends \$30,028,000 for parent information centers. The comparable fiscal year 2010 funding level and the budget request are \$28,028,000 for the centers...The Committee believes that the additional funds should be used to support the work of all centers, balanced by the importance of targeting additional resources to centers that are serving areas with growing populations. The Committee further believes that there should be more transparency with regard to the allocation formula being used to allocate these funds and requests the annual congressional budget justification include a description of the Department's methodology for allocating funds available for this program.

Response: The fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution (P.L. 111-322) passed on December 22, 2010 did not contain additional funds for the parent information centers. The Department plans to use the funds available under the CR to enable all centers to better meet the training and information needs of parents of children with disabilities. A description of the formula used to allocate parent information center funds has been added to the congressional budget justification for this program, beginning on page I-81.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2012 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

| (in thousands of dollars)   |               |                    |                    |                         | 2012 President's Budget Compared to 2011 CR |         |
|---|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|---|---------|
| Account, Program and Activity   | Category Code | 2010 Appropriation | 2011 CR Annualized | 2012 President's Budget | Amount                                      | Percent |
| <b>Special Education</b>  |               |                    |                    |                         |   |         |
| 1. State grants:  |               |                    |                    |                         |   |         |
| (a) Grants to States (IDEA B-611)   |               |                    |                    |                         |   |         |
| Annual appropriation  | D             | 2,912,828          | 2,912,828          | 2,272,108               | (640,720)                                   | -22.0%  |
| Advance for succeeding fiscal year  | D             | 8,592,383          | 8,592,383          | 9,433,103               | 840,720                                     | 9.8%    |
| Subtotal  |               | 11,505,211         | 11,505,211         | 11,705,211              | 200,000                                     | 1.7%    |
| (b) Preschool grants (IDEA B-619)   | D             | 374,099            | 374,099            | 374,099                 | 0   | 0.0%    |
| (c) Grants for infants and families (IDEA C)  | D             | 439,427            | 439,427            | 489,427                 | 50,000                                      | 11.4%   |
| Subtotal, State grants  |               | 12,318,737         | 12,318,737         | 12,568,737              | 250,000                                     | 2.0%    |
| 2. National activities (IDEA D):  |               |                    |                    |                         |   |         |
| (a) State personnel development (Subpart 1)   | D             | 48,000             | 48,000             | 48,000                  | 0   | 0.0%    |
| (b) Technical assistance and dissemination (section 663)                            | D             | 49,549             | 49,549             | 49,549                  | 0   | 0.0%    |
| (c) Personnel preparation (section 662)   | D             | 90,653             | 90,653             | 90,653                  | 0   | 0.0%    |
| (d) Parent information centers (sections 671-673)                                   | D             | 28,028             | 28,028             | 28,028                  | 0   | 0.0%    |
| (e) Technology and media services (section 674)                                     | D             | 43,973             | 43,973             | 33,289                  | (10,684)                                    | -24.3%  |
| Subtotal  |               | 260,203            | 260,203            | 249,519                 | (10,684)                                    | -4.1%   |
| 3. Special Olympics education programs (Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act) | D             | 8,095              | 8,095              | 8,095                   | 0   | 0.0%    |
| 4. Mentoring for individuals with intellectual disabilities (ESEA V-D-1)            | D             | 0                  | 0                  | 5,000                   | 5,000                                       | ---     |
| 5. PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI (IDEA D-663)                       | D             | 0                  | 0                  | 30,000                  | 30,000                                      | ---     |
| Total, Appropriation  | D             | 12,587,035         | 12,587,035         | 12,861,351              | 274,316                                     | 2.2%    |
| Total, Budget authority   | D             | 12,587,035         | 12,587,035         | 12,020,631              | (566,404)                                   | -4.5%   |
| Current <sup>1</sup>  |               | 3,994,652          | 3,994,652          | 3,428,248               | (566,404)                                   | -14.2%  |
| Prior year's advance  |               | 8,592,383          | 8,592,383          | 8,592,383               | 0   | 0.0%    |

NOTES: -Category Codes are as follows: D = discretionary program; M = mandatory program.  
 -The FY 2011 level for appropriated funds is an annualized amount provided under the fourth Continuing Resolution (P.L. 111-322).

<sup>1</sup> Excludes advance appropriations that become available on October 1 of the following fiscal year. Advanced appropriations are \$8,592,383 thousand in fiscal year 2010 and under the 2011 CR level, and \$9,433,103 thousand at the fiscal year 2012 President's Budget level.

## 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 2012 budget request for Special Education of \$12.9 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 \$11.7 billion for the **Grants to States** program, an increase of \$200 million above the FY 2011 annualized CR 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 \$1,765 for each of the 6.614 million children with disabilities who are estimated to be served for 2012. The Federal contribution toward meeting the excess cost of special education and related services would be approximately 17 percent of the national average per pupil expenditures under this request.

The request of \$374.1 million for **Preschool Grants** is the same as the FY 2011 CR level and the request of \$489.4 million for **Grants for Infants and Families** is an increase of \$50 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 \$249.5 million request for **National Activities** programs would support a variety of technical assistance, dissemination, training, and other activities to help States, local educational agencies, parents, and others in improving results for children with disabilities.

**State Personnel Development, Technical Assistance and Dissemination, Personnel Preparation, and Parent Information Centers** would be funded at the FY 2011 CR levels of \$48.0 million, \$49.5 million, \$90.7 million, and \$28.0 million, respectively. The **Technology and Media Services** program would be funded at \$33.3 million, \$10.7 million less than the program's funding in FY 2011, due to the elimination of funding for earmarks.

The **Special Olympics Education Programs** would be funded at \$8.1 million, the same as the FY 2011 CR level. The request would also include \$5.0 million for a new program, **Mentoring for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities**, which would support competitive grants for activities to increase the participation of people with intellectual disabilities in community life. 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. 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.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### State grants: Grants to States

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite<sup>1,2</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

|                                    | <u>2011 CR</u>             | <u>2012</u>              | <u>Change</u>   |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Annual appropriation               | \$2,912,828 <sup>3,4</sup> | \$2,272,108 <sup>3</sup> | -\$640,720      |
| Advance for succeeding fiscal year | <u>8,592,383</u>           | <u>9,433,103</u>         | <u>+840,720</u> |
| Total                              | 11,505,211                 | 11,705,211               | +200,000        |

---

<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 2012 would be \$30,045 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 2012 would be \$143,506 thousand.

<sup>3</sup> Includes \$29,000 thousand for technical assistance activities in fiscal years 2011 and 2012.

<sup>4</sup> Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to 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.

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 2012, school districts will use both the forward- and advance-funded amounts primarily during the 2012-2013 school year.

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, 2014 to obligate their fiscal year 2012 awards.

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 2012, the latter amount is estimated to be \$959,697.

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

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

---

<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

---

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

The IDEA also requires each State to maintain its level of 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 50 percent of any increase in its allocation under the Grants to States program over the prior year. The Secretary may prohibit a State from exercising this authority if it is determined that a State is not adequately carrying out its responsibilities under the IDEA.

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

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

---

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

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

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.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

|                   | (\$000s)     |              |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
| 2007 .....        | \$10,782,961 | <sup>1</sup> |
| 2008 .....        | 10,947,511   | <sup>1</sup> |
| 2009 .....        | 11,505,211   | <sup>1</sup> |
| Recovery Act..... | 11,300,000   |              |
| 2010 .....        | 11,505,211   | <sup>2</sup> |
| 2011 CR.....      | 11,505,211   | <sup>3</sup> |

---

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

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

<sup>3</sup> Includes \$29,000 thousand for technical assistance.

### **FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$11.7 billion for Grants to States, an increase of \$200 million over the FY 2011 CR, to assist in covering the excess costs associated with providing special education and related services to children with disabilities.

This request would provide an average of \$1,765 per child. This is an increase from the \$1,735 per child provided in 2011. 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 2010 level of 6.614 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 17 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure (APPE).

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

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 has decreased slightly each year from the prior fiscal year. Fiscal year 2010 represents the first

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

increase in this population of students in 5 years. In the absence of better information, we have projected the numbers of children with disabilities expected to be served for fiscal years 2011 and 2012 at 6.614 million children, the same level as reported by States for fiscal year 2010.

#### Department of the Interior Set-Aside

As in previous years, we are proposing that the fiscal year 2012 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 \$21,269 for each child with a disability it serves, which is approximately 11.8 times the average amount per child that States would receive. At the request level with the cap, Interior would receive about 7.7 times the average amount per child that States would receive, which translates into an average of \$13,838 for each child with a disability, or about 129 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure (APPE) compared to 17 percent of the APPE for States overall.

#### Technical Assistance

The IDEA emphasizes improving results for children with disabilities through the collection and use of performance data. The law requires each State to develop a State Performance Plan that includes measurable and rigorous targets in a number of key monitoring areas. These areas are free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment; disproportionate representation of children in special education based on race and ethnicity; and State exercise of general supervision authority in key areas such as child find, monitoring, mediation, and transition. Each State has supervisory responsibility over the provision of special education and related services to children with disabilities within its jurisdiction, to ensure that the requirements in 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 \$29 million for such technical assistance, level with the amount set aside in fiscal year 2011. Most of the funds would be used for continuation costs, including support for two consortia of States to develop high-quality alternate assessments that will fit coherently with the State assessment systems developed under the Race to the Top Assessment Program. The Department also expects to make a multi-year award in fiscal year 2011 to help States develop Part C State data systems that would collect, analyze, and report infant and toddler outcome data. Funds available for new awards would be used to provide technical assistance to States and local educational agencies on the analysis and use of data, including support for systems that ensure the collection of such data is valid, reliable and timely.

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**State grants: Grants to States**

---

**PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**

|  | <u>2010</u>    | <u>2011 CR</u>            | <u>2012</u>               |
|--|----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b><u>Program funding (\$000):</u></b>                               |                |                           |                           |
| Formula grants to States   | \$11,347,631   | \$11,343,631              | \$11,541,778              |
| Formula grants to Outlying Areas                                     | 33,919         | 33,919                    | 34,418                    |
| Grants to Freely Associated States                                   | 6,579          | 6,579                     | 6,579                     |
| Department of the Interior   | 92,012         | 92,012                    | 93,366                    |
| Technical assistance   | 25,000         | 29,000                    | 29,000                    |
| Peer review of new Technical Assistance award applications           | <u>70</u>      | <u>70</u>                 | <u>70</u>                 |
| <br>Total  | <br>11,505,211 | <br>11,505,211            | <br>11,705,211            |
| <br>   |                |                           |                           |
| <b>Number of children with disabilities served ages 3 through 21</b> | 6,614,000      | 6,614,000 <sup>1</sup>    | 6,614,000 <sup>1</sup>    |
| <br><b>Average Federal share per child (\$)</b>                      | <br>\$1,736    | <br>\$1,735 <sup>1</sup>  | <br>\$1,765 <sup>1</sup>  |
| <br><b>Average per pupil expenditure (APPE) (\$)</b>                 | <br>\$10,412   | <br>\$10,534 <sup>1</sup> | <br>\$10,689 <sup>1</sup> |
| <br><b>Federal funding as a percentage of APPE</b>                   | <br>17%        | <br>17% <sup>1</sup>      | <br>17% <sup>1</sup>      |

---

<sup>1</sup> Estimate, based on State-reported cumulative total for children served during the 2009-2010 school year.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

---

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

|  | School Year<br><u>2005-2006</u> |              | School Year<br><u>2006-2007</u> |              | School Year<br><u>2007-2008</u> |              |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|--------------|
|  | Percent                         | Number       | Percent                         | Number       | Percent                         | Number       |
| <b>Basis:</b>  |                                 |              |                                 |              |                                 |              |
| Graduating with regular diploma                                    | 33.0%                           | 224,343      | 32.8%                           | 221,055      | 34.4%                           | 217,905      |
| Graduating through certification                                   | 9.0%                            | 60,864       | 9.6%                            | 64,887       | 8.4%                            | 53,260       |
| Transferred to regular education <sup>2</sup>                      | 10.5%                           | 71,397       | 9.9%                            | 66,788       | 8.2%                            | 51,786       |
| Dropped out, or moved but not known to have continued in education | 15.3%                           | 104,101      | 14.9%                           | 100,804      | 14.3%                           | 90,766       |
| Moved, but known to have continued in education <sup>2</sup>       | 31.1%                           | 210,984      | 31.6%                           | 213,435      | 33.5%                           | 212,337      |
| Reaching maximum age for Services and other reasons                | <u>1.1%</u>                     | <u>7,549</u> | <u>1.1%</u>                     | <u>7,696</u> | <u>1.1%</u>                     | <u>7,187</u> |
| <b>Total</b>   | 100.0%                          | 679,238      | 100.0%                          | 674,665      | 100.0%                          | 633,241      |

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

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

<sup>2</sup> Previous versions of this table did not contain the categories "Transferred to regular education" and "Moved, but known to have continued in education." OSERS recently revised the IDEA 618 data collection instrument and reporting categories to include these items, which track additional students with disabilities ages 14 and older who leave special education, and are mutually exclusive with other categories included in this table. Because this is the case, the percentages reported in this table are not comparable with percentages reported in the same table in Congressional Justifications prior to fiscal year 2010. For example, in the FY 2009 Congressional Justification the Department reported that approximately 56.5 percent of students with disabilities who left school graduated with a regular diploma in the 2005-2006 school year. The percentage of students with disabilities who left special education and graduated with a regular diploma reported in the 2005-2006 school year in this table is 33.0 percent. However, the actual number of students associated with both of these percentages is 224,343.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

#### History of Children Served and Program Funding

| <u>Fiscal Year</u> | <u>Children Served<br/>(000s)</u> | <u>Appropriation<br/>(\$000)</u> | <u>Federal<br/>Share Per Child<sup>1</sup></u> | <u>Percentage<br/>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  | 17%                           |
| 2011 CR            | 6,614 <sup>4</sup>                | 11,505,211 <sup>2,4</sup>        | 1,735 <sup>4</sup>                             | 17% <sup>4</sup>              |
| 2012               | 6,614 <sup>4</sup>                | 11,705,211 <sup>2,4</sup>        | 1,765 <sup>4</sup>                             | 17% <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, \$25 million in 2010, and \$29 million in 2011 and 2012.

