

Department of Education
SPECIAL EDUCATION
Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language	J-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	J-3
Appropriation Adjustments and Transfers	J-7
Summary of Changes	J-8
Authorizing Legislation.....	J-9
Appropriations History.....	J-11
Significant Items in FY 2013 Appropriations Reports.....	J-13
Summary of Request	J-14
Activities:	
State grants:	
Grants to States	J-16
Preschool grants	J-37
Grants for infants and families	J-50
National activities:	
State personnel development.....	J-61
Technical assistance and dissemination.....	J-69
Personnel preparation	J-80
Parent information centers.....	J-96
Educational Technology, Media, and Materials.....	J-107
Other activities:	
Special Olympics education programs.....	J-119
PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI	J-125
State Tables*	

*State tables reflecting final 2013 allocations and 2014 estimates will be posted on the Department's Web page at: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/statetables/index.html#update>.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

For carrying out the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act ("IDEA") and the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004, \$12,657,307,000, of which \$2,289,108,000 shall become available on July 1, 2014, and shall remain available through September 30, 2015, and of which \$10,124,103,000 shall become available on October 1, 2014, and shall remain available through September 30, 2015, for academic year 2014-2015:¹ *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 2013, 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 2013:² *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, without regard to section 611(d) of the IDEA, distribute to all other States (as that term is defined in section 611(g)(2)), subject to the third proviso, any amount by which a State's allocation under section 611(d), from funds appropriated under this heading, is reduced under section 612(a)(18)(B), according to the following: 85 percent on the basis of the States' relative populations of children aged 3 through 21 who are of the same age as children with disabilities for whom the State ensures the availability of a free appropriate public education under this part, and 15 percent to States on the basis of the States' relative populations of those children who are living in poverty:³ *Provided further*, That the Secretary may not distribute any funds under the previous proviso to any State whose reduction in allocation from funds appropriated under this heading made funds available for such a distribution:⁴ *Provided further*, That the States shall allocate such funds distributed under the second proviso to local educational agencies in accordance with section 611(f):⁵ *Provided further*, That the amount by which a State's allocation under section 611(d) of the IDEA is reduced under section 612(a)(18)(B) and the amounts distributed to States under the previous provisos in fiscal year 2012 or any subsequent year shall not be considered in calculating the

awards under section 611(d) for fiscal year 2013 or for any subsequent fiscal years:⁶ *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, notwithstanding section 643(e)(1) of the IDEA, reserve up to \$2,710,000 of the amount provided under section 644 for incentive grants to States to carry out section 635(c):⁷ *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:⁸ *Provided further*, That the funds reserved under section 611(c) may be used to provide technical assistance to States to improve the capacity of the States to meet the data collection requirements of sections 616 and 618 and to administer and carry out other services and activities to improve data collection, coordination, quality, and use under Parts B and C of the IDEA:⁹ *Provided further*, That the level of effort a local educational agency must meet under section 613(a)(2)(A)(iii) of the IDEA, in the year after it fails to maintain effort is the level of effort that would have been required in the absence of that failure and not the LEA's reduced level of expenditures:¹⁰ *Provided further*, That the Secretary may use funds made available for the State Personnel Development Grants program under Part D, subpart 1 of IDEA to evaluate program performance.¹¹

NOTES

A full-year 2013 appropriation for this account was not enacted at the time the budget was prepared; therefore, this account is operating under a continuing resolution (P.L.112-175).

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><u>¹...\$12,657,307,000, of which \$2,289,108,000 shall become available on July 1, 2014, and shall remain available through September 30, 2015, and of which \$10,124,103,000 shall become available on October 1, 2014, and shall remain available through September 30, 2015, for academic year 2014-2015:</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><u>² <i>Provided</i>, That the amount for section 611(b)(2) of the IDEA shall be equal to the lesser of the amount available for that activity during fiscal year 2013, 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 2013:</u></p>	<p>This language limits the amount of funds required to be transferred to the Department of the Interior under the Grants to States program to the lesser of an amount equal to the amount transferred to the Department of the Interior in 2012 plus inflation or the percent change in the appropriation for the Grants to States program. This language also clarifies that in the event of a decrease or no change in the appropriation for the Grants to States program, the amount of funds required to be transferred to the Department of the Interior remains level with the amount they received under the fiscal year 2013 appropriation.</p>

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><u>⁶ <i>Provided further, That the amount by which a State's allocation under section 611(d) of the IDEA is reduced under section 612(a)(18)(B) and the amounts distributed to States under the previous provisos in fiscal year 2012 or any subsequent year shall not be considered in calculating the awards under section 611(d) for fiscal year 2013 or for any subsequent fiscal years:</i></u></p>	<p>This language allows the Department to calculate a State's allocation under section 611(d) in future years without regard to reductions in awards made as a result of a failure to meet the maintenance of financial support requirements in section 612. This language mitigates the potential long-term impact of one-time reductions in awards.</p>
<p><u>⁷ <i>Provided further, That the Secretary may, notwithstanding section 643(e)(1) of the IDEA, reserve up to \$2,710,000 of the amount provided under section 644 for incentive grants to States to carry out section 635(c):</i></u></p>	<p>This language permits the Secretary to use up to \$2,710,000 of the funds appropriated for Part C of the IDEA for incentive grants for States to serve children 3 years of age until entrance into elementary school.</p>
<p><u>⁸ <i>Provided further, That funds made available for the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004 may be used to support expenses associated with the Special Olympics National and World Games:</i></u></p>	<p>This language authorizes funds made available for the Special Olympics Sports and Empowerment Act of 2004 to be used to support expenses associated with Special Olympics National and World games.</p>
<p><u>⁹ <i>Provided further, That the funds reserved under section 611(c) may be used to provide technical assistance to States to improve the capacity of the States to meet the data collection requirements of sections 616 and 618 and to administer and carry out other services and activities to improve data collection, coordination, quality, and use under Parts B and C of the IDEA:</i></u></p>	<p>This language authorizes the Department to use funds available under section 611(c) to provide technical assistance and support to States on a broad range of issues, including compliance with applicable privacy laws and appropriate coordination and linking of information within and across Federal, State and local data systems for the unique needs of students with disabilities and their families and the purposes of the IDEA programs and data collections.</p>

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>¹⁰ <u>Provided further, That the level of effort a local educational agency must meet under section 613(a)(2)(A)(iii) of the IDEA, in the year after it fails to maintain effort is the level of effort that would have been required in the absence of that failure and not the LEA's reduced level of expenditures:</u></p>	<p>This language clarifies that the level of effort a LEA must meet under maintenance of financial support requirements in section 613 of the IDEA, in the year after it fails to maintain effort is the level of effort that would have been required in the absence of that failure and not the LEA's reduced level of expenditures.</p>
<p>¹¹ <u>Provided further, That the Secretary may use funds made available for the State Personnel Development Grants program under Part D, subpart 1 of IDEA to evaluate program performance.</u></p>	<p>This language permits the Secretary to use funds authorized for the State Personnel Development Grants program under Part D of the IDEA to evaluate program performance.</p>

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Appropriation Adjustments and Transfers
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2012	2013	2014
Discretionary:			
Appropriation	\$12,647,066	\$12,640,709	\$12,657,307
Across-the board reduction (P.L. 112-74)	-6,357	0	0
Across-the board increase (P.L. 112-175)	<u>0</u>	<u>20,547</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, adjusted discretionary appropriation	12,640,709	12,661,256	12,657,307
Advance:			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-9,283,383	-9,283,383	-10,124,103
Advance from prior year	<u>8,576,143</u>	<u>9,283,383</u>	<u>9,283,383</u>
Total, budget authority	11,933,469	12,661,256	11,816,587

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Summary of Changes
(dollars in thousands)

2012	\$12,640,709
2014	<u>12,657,307</u>
Net change.....	+16,598

Increases:	<u>2012 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Increase in funding for Grants for Infants and Families (Part C).	\$442,710	+\$20,000
Increase in funding for State Personnel Development grants to support new awards.	43,917	<u>+1,094</u>
Subtotal, increases		+21,094
Decreases:	<u>2012 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Eliminates funding for PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI (IDEA D-663), which is now being funded through the Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research account.	\$1,996	-\$1,996
Reduction in funding for the Personnel Preparation program (section 662).	88,299	<u>-2,500</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-4,496
Net change		+16,598

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Authorizing Legislation

(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2013 Authorized	2013 Estimate	2014 Authorized	2014 Request
State Grants:				
Grants to States (<i>IDEA-B-611</i>)	Indefinite ¹	\$11,577,855 ²	Indefinite ¹	\$11,577,855 ²
Preschool grants (<i>IDEA-B-619</i>)	Indefinite	372,646	Indefinite	372,646
Grants for infants and families (<i>IDEA-C</i>)	0 ³	442,710	0 ³	462,710
National activities:				
State personnel development (<i>IDEA-D-1</i>)	0 ³	43,917	0 ³	45,011
Technical assistance and dissemination (<i>IDEA-D-2-663</i>)	0 ³	46,781 ⁴	0 ³	46,781
Personnel preparation (<i>IDEA-D-2-662</i>)	0 ³	88,299	0 ³	85,799
Parent information centers (<i>IDEA-D-3-671-673</i>)	0 ³	28,917	0 ³	28,917
Technology and media services (<i>IDEA-D-3-674</i>)	0 ³	29,588	0 ³	29,588
Special Olympics education programs (<i>SOSEA</i> ⁵ 3(a))	0 ⁶	8,000 ⁴	0 ⁶	8,000
PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI (<i>IDEA-D-2-663</i>)	<u>0⁷</u>	<u>1,996</u>	<u>0⁷</u>	<u>0</u>
Total definite authorization	0		0	
Total annual appropriation		12,640,709		12,657,307
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				706,806
Portion of request not authorized				0
Total appropriation including 0.612 percent ATB increase		12,661,256		

¹ Funding for technical assistance on State data collection is limited to \$25,000 thousand adjusted for inflation. This amount is estimated to be \$31,259,054 thousand for fiscal year 2013 and \$31,908,649 thousand for fiscal year 2014.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Authorizing Legislation—continued

² Includes \$25,000 thousand for technical assistance on State data collection in fiscal year 2013 and \$15,000 in fiscal year 2014.

³ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011. The Administration proposes to continue funding in FY 2014 through appropriations language.

⁴ In fiscal year 2013, Special Olympics education programs was funded at \$8,000 thousand with funds from Technical assistance and dissemination.

⁵ Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004.

⁶ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2010; this program is funded in FY 2013 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2014 through appropriations language.

⁷ The program was authorized in FY 2013 through appropriations language.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2005 (2005 Advance for 2006)	\$12,176,101 (5,413,000)	\$12,176,101 (5,413,000)	\$12,328,391 (5,413,000)	\$11,673,606 (5,413,000)
2006 (2006 Advance for 2007)	12,126,130 (6,204,000)	11,813,783 (5,413,000)	11,775,107 (5,424,200)	11,653,013 (5,424,200)
2007 (2007 Advance for 2008)	11,697,502 (6,215,200)	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	11,802,867 (5,424,200)
2008 (2008 Advance for 2009)	11,485,147 (6,215,200)	12,362,831 (6,641,982)	12,330,374 (5,924,200)	11,993,684 (6,856,444)
2009 (2009 Advance for 2010) Recovery Act Supplemental (P.L. 111-5)	12,335,943 (7,647,444) 0	12,587,920 ² (8,592,383) 13,600,000	12,511,631 ² (7,647,444) 13,500,000	12,579,677 (8,592,383) 12,200,000
2010 (2010 Advance for 2011)	12,579,677 (8,592,383)	12,579,677 (8,592,383)	12,587,856 ³ (8,592,383)	12,587,035 (8,592,383)
2011 (2011 Advance for 2012) Rescission (P.L. 112-74)	12,846,190 (8,592,383)	12,564,953 ⁴ (8,592,383)	12,787,035 ³ (8,592,383)	12,526,672 ⁵ (8,592,383) (16,240)
2012 (2012 Advance for 2013)	12,861,351 (9,433,103)	13,757,844 ⁶ (8,592,383)	12,553,066 ⁶ (8,592,383)	12,640,709 (9,283,383)
2013 (2013 Advance for 2014)	12,687,307 (10,124,103)	12,640,709 ⁷ (9,283,383)	12,770,709 ⁷ (9,283,383)	12,661,256 ⁸ (9,283,383)
2014 (2014 Advance for 2015)	12,657,307 (10,124,103)			

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

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

³ The level for the Senate allowance reflects committee action only.

⁴ The level for the House allowance reflects the House-passed full-year continuing resolution.

⁵ The level for appropriation reflects the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 112-10).

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Authorizing Legislation—continued

⁶ The level for the House allowance reflects an introduced bill and the level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Committee action only.

⁷ The level for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2013 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 112th Congress only through the House Subcommittee and the Senate Committee.

⁸ The amount shown includes the 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided by P.L. 112-175, in effect through March 27, 2013.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Significant Items in FY 2013 Appropriations Reports

Technical Assistance and Dissemination

Senate: Report 112-176. The Committee continues to support activities that address the need for high-quality, evidence-based technical assistance activities that improve the services to and outcomes for students with disabilities. Prior to issuing new notices for fiscal year 2013 competitions, the Committee directs OSEP to develop a long-term strategic plan for its technical assistance activities that is aligned with its revised monitoring and data reporting structures as well as the Department's other technical assistance activities.