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

<sup>4</sup> Estimate.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

## PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

### National Assessment of Educational Progress Measures

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading. <sup>1</sup> |        |        |
|--|--------|--------|
| Year   | Target | Actual |
| 2003   | 25     | 29     |
| 2005   | 35     | 33     |
| 2007   | 35     | 36     |
| 2009 <sup>2</sup>  | 37     | 34     |
| 2011   | 39     |        |
| 2013   | 40     |        |

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in mathematics. <sup>1</sup> |        |        |
|--|--------|--------|
| Year   | Target | Actual |
| 2003   | 23     | 29     |
| 2005   | 32     | 31     |
| 2007   | 33     | 33     |
| 2009 <sup>2</sup>  | 35     | 36     |
| 2011   | 37     |        |
| 2013   | 38     |        |

---

<sup>1</sup> 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."

<sup>2</sup> No comparable NAEP assessments are scheduled for reading or mathematics in 2010 or 2012.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

#### 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 this year, after moderate increases the previous 2 years, and fell shy of the 2009 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 2009 fourth-grade reading assessment, only 34 percent of students with disabilities scored at or above Basic, while 70 percent of other students 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 2009, the exclusion rate for students with disabilities on fourth-grade reading assessments dropped from 41 percent to 29 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 6 percent from 2000 to 2009. Among fourth-grade students with disabilities assessed in reading in 2009, 49 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.

Eight-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 exceeded the 2009 target. The data show that the majority of students with disabilities do not meet or exceed even the Basic levels of

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

achievement at any of the grade levels tested. Likewise, students with disabilities score well below other students. On the 2009 math assessment, only 36 percent of eighth-graders with disabilities scored at or above Basic, while 77 percent of other eighth-grade students 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 2009, the exclusion rate on eighth-grade mathematics assessments dropped from 30 percent to 22 percent. It should be noted that these percentages only include 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, 63 percent received accommodations in 2009.

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

**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 |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2007 | 51.8   | 41.5   |
| 2008 | 54.0   | 40.8   |
| 2009 | 61.7   | 43.8   |
| 2010 | 69.4   |        |
| 2011 | 77     |        |
| 2012 | 84.7   |        |

**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 |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2007 | 52.2   | 41.9   |
| 2008 | 53.3   | 42.1   |
| 2009 | 61.1   | 45.2   |
| 2010 | 68.9   |        |
| 2011 | 76.7   |        |
| 2012 | 84.4   |        |

**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 |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2007 | 21.6   | 28.7   |
| 2008 | 22.2   | 29.7   |
| 2009 | 18.5   | 29.7   |
| 2010 | 14.8   |        |
| 2011 | 11.1   |        |
| 2012 | 7.4    |        |

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

| <b>Measure:</b> The difference between the percentage of students with disabilities in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State 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 |
| 2007  | 19.4   | 26.1   |
| 2008  | 20.5   | 27.5   |
| 2009  | 17.0   | 26.1   |
| 2010  | 13.6   |        |
| 2011  | 10.2   |        |
| 2012  | 6.9    |        |

**Additional information:** As seen in the first two tables, States improved their performance with respect to students with disabilities on State mathematics and reading assessments between 2008 and 2009. 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 (43.8 percent and 45.2 percent, respectively).

The latter 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 (29.7 percent and 26.1 percent, respectively). The improvement in scores among students with disabilities over the past few years has not been sufficient to significantly close those gaps.

Definitions of proficient and advanced vary across States, meaning that the national data presented here may not aggregate entirely comparable levels of student achievement. In addition, students with the most severe cognitive disabilities may take alternate assessments if their disabilities prevent them from participating in the general assessment even with accommodations. 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 2008, approximately 13 percent of students with disabilities in grades 3 through 8 and high school were tested using an alternate assessment in math and reading.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

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

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma. |        |        |
|--|--------|--------|
| Year   | Target | Actual |
| 2007   | 57.0   | 56.1   |
| 2008   | 58.0   | 59.0   |
| 2009   | 59.0   | 60.6   |
| 2010   | 60.0   |        |
| 2011   | 61.0   |        |
| 2012   | 62.0   |        |

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students with disabilities who drop out of school. |        |        |
|--|--------|--------|
| Year   | Target | Actual |
| 2007   | 28.0   | 25.5   |
| 2008   | 27.0   | 24.6   |
| 2009   | 26.0   | 22.4   |
| 2010   | 25.0   |        |
| 2011   | 24.0   |        |
| 2012   | 23.0   |        |

**Additional information:** Between 2008 and 2009, 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 4 years and the graduation rate the past 2 years.

Data on graduations and dropouts are collected annually from States by OSERS and through EDEN/EDFacts. In determining progress on these measures, children who have moved, but are not known to have continued in school, are considered dropouts. Prior to 2004, these children were not considered in computing the drop-out rate. This change was made after discussions with State data managers indicated that, in most cases in which children move and are not known to have continued in school, the children have actually dropped out of school. Recent State reports have shown significantly fewer children reported in the “moved, but not known to have continued” category. Some of the improvement in drop-out rates may be attributable to closer tracking by States, which has resulted in some children being reported as continuing in school who would formerly have been reported as “moved, not known to have continued.” As with student achievement data, States have their own definitions and calculations for graduation rates and dropout rates. States will begin implementing a standard graduation rate calculation for the 2010-2011 school year, as required by Department regulation, 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1).

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

#### 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 expects to have baseline data by summer 2011.

#### Efficiency Measure

| <b>Measure:</b> The average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) response to the State. |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|
| Year  | Target | Actual |
| 2007  | 100    | 92     |
| 2008  | 95     | 104    |
| 2009  | 90     | 87     |
| 2010  | 88     |        |
| 2011  | 86     |        |
| 2012  | 86     |        |

**Additional information:** In 2009, the most recent year for which data are available, the Department completed 16 site visits. OSEP responded to States, on average, within 87 days of a site visit. This result surpasses the target for this measure in 2009 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 are 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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

progress and academic achievement of children with disabilities. The National Assessment includes the following activities:

Analytic Support. This contract supports the synthesis of existing evidence and new analyses of extant data sources to address research questions for the IDEA National Assessment targeting four topic areas: (1) outcomes for children with disabilities, (2) identification for early intervention and special education, (3) early intervention and special education services, and (4) early intervention and special education personnel. Priority is being given to completing studies on outcomes and identification, to be followed by studies on services and personnel. Among the data sources being used for the study are the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), data from State academic assessments of children with disabilities, data submitted by States to the Department pursuant to section 618 of the IDEA, population counts by State and year from the National Center for Education Statistics Common Core of Data and the National Vital Statistics System, and data gathered from four national longitudinal studies of children with disabilities (National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study, Pre-Elementary Education Longitudinal Study, Special Education Elementary Longitudinal Study, and National Longitudinal Transition Study-2). The analyses supported by this contract will be completed by February 2011.

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

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

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.

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

The evaluation will rely on existing data and surveys of school principals in 2010 and 2011. Key outcomes for this study align with the outcomes identified in section 664 of the IDEA, which relate to: academic achievement (including reading and mathematics); participation in the general education curriculum; receipt of special education services; receipt of such services in the least restrictive appropriate environment; and grade transitions. Reports are scheduled for release in early 2012 and early 2013.

Other Studies: 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 (NCSER), in the 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 in a September 2010 report. 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 NCSER 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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

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 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.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

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

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

| <u>2011 CR</u>         | <u>2012</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| \$374,099 <sup>1</sup> | \$374,099   | 0             |

---

<sup>1</sup> Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

---

### **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 provide services under this program to preschool-aged children who are experiencing developmental delays, as defined by the State and as measured by appropriate diagnostic instruments and procedures, and 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. The 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 education 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 minimums and maximums regarding the amount a State can receive in any year. No State can receive less

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

than it received in the prior year. In addition, every State must receive an increase equal to the greater of the percentage the appropriation grew above the prior year, minus 1.5 percent, or 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. The increase in a State's allocation may not exceed the percentage increase in the total appropriation from the prior year plus 1.5 percent. These provisions help ensure that every State receives a part of any increase in appropriations and that there is no dramatic 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 as reflected by the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers. 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, these services 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 709,004 in fiscal year 2009 to 731,832 in fiscal year 2010. This is the first increase since fiscal year 2007. These children also make up a larger percentage of the overall population aged 3 through 5 than in 2009, now accounting for 5.74% of the overall population. Despite more children than ever receiving services under this program in fiscal year 2010, 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 2010 level for fiscal year 2011 and 2012.

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

|                   | (\$000s)  |
|-------------------|-----------|
| 2007 .....        | \$380,751 |
| 2008 .....        | 374,099   |
| 2009 .....        | 374,099   |
| Recovery Act..... | 400,000   |
| 2010 .....        | 374,099   |
| 2011 CR.....      | 374,099   |

### **FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$374.1 million for the Preschool Grants program. The request would maintain funding for this program at the FY 2011 CR level. This amount would provide an average of \$511 per child, constant with the amount provided in 2010 and 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 2010 level of 731,832. The Administration 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.

The Administration is requesting \$11.7 billion for the Grants to States program for fiscal year 2012, increasing the fund level from fiscal year 2012 by \$200 million. Funding under Preschool Grants 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 President believes 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. These programs would include the proposed Early Learning Challenge Fund (ELCF), for which the Administration is requesting \$350 million in fiscal year 2012. The ELCF would provide 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.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

#### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

|                              | <u>2010</u> | <u>2011 CR</u>       | <u>2012</u>          |
|------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Children served <sup>1</sup> | 731,832     | 731,832 <sup>2</sup> | 731,832 <sup>2</sup> |
| Share per child (whole \$)   | \$511       | \$511 <sup>2</sup>   | \$511 <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 during the 2008-2009 school year.

#### History of Children Served and Program Funding

| <u>Fiscal Year</u> | <u>Children Served</u><br>(000s) | <u>Appropriation</u><br>(\$000s) | <u>Federal</u><br><u>Share per Child</u><br>(whole \$) |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| 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><br>(000s) | <u>Appropriation</u><br>(\$000s) | <u>Federal</u><br><u>Share per Child</u><br>(whole \$) |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| 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 CR            | 732 <sup>4</sup>                 | 374,099 <sup>4</sup>             | 511 <sup>4</sup>                                       |
| 2012               | 732 <sup>4</sup>                 | 374,099 <sup>4</sup>             | 511 <sup>4</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> 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 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

**Measure:** The percentage of children 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.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

**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.

**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.

**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. Since few Federal programs have attempted to assess their performance based on growth in early childhood outcomes, especially for children with disabilities, the Department has been deliberate about developing and implementing this measure. 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 a few 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 children with disabilities aged 3 through 5.

While States have made significant progress, some data quality issues still exist. In the 2010 APRs, a large number of States had high proportions of 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). The Department will work in the coming year to determine an appropriate threshold for missing data, given these two concerns. In addition, some States are still in the process of implementing their systems for assessing children at entry and exit across all providers and are not yet able to report data on all children served by the program. The Department is concerned that large percentages of missing data in some States may mean that the reported data are not representative of the entire population. For these reasons, the Department is cautious about interpreting the 2010 data and is not yet reporting on actual performance.

A sample of States with higher quality data, exhibits preliminary but encouraging outcomes for these measures. States were eliminated 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. Data for a final sample of 15 States were weighted for national representation. 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, 83 percent in the acquisition and use of knowledge, and 82 percent in the use of appropriate behavior. Outcomes in these States have been fairly consistent over the past 3 years, within a 10 percentage point range.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

As States improved their data collection, there has been a marked increase in the number of children with disabilities served by this program for whom outcome data have been reported each year. Outcomes have not declined as data are reported for more children, so the Department is optimistic that the national data, when complete, will demonstrate that the children served by the program are improving at similar levels. 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. 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.

The Department anticipates that the data collected in either February 2011 or February 2012 are likely to be of high enough quality to report outcomes and set targets for the first time.

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of children with disabilities (aged 3 through 5) who receive special education and related services in a regular early childhood program at least 80 percent of the time. |               |               |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>Target</b> | <b>Actual</b> |
| <b>2007</b>  |               | 42            |
| <b>2008</b>  | 43            | 50            |
| <b>2009</b>  | 43            | 51            |
| <b>2010</b>  | 43            | 53            |
| <b>2011</b>  | 48            |               |
| <b>2012</b>  | 48            |               |

**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.

This measure replaced a previous measure on the extent to which children with disabilities receive their special education services in regular education settings. The earlier measure did not provide any information on where the child spends the bulk of his or her day and the extent to which the child has opportunities to interact with nondisabled peers.