Response: The Department has developed a long-term strategic plan for its technical assistance activities aligned with proposed revisions to OSEP's Results Driven Accountability system, including the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reporting requirements. This plan supports Departmental goals related to early learning, college and career ready standards, equity, and continuous improvement of the U.S. education system. The strategic plan promotes collaboration with other ED-funded technical assistance, as well as technical assistance efforts in other agencies, e.g., HHS - early childhood, DOL - secondary transition, etc. Finally, the strategic plan includes the purposeful consolidation of technical assistance centers in order to use resources more efficiently and improve responsiveness to customers and stakeholders.

PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI

Senate: Report 112-176. The Committee includes new bill language requested by the administration that slightly modifies the [PROMISE] program as it was initially created in last year's bill. As requested by the administration, the Committee bill also includes new bill language that allows a portion of the funds provided to be used for Pay for Success awards, which are described in the highlights section in the introduction to the Committee report. The Committee expects to be notified prior to the issuance of any notice related to the Pay for Success activity.

Response: Grants under the PROMISE program will be awarded in fiscal year 2013 using amounts appropriated under the Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research account in fiscal year 2012 that remained available subsequent to the reallocation of funds to States under the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants program pursuant to section 110(b) of the Rehabilitation Act. The grant funds, which remain available for Federal obligation until September 30, 2013 under the authority provided in the fiscal year 2012 appropriations language, will not be used for Pay for Success activities.

[Click here for accessible version](#)

(in thousands of dollars)

Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2012 Appropriation	2013 Appropriation	2014 President's Budget	2014 President's Budget Compared to 2012 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent
Special Education						
1. State grants:						
(a) Grants to States (IDEA B-611)						
Annual appropriation	D	2,294,472	2,294,472	1,453,752	(840,720)	-36.641%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	9,283,383	9,283,383	10,124,103	840,720	9.056%
Subtotal		11,577,855	11,577,855	11,577,855	0	0.000%
(b) Preschool grants (IDEA B-619)	D	372,646	372,646	372,646	0	0.000%
(c) Grants for infants and families (IDEA C)	D	442,710	442,710	462,710	20,000	4.518%
Subtotal, State grants		12,393,211	12,393,211	12,413,211	20,000	0.161%
2. National activities (IDEA D):						
(a) State personnel development (Subpart 1)	D	43,917	43,917	45,011	1,094	2.491%
(b) Technical assistance and dissemination (section 663) ¹	D	46,781	46,781	46,781	0	0.000%
(c) Personnel preparation (section 662)	D	88,299	88,299	85,799	(2,500)	-2.831%
(d) Parent information centers (sections 671-673)	D	28,917	28,917	28,917	0	0.000%
(e) Educational technology, media and materials (section 674)	D	29,588	29,588	29,588	0	0.000%
Subtotal		237,502	237,502	236,096	(1,406)	-0.592%
3. Special Olympics education programs (Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act) ¹	D	8,000	8,000	8,000	0	0.000%
4. PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI (IDEA D-663)	D	1,996	1,996	0	(1,996)	-100.000%
Total, Appropriation	D	12,640,709	12,640,709	12,657,307	16,598	0.131%
Total, Budget authority	D	11,933,469	12,640,709	11,816,587	(116,882)	-0.979%
Current ²		3,357,326	3,357,326	2,533,204	(824,122)	-24.547%
Prior year's advance		8,576,143	9,283,383	9,283,383	707,240	8.247%
Across-the-board 0.612% increase applied to discretionary appropriation, provided in P.L. 112-175.			20,547			
Total, Appropriation		12,640,709	12,661,256	12,657,307	16,598	0.131%

NOTES: D = discretionary program, M = mandatory program; FY = fiscal year

FY 2013 discretionary appropriation amounts are based on P.L. 112-175, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013, that provided appropriations through March 27, 2013. FY 2013 mandatory amounts are either specifically authorized levels, or are based on FY 2013 President's Budget Policy, updated for more recent estimates of mandatory costs, or FY 2014 President's Budget Policy, as applicable.

Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

¹ In FY 2012 and 2013, funding for Special Olympics Education programs was provided under Technical Assistance and Dissemination.

² Excludes advance appropriations that become available on October 1 of the following fiscal year. Advance appropriations are \$9,283,383 thousand in fiscal years 2012 and 2013, and \$10,124,103 thousand in the FY 2014 President's Budget. In FY 2014, the amount for advances is increased due to the proposed consolidation of Teacher Quality State Grants into the Innovation and Instructional Teams account.

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 2014 budget request for Special Education of \$12.7 billion is aimed at making this goal a reality by helping States and school districts improve the results for children with disabilities.

The Administration requests \$11.6 billion for the **Grants to States** program, the same as the FY 2012 level, to assist States and schools in covering the excess costs of providing special education and related services to children with disabilities ages 3 through 21. The request would provide an average of \$1,767 for each of the 6.543 million children with disabilities who are estimated to be served in 2014. The Federal contribution toward meeting the excess cost of special education and related services would be approximately 15 percent of the national average per pupil expenditures under this request.

The request of \$372.6 million for **Preschool Grants** is the same as the FY 2012 level and the request of \$462.7 million for **Grants for Infants and Families** is an increase of \$20 million. The Preschool Grants program provides additional support to States and schools for providing special education services to children ages 3 through 5. The Grants for Infants and Families program provides assistance to States to help them implement statewide systems of early intervention services for children from birth through age 2.

The \$236.1 million request for **National Activities** programs would support a variety of technical assistance, dissemination, training, and other activities to help States, local educational agencies, parents, and others in improving results for children with disabilities.

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

The **Special Olympics Education Programs** would be funded at \$8 million. In FY 2012, activities carried out by this program were funded under the **Technical Assistance and Dissemination** program.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: Indefinite ^{1,2}

Budget Authority:

	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
Annual appropriation	\$2,294,472 ³	\$2,294,472 ³	\$1,453,752 ³	-\$840,720
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	<u>9,283,383</u>	<u>9,283,383</u>	<u>10,124,103</u>	<u>+840,720</u>
Total	11,577,855	11,577,855 ⁴	11,577,855	0

¹ 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 FY 2014 would be \$31,909 thousand.

² 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 FY 2014 would be \$141,945 thousand.

³ Includes \$25,000 thousand for technical assistance activities in FY 2012 and FY 2013, and \$15,000 thousand in FY 2014.

⁴ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) also includes several maximum and minimum allocation requirements that are triggered when the amount available for distribution to States increases.¹ If the amount available for allocation to States remains the same from one year to the next, States receive the same level of funding as in the prior year. If the amount available for allocation to States decreases from the prior year, any amount available for allocation to States above the 1999 level is allocated based on the relative increases in funding that the States received between 1999 and the prior year. If there is a decrease below the amount allocated for 1999, each State's allocation is ratably reduced from the 1999 level.

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

State Administration – A State may reserve for State administration up to the greater of the maximum amount the State could reserve for State administration from fiscal year 2004 funds, or \$800,000, increased by inflation as reflected by the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers. For fiscal year 2014, the latter amount is estimated to be \$1,021,383.

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

Starting in 2007, the amount that a State may set aside for other State-level activities is based on a percentage of its total allocation for 2006, increased for inflation. The percentage is based on whether the State opts to use funds for a risk pool and the amount of funds that the State sets aside for administration. If the State opts to use funds for a risk pool and the State sets aside \$850,000 or less for administration, the percentage is 10.5 percent. If the State opts to use funds for a risk pool and the State sets aside more than \$850,000 for administration, the percentage is 10 percent. If the State opts not to use funds for a risk pool and the State sets aside \$850,000 or less for administration, the percentage is 9.5 percent. If the State opts not to use funds for a risk pool and the State sets aside more than \$850,000 for administration, the percentage is 9 percent.

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

¹ 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

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

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

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

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

This is a forward-funded program that includes advance appropriations. In a typical year, a portion of the funds – the forward-funded portion – becomes available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year of the appropriation and remains available for 15 months, through September 30 of the following year. The remaining funds – the advance appropriation – become available for

² 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

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 2014, school districts will use both the forward- and advance-funded amounts primarily during the 2014-2015 school year.

Both forward-funded and advance funds remain available for obligation at State and local levels for an additional year. Hence, States and local educational agencies (LEAs) will have until September 30, 2016, to obligate their fiscal year 2014 awards.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009	\$11,505,211 ¹
Recovery Act	11,300,000
2010	11,505,211 ²
2011	11,465,960 ²
2012	11,577,855 ²
2013	11,577,855 ^{2,3}

¹ Includes \$15,000 thousand for technical assistance.

² Includes \$25,000 thousand for technical assistance.

³ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$11.6 billion for Grants to States to assist in covering the excess costs associated with providing special education and related services to children with disabilities. This request, which is level with the FY 2012 estimate, would help States improve the quality of the special education and related services that children with disabilities receive.

This request would provide an average of \$1,767 per child. This average is based on the assumption that the number of children aged 3 through 21 who will be served will remain constant at the 2012 level of 6.543 million. The request level would slightly reduce the Federal contribution toward offsetting the cost of special education and related services for children with disabilities to approximately 15 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure (APPE).

From 1975, when the IDEA was enacted, through 2005, the growth in the number of children with disabilities served outpaced the growth in the general population ages 3 through 21. However, from 2006 to 2009, the count of children with disabilities reported by States decreased slightly each year from the prior fiscal year. Fiscal year 2010 represented the first increase in this population of students in 5 years, but the population declined again in fiscal year 2011 and 2012. Fiscal year 2010 appears to be an outlier and the Department believes the population of children with disabilities will continue to trend downward in future years, but in the absence of more certain information we have projected the numbers of children with disabilities expected to be served for fiscal years 2013 and 2014 at 6.543 million children, the same level as reported by States for fiscal year 2012.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

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.

FY 2014 Proposed Appropriation Language:

State Maintenance of Effort

The IDEA requires each State to make available for special education and related services at least as much funding as it did in the prior year. If a State fails to maintain its fiscal support for special education and related services and does not receive a waiver of the requirement, the IDEA directs the Department to reduce that State's award under the Special Education Grants to States program. In 2012, the Department reduced two State's awards, Kansas and South Carolina, under this provision for the first time. Under current law, the Department does not have authority to redistribute or otherwise spend any funds made available as a result of such a reduction.

As such, the Administration is proposing language that would (a) allow the Department to redistribute reductions to other States and (b) mitigate the ongoing impact of a reduction on a State's future year awards. Without the language, any funds reduced from a State's award would revert to Treasury at the end of the period of availability. The proposed language would allow the Department to provide these funds to other States who have not had their awards reduced as a result of a failure to maintain financial support for special education and related services, so that these funds are used to offset the additional costs of providing services to students who qualify for services under the IDEA. Additionally, because of the way that the formula for determining State allocations operates, a State's award in any year depends, in part, on the amount the State received in the prior year. Without this additional language, a reduction in a State's award taken in any one year could have long-lasting impacts on that State's award, depending on the growth in the Grants to States appropriation and the size of the reduction in the individual State's award.

Local Educational Agency Maintenance of Effort

The IDEA requires LEAs to provide through a combination of local or State support at least the same level of special education funding provided in the previous fiscal year. The Administration is proposing language to clarify that the level of effort a LEA must meet under maintenance of financial support requirements in the year after it fails to maintain effort is the level of effort that would have been required in the absence of that failure and not the LEAs reduced level of expenditures. This language would provide clarity to LEAs and is consistent with State MOE statutory language.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

Technical Assistance

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

The IDEA authorizes the Secretary of Education to use a portion of Grants to States funds to provide technical assistance to States to improve their capacity to meet these data collection requirements. The request includes \$15 million for such technical assistance, \$10 million less than the amount set aside in fiscal year 2012. The request would be used for continuation costs for the National IDEA Technical Assistance Center on Early Childhood Longitudinal Data Systems, which supports States in developing and using their early childhood data systems. Funds would also support the continuation of one multi-year award the Department plans to make in fiscal year 2013. This award would provide technical assistance to States and local educational agencies on improving their data collection and analytic processes in order to promote use of data to drive program improvement.

In fiscal year 2014, the Administration is proposing appropriation language that would expand the authority of the Department to administer and carry out other services and activities to improve data collection, coordination, quality, and use under parts B and C of the IDEA. This authority would be used to modify existing Department data collection systems and align them to collect State level special education data.

Department of the Interior Set-Aside

As in previous years, we are proposing that the fiscal year 2014 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 \$21,220 for each child with a disability it serves, which is approximately 12 times the average amount per child that States would receive. At the request level with the cap, Interior would receive about 7.9 times the average amount per child that States would receive, which translates into an average of \$13,890 for each child with a disability, or about 121 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure (APPE) compared to 15 percent of the APPE for States overall.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
<u>Program funding:</u>			
Formula grants to States	\$11,380,727	\$11,419,116	\$11,429,116
MOE Penalties	38,389	TBD	TBD
Formula grants to Outlying Areas	34,250	34,250	34,250
Grants to Freely Associated States	6,579	6,579	6,579
Department of the Interior	92,910	92,910	92,910
<u>Technical Assistance (TA):</u>			
RTTA-GSEG	15,000 ^{1 2}	0	0
Early Childhood Data	8,425 ^{3 4}	6,493	6,496
TA Center on State Data	<u>1,565 ⁵</u>	<u>TBD ⁶</u>	<u>TBD ⁶</u>
Subtotal, TA	24,990 ⁷	24,930	15,000
Peer review of new Technical Assistance award applications	<u>10 ⁸</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	11,577,855	11,577,855 ⁹	11,577,855
Number of children with disabilities served ages 3 through 21	6,542,527	6,542,527 ¹⁰	6,542,527 ¹⁰
Average Federal share per child (whole dollars)	\$1,766	\$1,766 ¹⁰	\$1,767 ¹⁰
Average per pupil expenditure (APPE) (whole dollars)	\$10,826	\$11,208 ¹⁰	\$11,450 ¹⁰
Federal funding as a percentage of APPE	16%	16% ¹⁰	15% ¹⁰

¹ Race to the Top Assessment-General Supervision Enhancement Grants (RTTA-GSEG) also received \$15,000 thousand of FY 2011 carry-over funds in FY 2012.