Under the revised data collection, States must report children under one of two categories. Category A includes children attending a regular early childhood program, which is defined as a program in which at least 50 percent of the children are not disabled. The category has three reporting subsets based on the amount of time the child spends in the regular early childhood 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). States began using the revised data collection between October 1 and December 1, 2006, inclusive. These data were reported for fiscal year 2007.

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 show children in programs in which 70 percent or more of the children are not disabled. SEAs and other interested parties submitted extensive comments regarding the proposal and the general

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

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

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>).

| Year | Target | Actual |
|------|--------|--------|
| 2007 | 38     | 34     |
| 2008 | 39     | 38     |
| 2009 | 40     | 39     |
| 2010 | 40     |        |
| 2011 | 41     |        |
| 2012 | 41     |        |

**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.

**Additional information:** The Department did not meet its target for fiscal year 2009, the most recent year for which data are available. However, performance was only one State below the target and 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 steady improvement supports the Department's belief that the targets for fiscal year 2011 and 2012 represent ambitious, but reasonable performance targets. This measure includes the 50 States, D.C., Puerto Rico, the Outlying Areas and the Bureau of Indian Education.

OSEP has a number of investments designed to assist States in preparing a sufficient number of qualified preschool special education personnel. Beginning 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 funds The Center to Mobilize Early Childhood Knowledge (CONNECT), which

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

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.

#### Efficiency Measure

| <b>Measure:</b> The average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) response to the State. |               |               |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| <b>Year</b>   | <b>Target</b> | <b>Actual</b> |
| <b>2007</b>   | 100           | 92            |
| <b>2008</b>   | 95            | 104           |
| <b>2009</b>   | 90            | 87            |
| <b>2010</b>   | 88            |               |
| <b>2011</b>   | 86            |               |
| <b>2012</b>   | 86            |               |

**Additional information:** In 2009, the most recent year for which data are available, the Department completed 16 site visits. OSEP responded to States, on average, within 87.2 days of a site visit. This result surpasses the target for this measure in 2009 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 are 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?

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

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

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

Based on teacher reports, there were no statistically significant differences in the ease with which children transitioned to kindergarten by gender, race/ethnicity, household income, or primary disability. However, there were some statistically significant differences based on parent reports of the ease of children's transition to kindergarten by demographics. Parents of Hispanic children were more likely than parents of Black or White children to report "a somewhat hard" or "very hard" transition to kindergarten. The support and involvement of schools in the process of transitioning to kindergarten was significantly associated with how easy the transition was perceived to be by parents and teachers. For example, 87 percent of parents and 86 percent of teachers reported that the transition was "somewhat" or "very easy" when the school initiated support to facilitate the transition.

For all 3 years of data collection, parents were asked a number of questions about their children's social skills and behavior. Parent reports regarding their children's social skills and behaviors changed significantly during the time their children were receiving preschool services, generally in the direction of improved social skills and fewer behavior problems. The study also found that transfers out of special education were closely associated with children's social skills and the extent that they no longer exhibited problem behaviors (<http://www.peels.org>).

Other Studies: The Department also is conducting the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study program through the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). This program involves two 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.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

During this collection, the majority of the children in the cohort were age-eligible for kindergarten, although all sample children were evaluated, regardless of kindergarten enrollment status. Since about a quarter of the cohort were not age-eligible for kindergarten until fall 2007, a second kindergarten data collection was fielded in 2007 to measure the kindergarten experiences of these children. The ECLS-K followed children through the cohort's eighth grade year in school year 2008-09. The final data for the 8th and final year of data collection was released in July 2009. A new study, the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class of 2010-11 (ECLS-K:2011) replaces the ECLS-K and will be an ongoing study sponsored by 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)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

| <u>2011 CR</u>         | <u>2012</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| \$439,427 <sup>2</sup> | \$489,427   | +\$50,000     |

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2011. The program is proposed for authorization in FY 2012 under appropriations language.

<sup>2</sup> Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

---

### **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. No additional States elected to implement this option in fiscal year 2010.

## 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. Two States opted to extend their provision of Part C services beyond age 3 and received additional funds through this program. States have until September 30, 2011 to expend these funds. The appropriation for fiscal year 2010 did not exceed \$460 million, so the Department did not have the authority to award State Incentive Grants in 2010.

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 organizations, or consortia for the coordination of early intervention services on reservations

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

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

---

with Interior schools. Tribes and tribal organizations can use the funds they receive to provide (1) help to States in identifying Indian infants and toddlers with disabilities, (2) parent training, and (3) early intervention services.

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

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

|                   | (\$000s)  |
|-------------------|-----------|
| 2007.....         | \$436,400 |
| 2008.....         | 435,654   |
| 2009.....         | 439,427   |
| Recovery Act..... | 500,000   |
| 2010.....         | 439,427   |
| 2011 CR.....      | 439,427   |

**FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$489.427 million for the Grants for Infants and Families program for fiscal year 2012, an increase of \$50 million over the fiscal year 2011 CR level. 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 \$1.03 million, enabling States to expand their early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and ensure that the services provided are of high quality and appropriate to the needs of these children. 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 is requesting \$350 million for the Early Learning Challenge Fund in 2012. The Early Learning Challenge Fund would provide competitive grants to States to establish model systems of early learning for children, from birth to kindergarten entry, that promote high standards of quality and a focus on outcomes across settings to ensure that more children enter school ready to succeed, including activities that would enhance inclusive practices to facilitate participation in these programs by children with disabilities. The requested increase for the Part C program would enable State lead agencies to hire personnel to serve as liaisons to State and local educational agencies administering early childhood programs, including those supported through the Early Learning Challenge Fund. State lead agencies could also use the increase in Part C funding to ensure that the interests of the lead agency and those infants and toddlers with disabilities transitioning from programs under Part C of the Act to programs under Part B of

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

the Act are represented on coordinating councils or advisory boards for this and other Federal early childhood programs.

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 are available to States for obligation until September 30, 2011. The requested increase for 2012 would enable the Administration to reserve funds to continue support for these activities in Maryland and New Mexico, as well as for additional States that may elect to extend eligibility for Part C services. At the requested level, up to \$4.414 million could be reserved 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 \$882,810 through a State Incentive Grant.

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

|  | <u>2010</u> | <u>2011 CR</u> <sup>1</sup> | <u>2012</u> <sup>2</sup> |
|--|-------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Range in size of awards to States:                 |             |                             |                          |
| Smallest State regular Part C award <sup>3,4</sup> | \$2,153     | \$2,153                     | \$2,379                  |
| Average State regular Part C award <sup>3</sup>    | \$8,281     | \$8,281                     | \$9,152                  |
| Largest State regular Part C award <sup>3</sup>    | \$53,560    | \$53,560                    | \$59,240                 |
| Estimated number of State Incentive Grant awards   | 0           | 0                           | 8                        |
| Maximum State Incentive Grant award amount         | 0           | 0                           | \$883                    |
| Children served <sup>1</sup>                       | 342,000     | 352,000                     | 360,000                  |

<sup>1</sup> Estimates.

<sup>2</sup> Allocations in FY 2012 would depend on the number and size of State Incentive Grant awards. Since we do not yet know which 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 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

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

**Additional information:** Through their Annual Performance Reports (APRs), States report on the development of social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behavior among children with disabilities served through the Part C program. The Department uses these data to assess outcomes for children served through this program. Measuring growth in these domains, especially for infants and toddlers, is a complicated effort 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 and reliable. 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 four 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 set of entry and exit data for a cohort of infants and toddlers with disabilities.

Although States have made significant progress in collecting and reporting outcomes data, some quality issues persist. In the 2010 APRs, a large number of States had high proportions of missing data. In some cases, States may be unable to collect exit data for certain children (e.g., due to a move to another State, unexpected withdrawal from the program, or death). The Department will work in the coming year to determine an appropriate threshold for missing data. In addition, some States are still in the process of implementing their systems for assessing children at entry and exit across all providers and are not yet able to report data on all children served by the program. The Department is concerned that large percentages of missing data in some States may mean that the reported data are not representative of the entire population.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

Due to these concerns, the Department is not ready to use these data for program performance reporting purposes.

A sample of 19 States with higher quality data exhibits preliminary but encouraging outcomes for these measures. States were eliminated 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. Data for these States were weighted to provide a national estimate. The weighted data indicate that at least 71 percent of infants and toddlers in each category substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program: 71 percent increased their rate of growth in positive social-emotional skills, 76 percent in the acquisition and use of knowledge, and 76 percent in the use of appropriate behavior. Outcomes in these States have been fairly consistent over the past 3 years, within a 10 percentage point range.

As States improved their data collection, there has been a marked increase in the number of infants and toddlers with disabilities served by this program for which outcome data are reported each year. Outcomes have not declined as data are reported for more children, so the Department is optimistic that the national data, when reported, will demonstrate that the children served by the program are improving at similar levels. States have indicated that they believe the data will be useful in their program improvement efforts. 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.

The Department anticipates that the data collected in February 2011 or February 2012 will be of high enough quality to report outcomes and set targets for the first time.

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

| <b>Measure:</b> The number of States that serve at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under age one through Part C. |               |               |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| <b>Year</b>   | <b>Target</b> | <b>Actual</b> |
| <b>2007</b>   | 27            | 24            |
| <b>2008</b>   | 27            | 25            |
| <b>2009</b>   | 27            | 25            |
| <b>2010</b>   | 27            | 25            |
| <b>2011</b>   | 27            |               |
| <b>2012</b>   | 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, and the program has not met its target in any year. 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; 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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

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 as a result.

| <b>Measure:</b> The number of States that serve at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age 2, through Part C. |        |        |
|--|--------|--------|
| Year   | Target | Actual |
| 2007   | 31     | 29     |
| 2008   | 31     | 31     |
| 2009   | 31     | 35     |
| 2010   | 31     | 37     |
| 2011   | 32     |        |
| 2012   | 32     |        |

**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.

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of children receiving age-appropriate early intervention services in the home or in programs designed for typically developing peers. |        |        |
|--|--------|--------|
| Year   | Target | Actual |
| 2007   | 86     | 91     |
| 2008   | 86     | 92     |
| 2009   | 87     | 93     |
| 2010   | 87     |        |
| 2011   | 93     |        |
| 2012   | 93     |        |

**Additional information:** State lead agencies report annually to the Department on the settings in which children receive services provided under the Part C program. 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. To reflect increases in the actual performance of States under this measure, targets beginning with 2011 have been increased. Actual data for 2010 will be available in October 2011.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

#### Efficiency Measures

| <b>Measure:</b> The average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) response to the State. |               |               |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| <b>Year</b>   | <b>Target</b> | <b>Actual</b> |
| <b>2007</b>   |               | 60            |
| <b>2008</b>   |               | 82            |
| <b>2009</b>   | 79            | 80            |
| <b>2010</b>   | 79            |               |
| <b>2011</b>   | 79            |               |
| <b>2012</b>   | 79            |               |

**Additional information:** The Department collects data for this measure through its program monitoring files. In 2007, the Department issued an unusually small number of written responses, so the number of workdays required to issue responses for that year was lower than in a typical year. Although the number of days increased in 2008, the Department reduced the number of days to issue responses in 2009 and continues to make progress toward meeting its target of 79 days. In the fall of 2010, the Office of Special Education Programs revised its reporting format to remove extraneous descriptions and text that is not relevant to the findings in order to ensure that the written responses are issued in a reasonable period of time and are meaningful to the public. Actual data for 2010 will be available in October 2011.

#### Other Performance Information

Through the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study - Birth Cohort (ECLS-B), the National Center for Education Statistics 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 birthweight 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 at: <http://nces.ed.gov/ECLS/birth.asp>.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### National activities: State personnel development

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

| <u>2011 CR</u>        | <u>2012</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| \$48,000 <sup>2</sup> | \$48,000    | 0             |

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2011. The Administration proposes to continue funding this program in FY 2012 through appropriations language.

<sup>2</sup> Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

---

## 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 determine the ultimate amount of each competitive award are: the amount of funds available;

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

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:

|               | (\$000s)       |
|---------------|----------------|
| 2007.....     | 0 <sup>1</sup> |
| 2008.....     | \$22,598       |
| 2009.....     | 48,000         |
| 2010.....     | 48,000         |
| 2011 CR ..... | 48,000         |

---

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

### **FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$48.0 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. The request, which would maintain funding at the FY 2011 CR level, would be used to support 23 continuation awards and 24 new awards.

Personnel shortages and inadequately trained teachers in special education are among the most pressing and chronic problems facing the field. SPD projects assist in addressing critical State and local needs for personnel preparation and professional development identified in the State's Personnel Development Plan. Projects provide personnel with the knowledge and skills to meet the needs of, and improve the performance and achievement of infants, toddlers, preschoolers, and children with disabilities, and to meet the State's performance goals established in accordance with section 612(a)(15) of IDEA. States must develop SPD activities in a collaborative fashion and seek the input of teachers, principals, parents, administrators, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel. 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 ESEA, and who are effective in improving outcomes for children with disabilities. The majority of States have adopted common, internationally benchmarked, college and career-ready academic standards for elementary and secondary school students. States will need assistance in transitioning to and implementing these new standards, including assistance in developing and implementing professional development programs that will provide personnel with the strategies needed to translate the standards into classroom practice. To address this need, the Department plans to give priority in its FY 2011 SPD competition to projects that are designed to support the

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

implementation of common, internationally benchmarked, college- and career-ready academic standards to improve instruction and learning for children with disabilities.