² The Department plans to obligate \$15,000 thousand of FY 2012 funds in FY 2013.

³ This project also received \$4,567 thousand of FY 2011 carry-over funds in FY 2012.

⁴ The Department plans to obligate \$6,492 thousand of FY 2012 funds in FY 2013.

⁵ The Department plans to obligate \$1,565 thousand of FY 2012 funds in FY 2013.

⁶ The Department has not yet determined the size of this award. Any remaining FY 2013 funds not needed for this award will be carried over into FY 2014.

⁷ The Department carried over \$23,067 thousand of the remaining FY 2012 multi-year appropriation into FY 2013.

⁸ The Department plans to obligate \$10 thousand of FY 2012 funds in FY 2013.

⁹ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

¹⁰ Estimate, based on State-reported cumulative total for children served in the fall of 2012.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Basis for Leaving Special Education for Youth with Disabilities Ages 14 and Older ¹

<u>Basis:</u>	<u>School Year</u> <u>2008-2009</u>	<u>School Year</u> <u>2008-2009</u>	<u>School Year</u> <u>2009-2010</u>	<u>School Year</u> <u>2009-2010</u>	<u>School Year</u> <u>2010-2011</u>	<u>School Year</u> <u>2010-2011</u>
	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>
Graduating with regular diploma	35.7%	247,299	37.9%	256,102	39.7%	255,801
Graduating through certification	8.9%	61,508	8.9%	60,001	9.2%	58,946
Transferred to regular education	9.6%	66,364	9.9%	66,920	9.5%	61,243
Dropped out, or moved but not known to have continued in education	13.2%	91,318	12.8%	86,327	12.6%	80,927
Moved, but known to have continued in education	31.6%	219,020	29.6%	199,899	28.2%	181,618
Reaching maximum age for services and other reasons	<u>0.9%</u>	<u>6,112</u>	<u>0.8%</u>	<u>5,071</u>	<u>0.8%</u>	<u>5,245</u>
Total	100.0%	691,621	100.0%	674,320	100.0%	643,780

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

¹ Percentages may not add to 100 percent due to rounding.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

History of Children Served and Program Funding

Fiscal Year	Children Served (thousands)	Appropriation (dollars in thousands)	Federal Share Per Child ¹ (whole dollars)	Percentage of APPE
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 ²	1,558	18%
2006	6,814	10,582,961 ²	1,551	18%
2007	6,796	10,782,961 ²	1,584	17%
2008	6,718	10,947,511 ²	1,609	17%
2009	6,599	22,805,211 ^{2 3}	3,453 ³	33%
2010	6,614	11,505,211 ²	1,736	16% ³
2011	6,558	11,465,960 ²	1,745	16%
2012	6,543	11,577,855 ²	1,766	16%
2013	6,543 ⁴	11,577,855 ^{2 4 5}	1,766 ⁴	16% ⁴
2014	6,543 ⁴	11,577,855 ^{2 4}	1,767 ⁴	15% ⁴

¹ 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.

² Includes \$10,000 thousand for technical assistance activities in 2005, \$15,000 thousand in 2006 through 2009 and 2014, and \$25,000 thousand in 2010 through 2013.

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

⁴ Estimate.

⁵ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

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 fiscal year 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

National Assessment of Educational Progress Measures

Measure: The percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading.¹

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

NOTES: As defined for purposes of NAEP, "students with disabilities" includes any student classified by a school as having a disability, including children who receive services under a Section 504 plan. These measures 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."

¹ NAEP is a biannual assessment. No comparable NAEP assessments are scheduled for reading in 2012 and 2014.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

Measure: The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in mathematics.¹

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

NOTES: As defined for purposes of NAEP, “students with disabilities” includes any student classified by a school as having a disability, including children who receive services under a Section 504 plan. These measures 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.”

¹NAEP is a biannual assessment. No comparable NAEP assessments are scheduled for mathematics in 2012 and 2014.

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, measured every 2 years, decreased in 2009 and 2011, after moderate increases over the course of the previous 4 years. Both the 2009 and 2011 reading scores fell short of their targets. The data show that the majority of students with disabilities do not meet or exceed even the Basic levels of achievement at any of the grade levels tested. Likewise, students with disabilities score well below other students. On the 2011 fourth-grade reading assessment, only 32 percent of students with disabilities scored at or above Basic, while 71 percent of other students scored at or above Basic.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

The use of accommodations for students with disabilities, such as testing in small groups and extended time, has increased substantially. The share of the overall population that is students with disabilities who receive accommodations increased from 2 percent to 7 percent from 2000 to 2011. Among fourth-grade students with disabilities assessed in reading in 2011, 57 percent received accommodations.

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

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

NAEP data for mathematics demonstrate slow progress. The performance of students with disabilities had improved steadily over baseline years and exceeded the 2009 target. However, in 2011, 8th grade math scores were flat and did not meet the target. The NAEP data also show that the majority of students with disabilities do not meet or exceed even the Basic levels of achievement at any of the grade levels tested. Likewise, students with disabilities score well below other students. On the 2011 math assessment, only 36 percent of eighth-graders with disabilities scored at or above Basic, while 77 percent of other eighth-grade students scored at or above Basic.

The NCES collects data on the percentage of students with disabilities who are excluded from the NAEP assessments because of their disabilities. Exclusion rates are important to keep in mind when considering the performance of students with disabilities because increases in performance accompanied by reductions in students with disabilities tested might simply reflect higher exclusion rates among lower functioning students. Between 2000 and 2011, the exclusion rate on eighth-grade mathematics assessments dropped from 32 percent to 19 percent. It should be noted that these percentages only include students with disabilities who have been included in the NAEP testing sample. Students in schools specifically for children with disabilities are not included in the NAEP sample.

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

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

Elementary and Secondary Education Measures

The Department has adopted 4 measures for the Special Education Grants to States program that are parallel with those used for the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program. Data on the measures are collected annually through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and made available through EDFacts. Targets are based on a straight-line trajectory toward the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) goal to have all children performing at proficient or advanced levels by 2014. States were not required to test students in all grades 3 through 8 in 2005. However, they were required to test children in all grades 3 through 8 in 2006. The targets for 2007 were based on the incomplete 2005 tests. Targets for 2008 through 2012 were revised based on the more comprehensive 2006 data.

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	61.7	43.8
2010	69.4	43.9
2011	77.0	44.3
2012	84.7	
2013	92.4	
2014	100	

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
2009	61.1	45.2
2010	68.9	46.3
2011	76.7	45.7
2012	84.4	
2013	92.2	
2014	100	

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

Measure: The difference between the percentage of students with disabilities in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State 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
2009	18.5	28.3
2010	14.8	28.3
2011	11.1	28.1
2012	7.4	
2013	3.6	
2014	0	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2008	20.5	27.5
2009	17.0	26.1
2010	13.6	25.3
2011	10.2	26.0
2012	6.9	
2013	3.4	
2014	0	

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 2010. However, in 2011, State scores improved in reading but regressed in mathematics. 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 (44.3 percent and 45.7 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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

(28.1 percent and 26 percent, respectively). The improvement in scores among students with disabilities over the past few years has not been sufficient to significantly close those gaps.

Because definitions of proficient and advanced vary across States, the national data presented here, which simply aggregates State data, may not give a clear or entirely meaningful picture of student achievement. In addition, students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may take alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, and students with disabilities whose disability has precluded them from achieving grade-level proficiency may take alternate assessments based on modified academic achievement standards. States may include scores from these assessments for the purposes of adequate yearly progress (AYP) decisions, but only up to a cap of 3 percent of the total population tested, a maximum of 2 percent from alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards and a maximum of 1 percent from alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards. In 2011, approximately 20 percent of students with disabilities in grades 3 through 8 and high school were tested in math and reading using an alternate assessment (including those based on modified achievement standards and alternate achievement standards).

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2008	58.0	59.0
2009	59.0	60.6
2010	60.0	62.6
2011	61.0	63.6
2012	62.0	
2013	63.0	
2014	64.0	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2008	27.0	24.6
2009	26.0	22.4
2010	25.0	21.1
2011	24.0	

Note: The Department is no longer using this measure because it eliminated the “dropout” data element from data collection due to concerns with data validity and usability.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

Additional information: From 2008 to 2011, States successfully increased their graduation rates among students with disabilities and exceeded the targets for the graduation rate the past 6 years. However, there have been significant changes to reporting requirements for graduation and dropout rates over the last 4 years.

The instructions States received from the Department for calculating and submitting their graduation and dropout rates changed substantially in 2009. Previously, States used various methods of defining and calculating graduates and dropouts. Beginning in 2009, through their Annual Performance Reports (APR), States were asked to report using the calculation and timeline required under ESEA. The graduation rate under ESEA is a cohort rate that defines a graduate as someone who receives a diploma in 4 years and adjusts for transfers in and out of the school. Students who receive modified diplomas or GEDs do not count as graduates in this calculation. States may receive permission from the Department to report data on cohorts of different lengths of time (such as a 5- or 6-year cohort).

The new graduation rate calculation requires States to track students using a longitudinal data system, which not all States have fully implemented. Most States did comply with the new requirements for reporting graduation rate data in 2009. Only 9 States reported graduation rates using previous methods with data compiled under Section 618 of the IDEA. In the 2010-11 school-year, all but 4 States used the new methods for calculating their graduation rates.

For the 2010-11 school-year, the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education eliminated the State-reported data element "dropout" from the Consolidated State Performance Report for all students and subgroups due to substantial concerns with the validity and usability of the data. In an attempt to reduce the reporting burden of States, they are no longer required to report this data element.

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. The Department believes that this is a critical indicator for the program, since it is a reflection of the ultimate results of efforts to provide special education under the Grants to States program. The Department collected baseline data in fall 2011 and 2012 and identified numerous data quality and collection issues across States. The Department is working with States to provide technical assistance to identify improvement activities to produce meaningful data on postsecondary outcomes. The Department will not report these data or establish a baseline until next year when the data are likely to be more reliable.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

Efficiency Measure

Measure: The average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) response to the State.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	90	87
2010	88	66
2011	86	
2012	86	
2013	75	
2014	75	

Additional information: In 2010, the most recent year for which data are available, the Department completed 16 site visits. OSEP responded to States, on average, within 66 days of a site visit. This result surpasses the target for this measure in 2010 and is an improvement over the prior 3 years. In 2012, the Department modified its accountability system to improve efficiencies and balance its focus on improved results for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities and compliance with the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. OSEP is developing a modified efficiency measure and anticipates it being operational for the FY 2014 data collection. In the meantime, OSEP continues to meet its statutory monitoring responsibilities through the SPP/APR process, fiscal monitoring, and its work with State dispute resolution systems.

Other Performance Information

IDEA National Assessment

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

Analytic Support. A report published in January 2010, Patterns in the Identification of and Outcomes for Children and Youth with Disabilities (Patterns) (see <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20104005/index.asp>), provided a synthesis of existing evidence and new analyses of extant data sources to address research questions for the IDEA National Assessment, targeting three topic areas: (1) identification of children for early intervention and special education, (2) declassification of children for early intervention and special education

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

services, and (3) developmental and academic outcomes for children with disabilities. Among the data sources used for the study are the 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 NCES Common Core of Data and the National Vital Statistics System, and data gathered from four national longitudinal studies of children with disabilities (National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study, Pre-Elementary Education Longitudinal Study, Special Education Elementary Longitudinal Study, and National Longitudinal Transition Study-2).

From 1997 to 2005, the percent of children aged 6 to 17 served under IDEA increased from 12.3 to 12.9. The percentage varies by race/ethnicity, with a low of 6.3 percent for Asian children served under IDEA up to a high of 16.7 percent for black children. There is also variation by State, ranging from 9.9 percent up to 18.6 percent. From 1997 to 2005, the largest increases in disability types were autism, a 400 percent increase among children ages 10 to 17 years, and developmental delay, almost a 2,000 percent increase among children ages 3 to 9 years. The study cited research on declassification (Holt, McGrath, and Herring 2007) that showed almost 50 percent of children eligible in kindergarten were no longer eligible for services by third grade. Children with speech/language impairment are the most likely to be declassified within 2 years (34 percent). Declassified children had higher literacy and math outcomes than children who continued to receive services under IDEA.

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

Implementation Study. The final report for the IDEA National Assessment Implementation Study was published in July 2011. This study collected data from State agencies and school districts to address implementation questions for the IDEA National Assessment in four broad areas targeted for this study: (1) services to young children with disabilities; (2) identification of children and youth with disabilities; (3) efforts to promote positive developmental and educational outcomes for children and youth with disabilities; and (4) dispute resolution and mediation. Data collection included three surveys of State administrators: (1) IDEA Part B administrators responsible for programs providing special education services to school-aged children with disabilities ages 6-21; (2) IDEA Part B section 619 coordinators who oversee preschool programs for children with disabilities ages 3-5; and (3) IDEA Part C coordinators who are responsible for early intervention programs serving infants and toddlers. A fourth survey collected district level data from a nationally representative sample of local special education administrators about preschool and school-age programs for children with disabilities ages 3-21.