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

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, evidence-based reading instruction, early and appropriate interventions to identify and help children with disabilities, effective instruction for children with low incidence disabilities, and successful transitioning to postsecondary opportunities. Funds also assist States in utilizing classroom-based techniques to assist children prior to referral for special education. Listed below are a few examples of how States are using SPD funds to improve the knowledge and skills of teachers serving children with disabilities.

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 11 regional coordinators who manage technical assistance and training for over 600 participating Michigan schools. In 2009-2010, MiBLSi conducted 393 days of training across the State on evidence-based practices around behavior and reading supports. Outcomes for the four student cohorts (2004 to 2010) in the participating elementary schools include: an average increase of 5 percent each year in students scoring at grade level based on Curriculum-Based Measurement reading assessments; an average increase of 5 percent each year in the 4 student cohorts scoring at grade level on Curriculum-Based Measurement reading assessments; an average reduction of 3 percent each year in students requiring intensive reading supports, and a 10 percent average reduction in the rate of major discipline referrals per year.

- The Commonwealth of Virginia has used its SPD funds to increase the quantity and improve the quality of professional personnel providing leadership and instruction for the statewide educational program for students with disabilities. One of the strategic goals of the project is to improve the performance of students with disabilities on high stakes assessment and increase access to the general curriculum. The entire faculties of high schools participating in the SPD training have received comprehensive personnel development in providing evidence-based instructional practices and strategies. The percentage of students with disabilities from participating high schools who passed 11<sup>th</sup> grade English Standards of Learning Tests (required for a standard or advanced diploma in Virginia) increased by 24 percent from 2007 to 2009. In comparison, the increase in the percentage of students with disabilities who passed these tests across all high schools was 6 percent. Similar results are seen in the feeder middle schools. The majority of the 210 teachers (78 percent) who have been involved with the program for the past 3 years agree that the SPD initiative has led to increased access to the general curriculum for students with disabilities.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

#### Recruiting and Retaining Effective and Highly Qualified Special Education Teachers

The SPD program also supports States in developing and implementing strategies that are effective in promoting the recruitment and retention of 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 improving outcomes for students with disabilities. Listed below are examples of how two States are using SPD funds to recruit and retain effective and highly qualified special education teachers.

- Oklahoma has used its SPD funds to provide stipends for teachers remaining in special education teaching positions in core content areas. The stipends increase for each added year of teaching. In addition, they have provided subgrants to school districts to assist special education teachers to complete their training to become highly qualified in a content area. To date, 66 teachers have completed training and 45 teachers have taken and passed a content area certification test, for an accomplishment rate of 68 percent.
- Florida has used its SPD funds to work with the existing system of regional Personnel Development Partnerships to provide local school districts with a single access point for all professional development planning and implementation for education and related services personnel. Existing programs are being scaled up, including Para-to-Teacher Tuition Support, Induction and Mentoring, Virtual ESE Distance Learning, and Weekends with the Experts programs. A new program aimed at assisting special education teachers to become highly qualified is also being developed and implemented. In addition, Florida's implementation of endorsement courses needed to meet requirements for specific common competencies and training in Pre-Kindergarten Disabilities, Autism Spectrum Disorders, and Severe/Profound Disabilities has led to an increase in the number of personnel serving students with these disabilities.

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

|                                       | <u>2010</u>         | <u>2011 CR</u> | <u>2012</u> |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Project funding:                      |                     |                |             |
| SPD awards                            |                     |                |             |
| New                                   | \$7,478             | \$12,031       | \$23,975    |
| Continuations                         | 40,503 <sup>1</sup> | 35,934         | 23,955      |
| Peer review of new award applications | <u>19</u>           | <u>35</u>      | <u>70</u>   |
| Total funding                         | 48,000              | 48,000         | 48,000      |
| <br>Average award                     | <br>\$1,090         | <br>\$1,021    | <br>\$1,020 |
| <br>Number of awards:                 |                     |                |             |
| New awards                            | 7                   | 12             | 24          |
| Continuation awards                   | <u>37</u>           | <u>35</u>      | <u>23</u>   |
| Total awards                          | 44                  | 47             | 47          |

<sup>1</sup> About \$2,621 thousand of these funds were used to support FY 2011 continuation costs.

## 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 developed for this objective were aligned with the priority developed for the SPD FY 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 FY 2009 as a part of 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 19 (of a possible 20)

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

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 SPDG 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 FY 2011, the Department plans to replace these measures with new ones that are aligned with the current focus of the program and that do not require review panels comprised of non-Federal experts. The Department will use information from the DQI study to guide the development of the new measures and the methodology for assessing performance.

**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 area(s) for which they were trained for at least 2 years after participating in SPDG 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 FY 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 FY 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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

system after 4 years. Alaska plans to continue to follow the later cohorts of teachers who participated in the project.

**Efficiency Measure:** The current efficiency measure is the cost per individual receiving professional development on scientific- or evidence-based practices provided through the SPD program. Performance information for this measure is not available. The Department plans to revise the efficiency measure to align with the new performance measures to be developed.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

| <u>2011 CR</u>        | <u>2012</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| \$49,549 <sup>2</sup> | \$49,549    | 0             |

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2011. The Administration proposes to continue funding this program in FY 2012 through appropriations language.

<sup>2</sup> Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

---

## PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

A majority of the grants currently funded under the TA&D program support individual centers that tend to focus their work on a single substantive area, population, or age range, such as early intervening services, dispute resolution, early childhood, college- and career-readiness, and positive behavioral interventions. 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. The targeted/specific level consists of 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. General/universal technical assistance involves information and services obtained by independent users through their own initiative. Such assistance includes one-time presentations, newsletters, or research syntheses available on center websites. Most activities supported through the TA&D 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.

In addition to facilitating the adoption of model practices, TA&D 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.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

|               | (\$000s) |
|---------------|----------|
| 2007 .....    | \$48,903 |
| 2008 .....    | 48,049   |
| 2009 .....    | 48,549   |
| 2010 .....    | 49,549   |
| 2011 CR ..... | 49,549   |

### **FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2012, the Administration is requesting \$49.5 million for the Technical Assistance and Dissemination (TA&D) program, the same as the FY 2011 CR. The request includes about \$12.9 million (including peer review costs) for new technical assistance and dissemination projects, and \$36.7 million for continuation projects.

TA&D 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. Funds available for new awards would be used to provide technical assistance in such areas as implementing multi-tiered interventions, improving outcomes among students with severe emotional disturbance, and building State capacity to scale up evidence-based practices. The Department will continue to explore strategies for increasing the impact of its TA&D investments, including efforts to make fewer but larger investments in the areas in which there is the greatest need.

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

*Projects focusing on particular topical areas:*

- National Dropout Prevention for Students with Disabilities – This center provides technical assistance that is designed to help States build capacity to develop, select, and implement effective, evidence-based interventions and programs to improve school completion rates among students with disabilities (<http://www.ndpc-sd.org/>).
- Partial support for selected Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) comprehensive technical assistance centers – OSEP has provided partial funding for three content centers since the centers received initial funding in 2005. OSEP funds are used to ensure that appropriate expertise and services related to students with disabilities are included as a part of the centers' efforts to increase State capacity to assist districts and

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

schools in meeting their student achievement goals. A new competition is currently scheduled for fiscal year 2012, although the Department has not yet determined the structure of that competition (<http://www.ed.gov/programs/newcccp/index.html>).

- National Center on Dispute Resolution – This center provides technical assistance that is designed to increase the effective use of mediation and other collaborative strategies to resolve disagreements, frequently between schools and parents of children with disabilities, about services provided through special education and early intervention programs (<http://directionservice.org/cadre/index.htm>).

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

- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center – This center provides technical assistance that is designed to help States develop and implement child and family outcome measures for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with disabilities. These measures can be used in local, State, and national accountability systems (<http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~eco/index.cfm>).

*Projects focusing on children with particular disabilities:*

- Deaf-Blindness Projects – The Department supports State and multi-State projects providing technical assistance on services for children who are both deaf and blind. The Department also supports a coordinating center that provides technical assistance to State and multi-State projects, which will be re-competed in fiscal year 2011 (<http://www.tr.wou.edu/ntac/>).

*Projects focusing on particular audiences:*

- The National Partnership Project – This project promotes coordination and interaction between the networks of national organizations and family groups in an effort to bring stakeholders into the work of States and to share lessons learned among the organizations (<http://www.ideapartnership.org/>).

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

|   | <u>2010</u>                  | <u>2011 CR</u>            | <u>2012</u>  |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| <u>Program funding:</u>                             |                              |                           |              |
| Specialized technical assistance and dissemination: |                              |                           |              |
| New   | 0                            | \$5,000                   | \$3,406      |
| Continuations                                       | <u>\$12,514</u> <sup>1</sup> | <u>7,531</u> <sup>2</sup> | <u>9,414</u> |
| Subtotal  | 12,514                       | 12,531                    | 12,820       |
| Model Demonstration Centers:                        |                              |                           |              |
| New   | 705                          | 1,200                     | 0            |
| Continuations                                       | <u>1,997</u>                 | <u>1,888</u>              | <u>2,450</u> |
| Subtotal  | 2,702                        | 3,088                     | 2,450        |

<sup>1</sup> About \$3,884 thousand of these funds were used to pay 2011 continuation costs.

<sup>2</sup> About \$2,085 thousand of these funds will be used to pay 2012 continuation costs.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

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

|   | <u>2010</u>   | <u>2011 CR</u> | <u>2012</u>    |
|---|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| Regional/Federal Resource Centers:  |               |                |                |
| New   | \$1,271       | 0              | 0              |
| Continuations   | <u>6,741</u>  | <u>\$7,710</u> | <u>\$7,735</u> |
| Subtotal  | 8,012         | 7,710          | 7,735          |
| Early childhood technical assistance:   |               |                |                |
| New   | 0             | 0              | 4,450          |
| Continuations   | <u>5,284</u>  | <u>5,250</u>   | <u>800</u>     |
| Subtotal  | 5,284         | 5,250          | 5,250          |
| Secondary, transition and postsecondary technical assistance:   |               |                |                |
| New   | 0             | 2,400          | 0              |
| Continuations   | <u>3,899</u>  | <u>1,500</u>   | <u>3,900</u>   |
| Subtotal  | 3,899         | 3,900          | 3,900          |
| Technical assistance for children who are both deaf and blind:  |               |                |                |
| New   | 0             | 0              | 0              |
| Continuations   | <u>11,350</u> | <u>11,350</u>  | <u>11,350</u>  |
| Subtotal  | 11,350        | 11,350         | 11,350         |
| Transfers to Elementary and Secondary Education for comprehensive centers:  |               |                |                |
| New   | 0             | 0              | 3,000          |
| Continuations   | 3,000         | 3,000          | 0              |
| Federal technical assistance, technical assistance in data analysis, State and Federal information exchange, other: |               |                |                |
| New   | 0             | 0              | 2,000          |
| Continuations   | <u>2,776</u>  | <u>2,645</u>   | <u>1,009</u>   |
| Subtotal  | 2,776         | 2,645          | 3,009          |
| Peer review of new award applications   |               |                |                |
|   | 11            | 75             | 35             |
| Total:  |               |                |                |
| New   | 1,977         | 8,600          | 12,856         |
| Continuations   | 47,561        | 40,874         | 36,658         |
| Peer review of new award applications   | <u>11</u>     | <u>75</u>      | <u>35</u>      |
| Total   | 49,549        | 49,549         | 49,549         |

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

## PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2012 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

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

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

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

Annual Measures: The three annual measures deal with the quality, relevance, and usefulness of products and services provided by the program. These measures were developed as part of an 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 TA&D program. Targets for 2011 were revised in 2010 to reflect strong performance that exceeded targets.

The actual data and targets for these measures have been adjusted 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 alongside the year in which those data were collected. In addition, two actual data points for the second measure have been corrected from what was reported in previous Congressional Justifications.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

The measures are:

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Technical Assistance and Dissemination products and services deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services. |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|
| Year  | Target | Actual |
| 2007  |        | 80     |
| 2008  | 76     | 94     |
| 2009  | 77     | 87     |
| 2010  | 78     |        |
| 2011  | 90     |        |
| 2012  | 92     |        |

**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 TA&D centers and 10 State Deaf-Blind programs. Each TA&D center included in the sample is asked to submit its best product or service, and the Department's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) randomly selects a typical product or service from a database containing all products and services. Each State Deaf-Blind grantee included in the sample is asked to submit a best product or service, and a typical product or service. Products and services are divided into the categories of policy and practice. Items that are considered to be in the area of practice are reviewed by the science panel, and policy items are reviewed by the State representative stakeholder panel.