The study specifically focused on implementation related to new or revised provisions from the 2004 reauthorization of IDEA. One such provision, Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS), allows districts to use up to 15 percent of their Part B funds to provide services to children not yet identified as in need of special education. Three percent of districts are required to use CEIS due to significant disproportionality and 11 percent of districts are voluntarily implementing CEIS. Of the districts that implement CEIS, it is used at the elementary

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

school level in 93 percent of districts and focuses on literacy instruction in 84 percent of districts. The study found that the use of Response to Intervention (RTI) is also widespread, and is being used in 71 percent of districts nationally. Similar to CEIS, RTI is most commonly used in elementary schools and in reading/language arts. However, only 41 percent of districts reported using IDEA funds for RTI, while 80 percent of districts reported using their own general funds.

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

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

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

This RTI 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 on RTI implementation and on student outcomes including reading achievement, grade promotion, and identification for special education was based on the 2010-11 and 2011-12 school years. The report for this study is scheduled for release in 2013.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

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 (NCSE), in a September 2010 report, Comparisons Across Time of the Outcomes of Youth With Disabilities up to 4 Years After High School, compared the changes in outcomes among youth in the NLTS and NLTS2 who had been out of high school for up to 4 years. The report focused on changes in rates of postsecondary education, employment, engagement in either postsecondary education or employment, household circumstances and community integration. Researchers also compared outcomes of youth with disabilities to the general population and across subgroups including disability category, gender, race/ethnicity, household income, high school completion status, and length of time since leaving high school.

According to the NCSE report, youth with disabilities were more likely to have enrolled in postsecondary education within 4 years of leaving high school in 2005 than in 1990. Almost half (46 percent) of all youth with disabilities had spent some time in postsecondary education in 2005. The rate of youth with disabilities who were currently enrolled in postsecondary education and/or employed was 86 percent in 2005, a 21 percentage-point increase over 1990. This increase is likely attributable to an increase in youth who were concurrently enrolled in postsecondary education and employed, given that rates of engagement in only one of these activities did not change significantly over that period of time. The report also illustrated the increasingly important connection between high school completion and postsecondary outcomes, as high school completers had significant and positive changes between 1990 and 2005 in a greater number of outcome measures than non-completers. Youth with disabilities from low-income households increased their postsecondary enrollment rate by 16 percentage points to 35 percent in 2005, but a significant enrollment gap remains between the highest and lowest income households. Similarly, in 2005, youth with disabilities enrolled in postsecondary education at a rate well below the general population, specifically, 46 percent compared to 63 percent.

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

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

The Interim Report on the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in School Accountability Systems was released in May 2012. This report presented data on schools in 40 States. For these 40 States, 35 percent of public schools have a large enough population of SWD to be required to meet SWD subgroup accountability standards for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

Nine percent of all public schools in 37 States failed to make AYP in the 2008–09 school year because of SWD subgroup performance and other reasons, and 5 percent missed it solely because of SWD subgroup performance. Among schools with a large enough population of SWD to be required to meet the accountability standards for the duration of the study, 44 percent were identified for school improvement. By comparison, 24 percent of schools with small SWD populations were identified for improvement. The final report is scheduled for release in early 2013.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: **Preschool grants**

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: Indefinite

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$372,646	\$372,646 ¹	\$372,646	0

¹ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

Funds are distributed to eligible entities through a formula based on general population and poverty. Under the formula, each State is first allocated an amount equal to its fiscal year 1997 allocation. For any year in which the appropriation is greater than the prior year level, 85 percent of the funds above the fiscal year 1997 level are distributed based on each State's

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

relative percentage of the total number of children aged 3 through 5 in the general population. The other 15 percent is distributed based on the relative percentage of children aged 3 through 5 in each State who are living in poverty. The formula provides several floors and ceilings regarding the amount a State can receive in any year. No State can receive less than it received in the prior year. In addition, every State must receive an increase equal to the higher of: (1) the percent the appropriation grew above the prior year, minus 1.5 percent, or, (2) 90 percent of the percentage increase above the prior year. The formula also provides for a minimum increase in State allocations of 1/3 of 1 percent of the increase in the appropriation over the base year and places a ceiling on how much the allocation to a State may increase, in that no State may be allocated an increase above the prior year greater than the percent of growth in the appropriation from the prior year plus 1.5 percent. These provisions help ensure that every State receives a part of any increase and that there is no radical shift in resources among the States.

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

The number of children served under this program increased from 737,690 in fiscal year 2011 to 745,349 in fiscal year 2012. The 2012 count is the third consecutive increase after steadily declining child counts since fiscal year 2007. Despite more children than ever receiving services under this program in fiscal year 2012, 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 2012 level for fiscal years 2013 and 2014.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009	\$374,099
Recovery Act	400,000
2010	374,099
2011	373,351
2012	372,646
2013	372,646 ¹

¹ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$372.6 million for the Preschool Grants program. The request would maintain funding for this program at the FY 2012 level, and provide an average of \$500 per child, the same amount provided in 2012. 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 2012 level of 745,349. The Department believes this request provides an appropriate level of resources to support activities for young children with disabilities, given that these funds are paired with those available under the Grants to States program under IDEA, Part B.

The Administration is requesting \$11.6 billion for the Grants to States program for fiscal year 2014, which will provide an average of \$1,767 per child. 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 Administration believes high-quality early learning is critical to the future success of all children, including children with disabilities, and that improved coordination among Federal early learning programs will lead to improved services and results. Funding under the Preschool Grants program supports early learning 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 learning 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 learning programs and programs operated or supported by other Federal programs.

The Administration is proposing to expand the Federal early learning investment by more than \$2 billion in fiscal year 2014 through the creation of the Preschool Development Grants and the Preschool for All programs, proposed for funding in the School Readiness account. Preschool Development Grants would provide competitive grants to States to support key quality improvement efforts and drive increased access to high-quality preschool programs. This effort

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

would expand the capacity of States to meet eligibility requirements for the Preschool for All program, which would fund grants to States that provide universal access to high-quality preschool programs for children from low- and moderate-income families.

These new investments would build upon the work of the Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC), for which the Department awarded 9 grants in 2011 and 5 grants in 2012, totaling \$630 million over 4 years. RTT-ELC provided States with additional incentives and opportunities to more effectively serve children with disabilities in inclusive, high quality early learning programs. The RTT-ELC funds supported competitive grants to States for the development of a statewide infrastructure of integrated high-quality early learning supports and services for children from birth through age 5, with a focus on children with high needs, including those with disabilities.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Children Served ¹	745,349	745,349 ²	745,349 ²
Share per child (whole dollars)	\$500	\$500 ²	\$500 ²

¹ 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.