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

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of TA&D center products and services that received an average quality rating of 6 or better (27 in FY 2009) by the total number of products and services reviewed (31 in FY 2009). The same calculation is completed for the State Deaf-Blind grantees (e.g., in 2009, 14 products and services received scores of 6 or better, divided by 16 products or services reviewed). The results of these calculations are assigned weights that correspond with the proportion of total program funds expended in each area, and then added together to provide a single overall quality rating for the program.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

Program grantees have made some progress since 2007 in ensuring that products and services are of reasonably high quality. The 2011 target has been adjusted to reflect this performance. 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 drop from the 2008 performance. The Department is planning to monitor individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Technical Assistance and Dissemination products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified members of the target audiences of the technical assistance and dissemination. |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|
| Year  | Target | Actual |
| 2007  |        | 95     |
| 2008  | 94     | 94     |
| 2009  | 94     | 96     |
| 2010  | 94     |        |
| 2011  | 94     |        |
| 2012  | 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 TA&D centers and 10 State Deaf-Blind programs. Each TA&D center included in the sample is asked to submit its best product or service, and OSEP randomly selects a typical product or service from a database containing all products and services. Each State Deaf-Blind grantee included in the sample is asked to submit a best product or service, and a typical product or service. Products and services are divided into the categories of policy and practice. Items that are considered to be in the area of practice are reviewed by the science panel, and policy items are reviewed by the State representative stakeholder panel.

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

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of TA&D center products and services that received an average relevance rating of 6 or better (31 in FY 2009) by the total number of products and services reviewed (31 in FY 2009). The same calculation is completed for the

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

State Deaf-Blind grantees (e.g., in 2009, 13 products and services received scores of 6 or better, divided by 16 products or services reviewed). The results of these calculations are assigned weights that correspond with the proportion of total program funds expended in each area, and then added together to provide a single overall rating for the program.

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

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of all Technical Assistance and Dissemination products and services deemed by experts to be useful by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice. |        |        |
|--|--------|--------|
| Year   | Target | Actual |
| 2007   | 48     | 78     |
| 2008   | 50     | 82     |
| 2009   | 52     | 85     |
| 2010   | 80     |        |
| 2011   | 85     |        |
| 2012   | 87     |        |

**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 TA&D centers and 10 State Deaf-Blind programs. Each TA&D center included in the sample is asked to submit its best product or service, and OSEP randomly selects a typical product or service from a database containing all products and services. Each State Deaf-Blind grantee included in the sample is asked to submit a best product or service, and a typical product or service. Products and services are divided into the categories of policy and practice. Items that are considered to be in the area of practice are reviewed by the science panel, and policy items are reviewed by the State representative stakeholder panel.

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

High usefulness for any individual product or service is defined as a total score of 6 or higher of 9 possible points.

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of TA&D center products and services that received an average usefulness rating of 6 or better (27 in FY 2009) by the total number of products and services reviewed (31 in FY 2009). The same calculation is completed for the State Deaf-Blind grantees (e.g., in 2009, 13 products and services received scores of 6 or better, divided by 16 products or services reviewed). The results of these calculations are assigned weights that correspond with the proportion of total program funds expended in each area, and then added together to provide a single overall rating for the program.

Actual performance at the program level far exceeds established targets through 2009. Targets established for 2010-2012 reflect this higher performance level. Program grantees have made substantial progress in ensuring that products and services are useful. Program grantees will need to continue to produce useful services and products to meet and exceed the adjusted target levels. To improve actual performance under this measure over the next few years, the Department is planning to monitor individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

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

- The percentage of school districts and service agencies receiving TA&D services regarding scientifically- or evidence-based practices for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities that implement those practices. (Targets and a baseline will be established in FY 2011 on the basis of data from 2009 and 2011. In 2009, the first year data were collected for this measure, 30 out of 38 (79 percent) districts and agencies sampled were implementing evidence-based practices.)
- Of the TA&D projects responsible for developing models, the percentage of projects that identify, implement, and evaluate effective models. (Targets and a baseline will be established in FY 2011 on the basis of data from 2009 and 2011. In 2009, the first year data were collected for this measure, 14 out of 16 (88 percent) projects responsible for developing models were actively engaged in identifying, implementing, and evaluating effective models.)

### **Efficiency Measures**

The Department has developed a common efficiency measure for OSEP programs that provide technical assistance. The measure is “the cost per unit of technical assistance.” The TA&D 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 TA&D 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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

per unit was \$1,556. In 2009, the Department disaggregated the cost per unit for each of the three levels of technical assistance. The general/universal cost per unit was \$64, the targeted/specific cost per unit was \$1,531, and the intensive/sustained cost per unit was \$4,754. The Department plans to set targets for this measure after collecting one more year of trend data in 2010.

### **Other Performance Information**

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

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

---

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

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

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

| <u>2011 CR</u>        | <u>2012</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| \$90,653 <sup>2</sup> | \$90,653    | 0             |

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2011. The Administration proposes to continue funding this program in FY 2012 through appropriations language.

<sup>2</sup> Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4<sup>th</sup> Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

---

## **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, beginning special educators, leadership, and low incidence disabilities.

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

Beginning Special Educators. The Secretary is also required to provide support 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 centers under this program. Unlike awards that provide support for scholarships, which are

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

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:

|               | (\$000s) |
|---------------|----------|
| 2007 .....    | \$89,720 |
| 2008 .....    | 88,153   |
| 2009 .....    | 90,653   |
| 2010 .....    | 90,653   |
| 2011 CR ..... | 90,653   |

### **FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year (FY) 2012, the Administration requests \$90.7 million for the Personnel Preparation program, the same level as the FY 2011 CR level. Of this amount, approximately \$20.8 million would be used for new projects (including peer review costs of approximately \$300,000) and \$69.9 million would support the continuation of grants made in prior years.

The Department is currently exploring how funds available to support new activities under this program can be better targeted to 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 evaluations 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 by looking at the effectiveness of graduates in the classroom.

To address these priorities, beginning in FY 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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

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.

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 a recent report, *Teacher Quality Under No Child Left Behind: Final Report*, illustrate the challenge. According to this study, completed by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) for the Department in January 2009, approximately half of all districts in the country reported difficulty attracting highly qualified 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 2006-2008 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.

Beyond the difficulties associated with hiring special educators at all, 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 elementary school special education teachers and 71 percent of those in middle schools.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

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

|   | <u>2010</u>               | <u>2011 CR</u>            | <u>2012</u>   |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| <u>Program funding:</u>                   |                           |                           |               |
| Low incidence disabilities grants:        |                           |                           |               |
| New                                       | \$3,578                   | \$5,122                   | \$3,172       |
| Continuations                             | <u>11,459<sup>1</sup></u> | <u>10,991</u>             | <u>13,057</u> |
| Subtotal                                  | 15,037                    | 16,113                    | 16,229        |
| Leadership training grants:               |                           |                           |               |
| New                                       | 6,446                     | 4,500                     | 4,400         |
| Continuations                             | <u>19,609<sup>2</sup></u> | <u>15,412<sup>3</sup></u> | <u>11,730</u> |
| Subtotal                                  | 26,055                    | 19,912                    | 16,130        |
| Minority institution grants: <sup>5</sup> |                           |                           |               |
| New                                       | 2,718                     | 2,410                     | 2,410         |
| Continuations                             | <u>8,689</u>              | <u>9,128</u>              | <u>9,181</u>  |
| Subtotal                                  | 11,407                    | 11,538                    | 11,591        |
| Program improvement grants:               |                           |                           |               |
| New                                       | 4,076                     | 4,500                     | 4,207         |
| Continuations                             | <u>5,173</u>              | <u>9,803<sup>4</sup></u>  | <u>11,098</u> |
| Subtotal                                  | 9,249                     | 14,303                    | 15,305        |
| Early childhood grants:                   |                           |                           |               |
| New                                       | 5,527                     | 4,901                     | 4,901         |
| Continuations                             | <u>14,619</u>             | <u>15,509</u>             | <u>15,617</u> |
| Subtotal                                  | 20,146                    | 20,410                    | 20,518        |
| Other personnel development grants:       |                           |                           |               |
| New                                       | 1,711                     | 1,517                     | 1,517         |
| Continuations                             | <u>5,024</u>              | <u>4,800</u>              | <u>4,833</u>  |
| Subtotal                                  | 6,735                     | 6,317                     | 6,350         |
| National Activities: <sup>6</sup>         |                           |                           |               |
| New                                       | 356                       | 0                         | 2,000         |
| Continuations                             | <u>1,330</u>              | <u>1,711</u>              | <u>2,180</u>  |
| Subtotal                                  | 1,686                     | 1,711                     | 4,180         |
| Peer review of new award applications     | \$338                     | \$350                     | \$350         |

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

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

|                                       | <u>2010</u> | <u>2011 CR</u> | <u>2012</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| Program Totals:                       |             |                |             |
| New                                   | 24,412      | 22,950         | 22,607      |
| Continuations                         | 65,903      | 67,353         | 67,696      |
| Peer review of new award applications | <u>338</u>  | <u>350</u>     | <u>350</u>  |
| Total                                 | 90,653      | 90,653         | 90,653      |

---

<sup>1</sup> The FY 2010 continuation awards total includes approximately \$43 thousand in FY 2011 continuation costs.

<sup>2</sup> The FY 2010 continuation awards total includes approximately \$6,472 thousand in FY 2011 continuation costs.

<sup>3</sup> The FY 2011 continuation awards total includes approximately \$4,500 thousand in FY 2012 continuation costs.

<sup>4</sup> The FY 2011 continuation awards total includes approximately \$206 thousand in FY 2012 continuation costs.

<sup>5</sup> This category includes awards to institutions with minority enrollments of not less than 25 percent. Under IDEA, Part D, Sec. 681(c)(2), the Secretary is required to reserve not less than 2 percent of the total amount of funds appropriated under Part D, subparts 2 and 3 for outreach and technical assistance activities for historically Black colleges and universities and IHEs with minority enrollments of not less than 25 percent, which translates into \$4,244 thousand in fiscal year 2010, \$4,189 thousand in 2011, and \$4,189 thousand in 2012.

<sup>6</sup> This category includes investments in national centers in a variety of different areas, including the National Center to Enhance the Professional Development of School Personnel Who Share Responsibility for Improving Results for Children with Disabilities, the National Center to Enhance the Training of Personnel Who Share Responsibility for Young Children with Disabilities, the Personnel Development Coordinating Center, the Center to Improve Project Performance, and the National Center on Service Obligations.

#### **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 personnel or training programs. Unfortunately, relatively little is known about the overall effectiveness of the Personnel Preparation program.

The actual data and targets for these measures have been adjusted from prior year Congressional Justifications to more accurately reflect the performance in the year that the activity took place. In previous years, the Department reported data alongside the year in which those data were collected.

#### **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 2012 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.

| <b>Measure:</b> Percentage of degree/certification recipients who maintain employment for 3 or more years in the area(s) for which they were trained and who are fully qualified under IDEA. |               |               |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>Target</b> | <b>Actual</b> |
| <b>2007</b>  |               | 90            |
| <b>2008</b>  |               | 91            |
| <b>2009</b>  | 91            | 65            |
| <b>2010</b>  | 93            |               |
| <b>2011</b>  | 95            |               |
| <b>2012</b>  | 95            |               |

**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 Improvement Act (P.L. 108-446). However, because the NCSO does not have data on 2005

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

graduates eligible for inclusion in this measure, data available for 2010 may not be 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. For FY 2010, this would require the calculation of data for FY 2005 graduates. However, because we do not have data on individuals graduating in that year, the Department calculated 2010 data using the percentage of 2006 graduates completing 3 or more years of service by the time of collection. Under this temporary calculation (to be used for FY 2010 only), 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.

For 2010, the Department determined that 0 percent of 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=0) 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=0), those who reported less than 3 years of acceptable service (n=0), those who reported no acceptable service (n=1), and those for whom no data are available (n=154).

The Department believes that these reported results for 2010 are an underestimate of actual performance due to: a large number of FY 2006 completers with service obligations of less than 3 years (approximately 75 percent); a high degree of non-response among degree recipients (approximately 85 percent) regardless of length of service obligation; and missing data on degree recipients and their required length of service (approximately 92 percent of all FY 2006 completers). The Department is currently working with NCSO and other contractors to increase program graduate response rates and to encourage timely data entry by program directors of service obligation requirements for degree recipients. The Department is also revisiting targets under this measure and working with both grantees and program graduates to ensure that individuals are meeting their service obligation requirements or are being referred for debt collection as outlined in statute. Additionally, the Department plans to draft a new contract for scholar data collection by FY 2013 that it believes will streamline the process and ensure greater data availability and quality.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

| <b>Measure:</b> Percentage of scholars completing Special Education Personnel Preparation funded training programs who are knowledgeable and skilled in evidence-based practices for children with disabilities. |               |               |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>Target</b> | <b>Actual</b> |
| <b>2007</b>  | 46            | 39            |
| <b>2008</b>  | 49            | 40            |
| <b>2009</b>  | 45            |               |
| <b>2010</b>  | 48            |               |
| <b>2011</b>  | 51            |               |
| <b>2012</b>  | 54            |               |

**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 (1,100 students in FY 2008) by the total number of students who completed training programs – including students who passed a test (1,100 students), students who did not pass a test (50 students), students who did not take a test (908 students), students for whom grantees did not know if they took a test (653 students), and students for whom test data was missing (1 student).

The Department does not currently require IHEs receiving program funds to use an independent assessment to assess the knowledge and skills of individuals graduating from institutions supported with program funds. The actual data and targets for this program are unusually low because, while all scholars receiving program funds are included in the denominator, a substantial number of these scholars (approximately 908 out of 2,712 in FY 2008) do not participate in independent assessments. These scholars attend programs at IHEs located in States that do not currently require graduates to pass an independent assessment to measure the knowledge and skills of graduates. Such IHEs either measure knowledge and skills through a “comprehensive,” but not independent, examination process (such as an “oral examination” administered by faculty at the IHE), or through some other mechanism. The Department is currently conducting a number of analyses to determine the extent to which specific management actions may be taken to improve performance on this measure, as well as to determine the validity and reliability of these data. The Department also plans to monitor grantees more closely to determine how they are assessing graduates’ knowledge and skills in evidence-based practices for children with disabilities, and how these alternate approaches compare with the use of an independent assessment.

### Annual Performance Measures

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

In most cases, because the actual data changed substantially, new targets also had to be established. These measures are:

| <b>Measure:</b> Percentage of projects that incorporate scientifically- or evidence-based practices in their curricula. |               |               |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| <b>Year</b>   | <b>Target</b> | <b>Actual</b> |
| <b>2007</b>   | 50            | 56            |
| <b>2008</b>   | 60            | 49            |
| <b>2009</b>   | 65            | 91            |
| <b>2010</b>   | 80            |               |
| <b>2011</b>   | 90            |               |
| <b>2012</b>   | 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 FY 2010 review, 46 syllabi from FY 2009 grantees were included from the following types of projects: early childhood (6 syllabi scored), leadership (13 syllabi scored), low incidence (11 syllabi scored), minority institutions (6 syllabi scored), and program improvement (10 syllabi scored). The average panel scores assigned in each of these areas were: 83.3 percent, 92.3 percent, 90.9 percent, 83.3 percent, and 100 percent, respectively. These individual ratings are then weighted according to the number of syllabi included in each area, yielding a total of 91.3 percent.

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, 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

| <b>Measure:</b> Percentage of scholars who exit training programs prior to completion due to poor academic performance. |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|
| Year  | Target | Actual |
| <b>2007</b>   | 0.99   | 1.4    |
| <b>2008</b>   | 0.99   | 1.6    |
| <b>2009</b>   | 1.9    |        |
| <b>2010</b>   | 1.9    |        |
| <b>2011</b>   | 1.9    |        |
| <b>2012</b>   | 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 1.6 percent of all scholars receiving program funds exited their training programs early due to poor academic performance in 2008, up slightly from 1.4 percent in 2007, but still below the 2.0 percent reported in 2006. This measure is calculated by dividing the total number of scholars exiting their training program in FY 2008 due to poor academic performance (n=57) and dividing it by the total number of scholars completing a training program in FY 2008 (n=2,877) and the number of scholars exiting their training program prior to completion for any reason (n=658).

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.

| <b>Measure:</b> Percentage of degree/certification recipients who are working in the area(s) for which they are trained upon program completion. |        |        |
|--|--------|--------|
| Year   | Target | Actual |
| <b>2007</b>  | 75     | 75     |
| <b>2008</b>  | 78     | 69     |
| <b>2009</b>  | 78     |        |
| <b>2010</b>  | 81     |        |
| <b>2011</b>  | 84     |        |
| <b>2012</b>  | 87     |        |

**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 (1,792 in FY 2008) by all degree and certification recipients who were employed in

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

their area of training (1,792 in 2008), recipients who were not employed in their area of training (270 in 2008), recipients for whom grantees did not know if they were employed upon program completion (337 in 2008), recipients who were not employed (165 in 2008), and recipients for whom employment data were missing (17 in 2008). Individuals who received only an endorsement are excluded from all calculations.

Over time, 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 current recession, shrinking local and State government tax bases, and the increased number of teacher layoffs, we are likely to see more teachers placed "out-of-field" as LEAs attempt to cope with smaller numbers of personnel. 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 placed "out-of-field." 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.

| <b>Measure:</b> Percentage of degree/certification recipients who are working in the area(s) for which they are trained upon program completion and who are fully qualified under IDEA. |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|
| Year  | Target | Actual |
| <b>2007</b>   | 70     | 70     |
| <b>2008</b>   | 72     | 65     |
| <b>2009</b>   | 74     |        |
| <b>2010</b>   | 77     |        |
| <b>2011</b>   | 80     |        |
| <b>2012</b>   | 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 (1,590 for FY 2008) 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 (2,436 for 2008). Note that the population included in calculations for this measure differs from the population included in the previous measure. While the denominator in the previous measure includes all students currently employed, not employed, and those for whom employment status was not known, the denominator here excludes students working in positions for which the State has no licensure or certification requirements. Additionally, scholars who received only an endorsement, as well as students who received leadership

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

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 FY 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:

| <b>Measure:</b> The Federal cost per degree or certification program recipient working in the area(s) in which they were trained upon program completion. |               |               |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| <b>Year</b>   | <b>Target</b> | <b>Actual</b> |
| <b>2007</b>   | \$25,000      | \$24,774      |
| <b>2008</b>   | 25,000        | 24,418        |
| <b>2009</b>   | 25,000        |               |
| <b>2010</b>   | 25,000        |               |
| <b>2011</b>   | 25,000        |               |
| <b>2012</b>   | 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 grantees, both in relation to one another as well as in relation to other Federal programs that provide graduate level scholarships.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

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) (\$80,187,545 in FY 2008) by the number of degree recipients who successfully completed funded training programs closing in that year and who are fully qualified (3,284 in FY 2008).

### 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 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 fall 2011.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### National activities: Parent information centers

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

| <u>2011 CR</u>        | <u>2012</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| \$28,028 <sup>2</sup> | \$28,028    | 0             |

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2011. The Administration proposes to continue funding this program in FY 2012 through appropriations language.

<sup>2</sup> Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

---

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

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 distribution method 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 promoting the use of technology. These technical assistance services enhance the ability 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 (<http://www.parentcenternetwork.org/>).

In order to receive an award for a parent center, an applicant must be a parent organization that has a board of directors, the majority of which 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, and early intervention. The parent and professional members of the board must be broadly representative of the population to be served, including low-income parents and parents of English Learners.

While parent centers act as direct resources for parents and families, they also serve as referral points to other resources such as those available under the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program and from the Institute of Education Sciences. Technical Assistance and Dissemination activities are coordinated with Parent Information Centers 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:

|               | (\$000s) |
|---------------|----------|
| 2007 .....    | \$25,704 |
| 2008 .....    | 26,528   |
| 2009 .....    | 27,028   |
| 2010 .....    | 28,028   |
| 2011 CR ..... | 28,028   |

### **FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration's request for the Parent Information Centers program is \$28.028 million, the same level as the FY 2011 CR 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, or knowledge of the English language.

The training and information provided by the parent centers help ensure that parents have the knowledge and skills to help their children with disabilities succeed. In addition to helping parents better understand the nature of their children's disabilities and their educational and developmental needs, the centers provide training and information on how parents can work with professionals serving their children. For school-aged children, this includes participating with administrators and teachers in the development of their child's individualized education programs (IEPs), as provided for by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (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 tens 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/parentinvguid.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 languages other than English, particularly Spanish (<http://www.cflparents.org/espanol/index.htm>).

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

The parent centers also play an important role in dispute resolution by explaining to parents the benefits of alternative methods of dispute resolution, such as mediation, which States are required by IDEA to make available. These alternative methods of dispute resolution can help avoid costly litigation. As part of that role, parent centers are required, 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 2012 request includes \$22.3 million for new and continuing parent training and information centers, \$3.0 million for new and continuing community parent resource centers, and \$2.4 million to fund continuation awards to provide technical assistance to centers. Together, these 108 centers provide training and information to over a million parents and professionals each year.

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

|  | <u>2010</u>   | <u>2011 CR</u> | <u>2012</u>   |
|--|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| <u>Program funding:</u>                  |               |                |               |
| Parent training and information centers: |               |                |               |
| New                                      | \$3,755       | \$5,353        | \$8,615       |
| Continuations                            | <u>18,308</u> | <u>17,101</u>  | <u>13,763</u> |
| Subtotal                                 | 22,063        | 22,454         | 22,378        |
| Community parent resource centers:       |               |                |               |
| New                                      | 1,000         | 1,000          | 1,000         |
| Continuations                            | <u>1,995</u>  | <u>1,998</u>   | <u>2,000</u>  |
| Subtotal                                 | 2,995         | 2,998          | 3,000         |
| Technical assistance:                    |               |                |               |
| Continuations                            | <u>2,674</u>  | <u>2,329</u>   | <u>2,400</u>  |
| Subtotal                                 | 2,674         | 2,329          | 2,400         |
| Other (contracts):                       |               |                |               |
| Continuations                            | <u>185</u>    | <u>185</u>     | <u>185</u>    |
| Subtotal                                 | 185           | 185            | 185           |
| Peer review of new award applications    | 111           | 63             | 65            |
| Total:                                   |               |                |               |
| New                                      | 4,755         | 6,353          | 9,615         |
| Continuations                            | 23,162        | 21,612         | 18,348        |
| Peer review of new award applications    | <u>111</u>    | <u>63</u>      | <u>65</u>     |
| Total                                    | <u>28,028</u> | <u>28,028</u>  | <u>28,028</u> |

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

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

|  | <u>2010</u> | <u>2011 CR</u> | <u>2012</u> |
|--|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| <u>Number of projects:</u>               |             |                |             |
| Parent training and information centers: |             |                |             |
| New                                      | 15          | 21             | 23          |
| Continuations                            | <u>56</u>   | <u>51</u>      | <u>49</u>   |
| Subtotal                                 | 71          | 72             | 72          |
| Community parent information centers:    |             |                |             |
| New                                      | 10          | 10             | 10          |
| Continuations                            | <u>20</u>   | <u>20</u>      | <u>20</u>   |
| Subtotal                                 | 30          | 30             | 30          |
| Technical assistance:                    |             |                |             |
| Continuations                            | <u>7</u>    | <u>7</u>       | <u>7</u>    |
| Subtotal                                 | 7           | 7              | 7           |
| Other (contracts):                       |             |                |             |
| Continuations                            | <u>3</u>    | <u>3</u>       | <u>3</u>    |
| Subtotal                                 | 3           | 3              | 3           |
| Total:                                   |             |                |             |
| New                                      | 25          | 31             | 33          |
| Continuations                            | <u>86</u>   | <u>81</u>      | <u>79</u>   |
| Total                                    | 111         | 112            | 112         |

#### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

##### **Performance Measures**

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2012 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.*

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

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

Six performance measures have been developed for the Parent Information Centers 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 2012 have been established based on performance data from 2007 to 2010. The measures are:

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of materials used by Parent Information Centers projects that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services. |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|
| Year  | Target | Actual |
| 2007  | 42     | 70     |
| 2008  | 72     | 58     |
| 2009  | 60     | 84     |
| 2010  | 63     | 76     |
| 2011  | 76     |        |
| 2012  | 78     |        |

**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 2010 were representative of all grantees, 1 product and 1 service were drawn from a stratified random sample of 10 community parent resource centers (CPRCs), 7 parent technical assistance centers (PTACs), and 23 parent training and information centers (PTIs) receiving funds in 2009, for a total of 40 products and 40 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 (61 in 2010) by the total number of products and services reviewed (80 in 2010), multiplied by 100 percent. For 2010, this score was 76.3 percent ( $61/80 = .763 \times 100\% = 76.3\%$ ), which is a slight decrease compared to 2009, although it still exceeds the target level. The Department is using the feedback from the expert panel to work with grantees to improve their products and services.

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Parent Information Centers products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified members of the Parent Information Centers target audience. |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|
| Year  | Target | Actual |
| 2007  | 49     | 96     |
| 2008  | 96     | 95     |
| 2009  | 96     | 89     |
| 2010  | 96     | 98     |
| 2011  | 96     |        |
| 2012  | 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 2010 were representative, 1 product and 1 service were drawn from a stratified random sample of 10 CPRCs, 7 PTACs, and 23 PTIs receiving funds in 2009, for a total of 40 products and 40 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 of materials is responsive to priority issues and challenges confronting the target groups. Specifically, the rubric is designed to yield ratings on the basis of the following three dimensions related to relevance: (1) Need (Does the content of the material attempt to solve an important problem or critical issue?); (2) Pertinence (Does the content of the material match the problem or issue facing the target group or groups?); and (3) Reach (To what extent is the content of the material applicable to diverse populations within the target group?). The total score for any individual product or service reviewed is the sum of the three quality dimension sub-scores. High relevance for any individual product or service is defined as a total score of 6 or higher of 9 possible points.

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of individual products and services that received an average relevance rating of 6 or better (78 in 2010) by the total number of products and services reviewed (80 in 2010), multiplied by 100 percent. For FY 2010, this score was 98 percent. ( $78/80 = .975 \times 100\% = 97.5\%$ ).

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 the target. The Department is using the feedback from the expert panel to work with grantees to improve their products and services.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of all Parent Information Centers products and services deemed to be useful by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice. |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|
| Year  | Target | Actual |
| 2007  | 29     | 96     |
| 2008  | 95     | 95     |
| 2009  | 95     | 86     |
| 2010  | 95     | 95     |
| 2011  | 95     |        |
| 2012  | 95     |        |

**Additional Information:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using a panel of six parent stakeholders who assess grant implementation by reviewing a randomly selected sample of materials (n=80) disseminated by the centers. In an effort to ensure that the sample materials reviewed in 2010 were representative, 1 product and 1 service were drawn from a stratified random sample of 10 CPRCs, 7 PTACs, and 23 PTIs receiving funds in 2009, for a total of 40 products and 40 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 to achieve the benefit intended?); and (3) Sustainability (Is it likely that the information derived from the product or service will eventually be used in more than one setting successfully over and over again to achieve the intended benefit?). The total score for any individual product or service reviewed is the sum of the three quality dimension sub-scores. High usefulness for any individual product or service is defined as a total score of 6 or higher of 9 possible points.

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of individual products and services that received an average usefulness rating of 6 or better (76 in 2010) by the total number of products and services reviewed (80 in 2010), multiplied by 100 percent. For FY 2010, this score was 95 percent. ( $76/80 = .950 \times 100\% = 95\%$ ).

Based on the most recent years of data it appears that program grantees do a good job of ensuring that products and services are useful to target audiences. The actual percentage of materials judged to be of high relevance exceeded the target. The Department is using the feedback from the expert panel to work with grantees to improve their products and services.

Long-term Measures: Two long-term measures have been developed for the program for which data are collected every 2 years through an OSEP-supported survey of parents 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 independent survey found parents' answers to questions were not significantly different from the original data and

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

confirmed the accuracy of the data collection methods used for the following long term measures:

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of parents receiving Special Education Parent Information Centers services who promote scientifically- or evidence-based practices for their infants, toddlers, children and youth. |        |        |
|--|--------|--------|
| Year   | Target | Actual |
| 2007   |        | 73     |
| 2009   | 74     | 79     |
| 2011   | 75     |        |
| 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. The National PTI Technical Assistance Center developed the survey. To calculate the measure, a weighted sum of the number of parents whose answers displayed an enhanced knowledge of evidence-based practices is divided by the total number of parents who responded to four relevant survey questions (n=10,925). Baseline data for this relatively new measure were first collected in 2007 and used to establish targets for later years.

Based on just a few years of data it appears that program grantees do a reasonably good job of ensuring that parents receiving parent information centers services promote sound practices for their children. The Department is currently exploring the feasibility of monitoring individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time. Data for fiscal year 2011 will be available in October 2011.

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

**Additional Information:** Data are collected for this new measure by the parent centers every 2 years using telephone interviews with 25 randomly selected parent stakeholders per center. The National PTI Technical Assistance Center developed the survey. To calculate the measure, a weighted sum of the number of parents whose answers displayed an enhanced knowledge of IDEA rights and responsibilities is divided by the total number of parents who responded to three relevant survey questions (n=7,806). The targets were established based on pilot data collected in 2007.

Initial data for this measure suggest that most of the parents receiving services from the grantees believe they enhanced their understanding of their rights and responsibilities under IDEA. However, it is too soon to tell if this level of performance will be maintained. If data in future years are consistent with 2009 data, the Department will make appropriate adjustments to

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

the targets. The Department also is currently exploring the feasibility of monitoring individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time. Data for fiscal year 2011 will be available in October 2011.

### Efficiency Measures

| <b>Measure:</b> The Federal cost per unit of output provided by the Special Education Parent Training and Information Centers, by category. |               |               |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| <b>Year</b>   | <b>Target</b> | <b>Actual</b> |
| <b>2007</b>   |               | \$2.24        |
| <b>2008</b>   | \$2.24        | 1.10          |
| <b>2009</b>   | 2.24          | 1.06          |
| <b>2010</b>   | 2.24          | 1.13          |
| <b>2011</b>   | 1.14          |               |
| <b>2012</b>   | 1.12          |               |

**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. That intensity weight represents the amount of interaction and support required to render each service. For example, IEP facilitation meetings received heavier weights than parent visits to websites. In 2010, the cost per unit of technical assistance for the program was \$1.13.

However, a comparison between the 2010 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 is currently considering revising the intensity weights to better reflect the actual effort and costs of each type of service provided by the centers. In addition, data consistency is still an issue. The dramatic decrease in cost per unit of technical assistance between 2007 and 2008 was attributable to the fact that the “total units of technical assistance” included in the denominator increased by over 5 million when the definition of technical expanded to include outputs such as hits on website materials and newsletters mailed. This ongoing review will help ensure that the results of the efficiency measure are more directly associated with core program outcomes.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### National activities: Technology and media services

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

| <u>2011 CR</u>        | <u>2012</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| \$43,973 <sup>2</sup> | \$33,289    | -\$10,684     |

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension applies through September 30, 2011. The Administration proposes to continue funding this program in FY 2012 through appropriations language.

<sup>2</sup> Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

---

## 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.

Closed captions for deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals are encoded into television transmissions and can be displayed by viewers, at their discretion. 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 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. Television broadcasters must close-caption all programming, with limited exceptions. However, mandatory captioning does not apply to video broadcasted 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 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 IDEA

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

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:

|               | (\$000s) |
|---------------|----------|
| 2007 .....    | \$38,428 |
| 2008 .....    | 39,301   |
| 2009 .....    | 38,615   |
| 2010 .....    | 43,973   |
| 2011 CR ..... | 43,973   |

### FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's request for the Technology and Media Services program is \$33.3 million, a decrease of \$10.7 million from the 2011 CR level. The fiscal year 2012 request would provide approximately \$12.8 million for new awards and approximately \$20.5 million for continuation projects. The request does not include funds for the Greater Washington Educational Television Association (GWETA) and Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Inc. (RFB&D), for which funds were earmarked in 2010. Instead of requesting funds for a specific entity, the Administration proposes to competitively award \$3.3 million of these funds, in combination with other funds available for new awards, for projects that will increase the availability of accessible educational materials and technology for students with disabilities and eliminate the remaining \$10.7 million of formerly earmarked funds.

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

#### Technology

The request includes \$18.3 million for Technology activities, which promote the development, demonstration, and use of technology. This is accomplished primarily through research, for which \$8.7 million is proposed. Of the \$4 million available for new research awards, \$2.5 million would be used to support 11 new projects for Steppingstones of Technology Innovation for Students with Disabilities. These projects are awarded in two phases: development of technology-based interventions and research on effectiveness. These projects focus on curriculum materials and instructional methodologies that use innovative and emerging technology to improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities. An additional

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

\$1.5 million would be available for a new research activity. A possible focus area of this activity is developing technology applications for children at the critical ages of birth to three.

The request would also support continuation funding in fiscal year 2012 for research grants awarded in prior years. Of the \$4.7 million for continuation funding, \$1 million would support the Video Description Research and Development Center, a project to be established in fiscal year 2011 devoted to improving access to new and emerging technologies for students with disabilities. Approximately \$3 million of the continuation funding would support 13 awards for the Steppingstones program.

In addition to research projects, the request for Technology activities includes \$8.6 million for continuation awards to support technical assistance and dissemination activities. Of this, approximately \$3 million would support the Accessible Instructional Materials Personnel Development Center. This center, which will be established in 2011, will assist educational agencies in at least 25 States with training teachers to recognize and diagnose students who are blind or have print disabilities and training local educational agencies to access accessible materials through authorized users and vendors. The goal of this project is to significantly enhance the capacity of education agencies and professionals across the country to deliver accessible instructional materials to students with disabilities.

Other Technology technical assistance and dissemination projects receiving continuation awards under the request include the Family Technology Center, the Center on Technology Implementation, the National Technical Assistance Center on Accessible Instructional Materials, and 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 second 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 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 that are accessible for individuals with disabilities, particularly deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals and blind and other visually impaired individuals. In fiscal year 2012, \$14.7 million would be allocated to these activities.

This amount includes \$8.7 million for a new competition to support the development, production, and distribution of educational materials in accessible formats to students with visual impairments and other print disabilities. The current grantee under this priority, Bookshare for Education, has transformed the provision of educational materials in accessible formats by providing free educational media, including textbooks, much less expensively and more quickly than was previously possible (<http://www.bookshare.org/web/Welcome.html>).

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

The 2012 request would provide a total of \$6 million in continuation funding for Media Services activities. Continuation funds would 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 will develop accessibility solutions appropriate for a variety of media formats (<http://www.diagramcenter.org/>).

Continuation projects also include \$4 million to support two 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 since, unlike closed captioning, there are very few Federal requirements for providing video descriptions. Information on the current captioning and description project is available at <http://www.dcmp.org>.

The IDEA requires the Department to support the National Instructional Materials Access Center (NIMAC), which is noncompetitively awarded to the American Printing House for the Blind. 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 \$584,680 for a new award for this project in fiscal year 2012.

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**National activities: Technology and media services**

---

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

|   | <u>2010</u>                | <u>2011 CR</u>            | <u>2012</u>  |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| <u>Program funding:</u>   |                            |                           |              |
| <b>Technology:</b>  |                            |                           |              |
| Research:   |                            |                           |              |
| New   | \$2,500                    | \$4,069                   | \$4,000      |
| Continuations   | <u>3,222</u>               | <u>3,489</u>              | <u>4,668</u> |
| Subtotal  | 5,722                      | 7,558                     | 8,668        |
| Technical assistance and dissemination:   |                            |                           |              |
| New   | 0                          | 9,000                     | 0            |
| Continuations   | <u>7,150</u> <sup>1</sup>  | <u>2,974</u> <sup>2</sup> | <u>8,600</u> |
| Subtotal  | 7,150                      | 11,974                    | 8,600        |
| Projects to address the postsecondary, vocational, technical, continuing, and adult education needs of individuals with deafness: |                            |                           |              |
| New   | 0                          | 1,000                     | 0            |
| Continuations   | <u>1,000</u>               | <u>0</u>                  | <u>1,000</u> |
| Subtotal  | 1,000                      | 1,000                     | 1,000        |
| Appropriation earmark for Greater Washington Educational Television Association (GWETA):  |                            |                           |              |
|   | 737                        | 0                         | 0            |
| <b>Subtotal, Technology:</b>  |                            |                           |              |
| New   | 2,500                      | 14,068                    | 4,000        |
| Continuations   | 11,372 <sup>1</sup>        | 6,464 <sup>2</sup>        | 14,268       |
| Appropriation Earmark   | <u>737</u>                 | <u>0</u>                  | <u>0</u>     |
| Subtotal  | 14,609                     | 20,532                    | 18,268       |
| <b>Media services:</b>  |                            |                           |              |
| Instructional materials and educational media in accessible formats:  |                            |                           |              |
| New   | 3,500                      | 1,500                     | 8,705        |
| Continuations   | <u>11,652</u> <sup>1</sup> | <u>7,036</u>              | <u>5,399</u> |
| Subtotal  | 15,152                     | 8,536                     | 14,104       |

---

<sup>1</sup> The fiscal year 2010 funds cover a portion of the continuation costs for fiscal year 2011.

<sup>2</sup> The fiscal year 2011 funds cover a portion of the continuation costs for fiscal year 2012.

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**National activities: Technology and media services**

---

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

|  | <u>2010</u>         | <u>2011 CR</u> | <u>2012</u>  |
|--|---------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Appropriation earmark for Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Inc.       | \$13,250            | 0              | 0            |
| National Instructional Materials Access Center (NIMAC) – Statutory earmark |                     |                |              |
| New  | 0                   | \$585          | 0            |
| Continuations  | <u>585</u>          | <u>0</u>       | <u>\$585</u> |
| Subtotal   | 585                 | 585            | 585          |
| <b>Subtotal, Media services:</b>   |                     |                |              |
| New  | 3,500               | 2,085          | 8,705        |
| Continuations  | 12,237 <sup>1</sup> | 7,036          | 5,984        |
| Appropriation Earmarks   | <u>13,250</u>       | <u>0</u>       | <u>0</u>     |
| Subtotal   | 28,987              | 9,121          | 14,689       |
| <b>Other (e.g. program evaluation contracts):</b>                          |                     |                |              |
| New  | 0                   | 0              | 0            |
| Continuations  | <u>249</u>          | <u>246</u>     | <u>246</u>   |
| Subtotal   | 249                 | 246            | 247          |
| <b>Unallocated:</b>  | 0                   | 13,987         | 0            |
| <b>Peer review of new award applications:</b>                              | 129                 | 87             | 87           |
| <b>Total:</b>  |                     |                |              |
| New  | 6,129               | 16,241         | 12,792       |
| Continuations  | 23,857              | 13,746         | 20,497       |
| Unallocated  | 0                   | 13,987         | 0            |
| Appropriation earmarks   | <u>13,987</u>       | <u>0</u>       | <u>0</u>     |
| Total  | 43,973              | 43,973         | 33,289       |

---

<sup>1</sup> The fiscal year 2010 funds cover a portion of the continuation costs for fiscal year 2011.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

## 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 2012 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 is a measure of efficiency.

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.*

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Technology and Media Services projects judged to be of high quality. |               |               |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>Target</b> | <b>Actual</b> |
| <b>2007</b>  |               | 80            |
| <b>2008</b>  |               | 83            |
| <b>2009</b>  | 82            | 100           |
| <b>2010</b>  | 83            | 97            |
| <b>2011</b>  | 97            |               |
| <b>2012</b>  | 97            |               |

**Additional Information:** The actual percentage of products judged to be of high quality far exceeded the target for fiscal year 2010, although it decreased slightly from fiscal year 2009. The Department set the targets for fiscal years 2011 through 2012 based on the high quality scores of the most recent 2 years of data. Fiscal year 2011 data are expected for this program in October 2011.

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

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 validity of the data has improved during the last few years because the methodology followed during the panel reviews has become more consistent and reliable over time.

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Technology and Media Services projects judged to be of high relevance to improving outcomes of infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities. |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|
| Year  | Target | Actual |
| 2007  |        | 91     |
| 2008  | 91     | 100    |
| 2009  | 93     | 100    |
| 2010  | 95     | 97     |
| 2011  | 97     |        |
| 2012  | 97     |        |

**Additional Information:** In fiscal year 2010, the percentage of products judged to be of high relevance for this measure decreased, although it continued to exceed the target. The reviewers judged 31 of the 32 products in the sample to be highly relevant. The Department set higher targets for this measure starting in fiscal year 2011 based on the consistent results obtained during the 3 most recent years of data. In fiscal year 2010, nearly all projects funded under this authority had very high scores on this measure for the third year in a row. The Department will reevaluate the criteria for the relevance scores to ensure that only the best products are receiving high ratings.

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. 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

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Special Education Technology and Media Services projects that produce findings, products, and/or services that contribute to improving results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities. |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|
| Year  | Target | Actual |
| 2007  |        | 82     |
| 2008  |        | 82     |
| 2009  | 83     | 100    |
| 2010  | 84     | 97     |
| 2011  | 97     |        |
| 2012  | 97     |        |

**Additional Information:** The actual figure for fiscal year 2010 far exceeds the target, although it slightly decreased compared to the previous year. Based on the most recent 2 years of actual data, the Department has raised the targets for fiscal year 2011 and subsequent years. Data for fiscal year 2011 are expected in October 2011.

The scores appearing 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 for which data will be collected every 2 years.

**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.*

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Special Education Technology and Media Services projects that validate their products and services. |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|
| Year  | Target | Actual |
| 2008  |        |        |
| 2009  |        | 73     |
| 2010  |        | 63     |
| 2011  |        |        |
| 2013  |        |        |

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

This is the second year that data have been collected for this measure. The Department will set appropriate targets for these measures after we receive and analyze a third year of data. 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 projects or completed the final year of their grants and submitted a final report. In fiscal 2010, all eight projects that were asked to submit evidence responded. Fiscal year 2011 data for this long term measure are expected in October 2011.

**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.*

| <b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Special Education Technology and Media Services projects that make validated technology products and services available for widespread use. |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|
| Year  | Target | Actual |
| 2008  |        |        |
| 2009  |        | 94     |
| 2010  |        | 100    |
| 2011  |        |        |
| 2013  |        |        |

This is the second year that data have been collected for this measure. The Department will set appropriate targets for these measures after we receive and analyze a third year of data. For this measure, a panel of six to eight special education external experts reviews and scores the extent to which the each project 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 8 centers that entered the dissemination phase of their projects or completed the final year of their grants and submitted a final report. Fiscal year 2011 data for this long term measure are expected in October 2011.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department has revised the efficiency measures for the Technology and Media Services program for fiscal year 2010. Previously, a single efficiency measure attempted to summarize the unit cost of the diverse set of activities in this program. This measure was “the Federal cost per unit of technology and media services, by category, weighted by the expert panel quality rating.” However, the Department had concerns regarding the validity of the methodology for combining technology and media into a single measure. Therefore, the Department is reporting these technology and media measures separately and dropping the weighting procedure in order to improve the transparency and validity of the efficiency data.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

| <b>Measure:</b> The Federal cost per unit of technology products and services funded by the Technology and Media Services program. |        |           |
|--|--------|-----------|
| Year   | Target | Actual    |
| <b>2007</b>  |        |           |
| <b>2008</b>  |        | \$216,878 |
| <b>2009</b>  |        | 126,809   |
| <b>2010</b>  |        | 156,285   |
| <b>2011</b>  |        |           |
| <b>2012</b>  |        |           |

In fiscal year 2010, the average cost per product developed was \$156,285. This technology measure is 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. Only four projects submitted sufficient data for this measure in 2010, a starting point the Department will work to improve upon in future years. Data for fiscal years 2008 and 2009 was calculated during fiscal year 2010 based on cost data submitted in prior years. Data will be available for fiscal year 2011 by December 2011. The Department continues to consider alternative methods for accurately measuring the efficiency of research and product development activities, and may implement changes to this measure in future years.

| <b>Measure:</b> The Federal cost per hour of video description funded by the Technology and Media Services program. |        |         |
|---|--------|---------|
| Year  | Target | Actual  |
| <b>2007</b>   |        |         |
| <b>2008</b>   |        | \$3,422 |
| <b>2009</b>   |        | 1,393   |
| <b>2010</b>   |        | 1,781   |
| <b>2011</b>   |        |         |
| <b>2012</b>   |        |         |

The media services measure is calculated as the amount of funding provided for description activities (\$3,629,581 in 2010) divided by the numbers of hours of accessible described media produced (2037.75 hours in 2010). The cost of an hour of media description decreased from fiscal years 2008 to 2010, possibly due to the ongoing rapid advances of technology in this field. During the last several years, video description has overtaken captioning to become the primary activity of grantees in this area because of the expanding scope of Federal captioning requirements. Evidence-based targets for this measure will be developed based on an analysis of the cost of video description services on the open market and prior year trends. The Department anticipates that data will be available for fiscal year 2011 by December 2011.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### Special Olympics education programs

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

| <u>2011 CR</u>       | <u>2012</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| \$8,095 <sup>2</sup> | \$8,095     | 0             |

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2010. The program is proposed for authorization in FY 2012 under appropriations language.

<sup>2</sup> Funding levels in FY 2011 represent the annualized continuing resolution levels of the 4th Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 111-322).

---

## 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:

- Activities to promote the expansion of Special Olympics, including activities to increase the participation of individuals with intellectual disabilities within the United States; and
- 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.

The Department currently supports the following Special Olympics activities:

Project UNIFY—This project has received the largest share of funding under this program. Project UNIFY is designed to bring youth together through sports to develop teamwork skills and increase awareness and social acceptance of individuals with intellectual disabilities by supporting a variety of activities including Young Athletes, Partners Clubs, Youth Summits, R-Word Assemblies and Rallies for Respect, “Get Into It”, and Athlete Leadership Programs. Participation in traditional Special Olympics games and sporting events are also supported through Project UNIFY. In FY 2010, a total of 1,562 schools offered Project UNIFY activities, including 790 schools which became involved with the Special Olympics and offered activities for the first time.

Special Olympics National and World Games—Funding has supported the 2009 World Winter Games in Boise, Idaho and the 2010 National Games in Lincoln, Nebraska.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Other activities: Special Olympics education programs

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

|               | (\$000s) |
|---------------|----------|
| 2007.....     | 0        |
| 2008.....     | \$11,790 |
| 2009.....     | 8,095    |
| 2010.....     | 8,095    |
| 2011 CR ..... | 8,095    |

### FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$8.095 million for Special Olympics education programs, the same as the FY 2011 CR level. 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). The Administration believes the activities supported under this program assist individuals with intellectual disabilities in becoming productive members of their communities by dispelling negative stereotypes and promoting positive and supportive learning environments.

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

|  | <u>2010</u> | <u>2011 CR</u> | <u>2012</u> |
|--|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| <b>Project UNIFY</b>                                   |             |                |             |
| Number of State projects                               | 42          | 42             | 42          |
| Schools offering project UNIFY activities <sup>1</sup> | 1,562       | 1,562          | 1,562       |

---

<sup>1</sup> The number of project participants for 2011 and 2012 is based on recipient-reported estimates for FY 2010.

### 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 that will demonstrate the expansion of the Special Olympics and the implementation of Special Olympics Education programs. The Department is also working with Special Olympics to develop performance indicators relevant to program objectives such as school climate and inclusiveness.

#### 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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **Other activities: Special Olympics education programs**

---

project success. Special Olympics reported difficulty in developing process and outcome measures as planned due to the differences in program implementation. However, the first year final report indicated that Project UNIFY was succeeding in reaching out to new schools and expanding the Special Olympics; 38 percent of the over 1,700 schools participating in Project UNIFY had no prior relationship with other Special Olympics programs.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### **Mentoring for individuals with intellectual disabilities**

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 1)

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

| <u>2011 CR</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|----------------|-------------|---------------|
| 0              | \$5,000     | +\$5,000      |

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. Reauthorizing language is sought for FY 2012.

---

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The purpose of the Mentoring for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities program is to support activities to increase the participation of people with intellectual disabilities in social relationships and other aspects of community life, including education and employment, within the United States.

The Administration is committed to ending the social isolation of people with intellectual disabilities and helping them become part of mainstream society. The Administration believes that mentoring relationships between individuals with disabilities and their non-disabled peers can foster self-esteem, build confidence, and provide advice, information, and encouragement that can assist individuals with intellectual disabilities succeed in school, secure rewarding jobs, and live independently.

### **FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$5 million in 2012 for the first year of the Mentoring for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities program. The Department would use these funds to support competitive awards to projects that support mentoring activities for people with intellectual disabilities in the United States.

Supported mentoring activities would promote meaningful relationships between individuals with intellectual disabilities and their non-disabled peers in order to help increase the self-esteem, confidence, and abilities of people with intellectual disabilities. These activities would also provide opportunities for fostering positive interactions in which non-disabled peers model age-appropriate social and work skills and behaviors that can assist individuals with intellectual disabilities to be successful in integrated school, employment, and community settings.

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**Other activities: Mentoring for individuals with intellectual disabilities**

---

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

|   | <u>2012</u> |
|---|-------------|
| <b>Mentoring for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities</b> |             |
| Number of new awards  | 5           |
| Average new award   | \$1,000     |
| Total new award funding   | \$5,000     |
| <br>  |             |
| Total award funding   | \$5,000     |

**PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

The Department has not yet developed performance measures for this proposed program, but will do so later in 2011. Program performance would be assessed through annual grantee reporting on indicators established by the Secretary and would align with the measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes identified in grant applications.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

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

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

FY 2012 Authorization (\$000s): 0<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

| <u>2011 CR</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>Change</u> |
|----------------|-------------|---------------|
| 0              | \$30,000    | +\$30,000     |

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2011. The Administration proposes to fund this program in FY 2012 through appropriations language.

---

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI program 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 outcomes of children who receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI) including their health status, both physical and emotional, and education and post-school outcomes, 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. 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. Possible strategies States could use include 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, and mentoring.

In addition to this FY 2012 PROMISE request, the Administration is requesting \$10 million for the Social Security Administration to evaluate these projects and to provide incentive payments to States based on positive outcomes. Incentive payments will be awarded to States whose projects produce positive outcomes for children and their families. States will be eligible to reinvest in the program any savings from reduced SSI payments that result from children exiting the SSI program due to these improved outcomes. The evaluation will be jointly developed by the participating Federal agencies, including the Department of Education. The SSA will also increase its use of Continuing Disability Reviews (CDRs) and Redeterminations to document medical and financial status.

The budget request would allow the Department of Education to use up to \$6 million of funding for the PROMISE initiative to support Pay for Success awards, a multi-agency productivity initiative designed to employ "pay for performance" models to drive better results and greater

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

cost-efficiency from Federal 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. Using a Pay for Success award, a Federal agency or a State or local government can provide new intervention services to a targeted population and pay only for the results that are achieved.

As one example of how this approach might work in the PROMISE program, a Pay for Success agreement - developed in partnership with the Department of Education, the State, and an intermediary representing the social investors - would obligate the Secretary of Education to pay for outcomes achieved by a non-governmental service provider based on terms and conditions set forth in the agreement. This State-sponsored pilot would be designed to achieve better outcomes for the target population by attracting private investment to finance new interventions to augment government services for the target population. For example, the additional services could include legal assistance in accessing services or out-of-school time academic enrichment. 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. If the outcomes are not achieved, Federal funds would not be disbursed under the Pay for Success Agreement and any funds that had been obligated could be redirected to the Special Education Grants to States program for allocation under that formula.

### **FY 2012 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$30 million in FY 2012 for the PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI program. This request will provide funding for substantial demonstration programs 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.

SSA, which administers SSI, is an efficient cash benefit provider but provides no 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, 58 percent of child SSI recipients immediately continue to receive SSI as adults. 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. 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. This program would support States in increasing uptake of

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

these services by enabling the design of a more comprehensive and coordinated service delivery system not currently available under the individual programs. The incentive payment structure of this program advances the Administration's efforts to reward innovative efforts resulting in positive outcomes for program beneficiaries. The subsequent rigorous evaluation of State pilot demonstrations will complement the current study by the SSA of its Youth Transition Demonstration to inform any future efforts to promote improved outcomes of children who receive SSI.

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. These 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;
- A negotiated payment level for outcomes that provides private investors with a sufficient return if the intervention is successful and improves the cost-effectiveness of government investments.

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 above conditions exist and investors show interest.

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

|                   | <u>2012</u>           |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Program funding:  | \$30,000 <sup>1</sup> |
| Average award:    | \$10,000              |
| Number of awards: | 3                     |

---

<sup>1</sup> Not to exceed \$6,000 thousand of the program funding may be used for Pay for Success projects.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

Other activities: PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI

---

### **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**

#### **Performance Measures**

No performance measures have yet 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 outcomes related to education and employment of child SSI recipients and the family or household. 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. Monthly earnings are among the administrative data collected by the SSA, and can be used to measure the economic well-being of children and their families or households. 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. Other 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.