² Estimate, based on State-reported cumulative total for children served in the fall of 2011.

History of Children Served and Program Funding

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Children Served</u> (thousands)	<u>Appropriation</u> (dollars in thousands)	<u>Federal Share per Child</u> (whole dollars)
1977	197	\$12,500	\$64
1978	201	15,000	81
1979	215	17,500	81
1980	232	25,000	108
1981	237	25,000	105
1982	228	24,000	105
1983	242	25,000	103
1984	243	26,330	108
1985	260	29,000	112
1986	261	28,710	110
1987	266	180,000	677 ¹
1988	288	201,054	698
1989	322	247,000	767
1990	352	251,510	715
1991	367	292,766	798 ²

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

History of Children Served and Program Funding - Continued

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Children Served</u> (thousands)	<u>Appropriation</u> (dollars in thousands)	<u>Federal Share per Child</u> (whole dollars)
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
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 ³	1,092 ³
2010	732	374,099	511
2011	738 ⁴	373,351	508
2012	745 ⁴	372,646	500
2013	745 ^{4 5}	372,646 ⁶	500 ⁵
2014	745 ^{4 5}	372,646 ⁵	500 ⁵

¹ 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.

² 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.

³ These figures include funds provided under the Recovery Act in FY 2009.

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

⁵ Estimates.

⁶ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

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 2014 and future years, as well as 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.*

Three of the performance measures for the Preschool Grants program look at the percentage increase in growth by preschool children with disabilities in specific areas — positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships), acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs — as measured from the point of time on entering a program to the time the child exits the program.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010		80
2011	80	79
2012	81	
2013	82	
2014	83	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010		78
2011	80	79
2012	81	
2013	82	
2014	83	

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010		78
2011	80	78
2012	81	
2013	82	
2014	83	

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 Grants program. The Department, with the assistance of its grantee, the Early Childhood Outcomes Center, uses these data to assess outcomes for children served through this program. Measuring growth in these outcomes, especially for preschool aged children, is a complicated endeavor that requires a significant investment of time and technical assistance at both the Federal and State levels to ensure that the data collected are valid, reliable, and meaningful.

The Department has been deliberate in developing these measures due to the challenges of assessing program performance based on growth in early childhood outcomes, especially for children with disabilities. In 2005, States began developing systems for collecting entry and exit data on children with disabilities who receive services through the preschool program and remain in the program for at least 6 months. While four States have received approval from the Department to collect data for a representative sample of the children they serve through the Preschool Grants program, all other States are responsible for reporting data on all children served. The APRs submitted by States in February 2010 were to include, for the first time, complete entry and exit data for a full cohort of children with disabilities aged 3 through 5, but the Department did not publish these data because a large number of States had high percentages of missing data or other data quality concerns.

However, the quality of the data States reported in their APRs since February 2011 has demonstrated marked improvement, and the sample of States with the highest quality data increased from 33 to 36 out of 59 States and jurisdictions in 2012. To help determine an appropriate baseline for these three measures, a weighted data set was derived from these 36 States, excluding from the percentage calculation all States that had high proportions of missing data, anomalous outcomes, or were known to have other data quality or collection issues. The weighted data showed that, of this smaller sample of States, more than 80 percent of preschoolers substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program in each measure category: 81 percent in the acquisition and use of knowledge, 81 percent in positive social-emotional skills, and 81 percent in the use of appropriate behavior. These results represent a slight decrease from the 2011 school year and do not meet the targets set for each category; however, this decrease may be attributed to a larger sample and increased reporting. The targets for these measures were set based, in part, on the outcomes of this sample of States with higher quality data. As States have improved their data collection, the number of children served by this program for whom outcome data are reported has increased

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

substantially each year. Since outcomes have generally improved as data are reported for more children and States are better able to target program improvement, the Department is optimistic that, within the next few years, the national data will demonstrate that the children served by the program are improving at levels similar to the children in States with the best data quality.

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

Measure: The percentage of children with disabilities (aged 3 through 5) who receive special education and related services in a regular early learning program at least 80 percent of the time.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	43	51
2010	43	53
2011	48	
2012	48	
2013	50	
2014	52	

Additional information: Actual performance in fiscal year 2010, the most recent year for which data are available, 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.

States began using a revised data collection between October 1 and December 1, 2006, inclusive. These data were reported and are reflected in the fiscal year 2007 data. Under the revised data collection, States must report children under one of two categories. Category A includes children attending a regular early learning 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 learning 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 learning 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).

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

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 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 learning classroom. The form now will only require the parent to indicate whether the child's usual daily routine includes attending a regular early learning 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 was the 2010-11 school year, with the first data reported in the Annual Performance Reports due in February 2013.

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	40	39
2010	40	43
2011	41	45
2012	41	
2013	42	
2014	45	

Additional information: The Department exceeded its target for fiscal years 2010 and 2011, with 2011 being the most recent year for which data are available. As of 2007, 11 additional States have met the 90 percent requirement ensuring their special education teachers are fully certified in the areas in which they are teaching. This measure includes the 50 States, D.C., Puerto Rico, the Outlying Areas and the Bureau of Indian Education.

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has made a number of investments designed to assist States in preparing a sufficient number of qualified preschool special education personnel. In 2012, the Department established an Early Childhood Personnel

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

Center to improve professional development for personnel working with children with disabilities birth through age 5 and their families. This Center will help address State-identified needs for highly qualified personnel in special education, related services, early intervention, and regular education to work with infants, toddlers, and children with disabilities and ensure that those personnel have the necessary skills and knowledge, derived from practices that have been determined through scientifically-based research and experience, to be successful in serving those children.

The Department also created the National IDEA Technical Assistance Center on Early Childhood Longitudinal Data Systems in 2012. This center will provide technical assistance on developing and expanding statewide, longitudinal data systems that incorporate data required under Sections 616 and 618 of IDEA. The center will work intensively with 10-12 States in four main areas of data collection: defining data elements, acquiring data, validating data, and using data to examine validity and program improvement. The center will coordinate with other Department initiatives related to data systems and early learning, including Race To the Top – Early Learning Challenge Fund and the Statewide Longitudinal Data System Grant Program.

Efficiency Measure

Measure: The average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) response to the State.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	90	87
2010	88	66
2011	86	
2012	86	
2013	86	
2014	75	

Additional information: In 2010, the most recent year for which data are available, the Department completed 16 site visits. OSEP responded to States, on average, within 66 days of a site visit. This result surpasses the target for this measure in 2010 and is an improvement over the prior 3 years. In 2012, the Department modified its accountability system to improve efficiencies and balance its focus on improved results for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities and compliance with the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. We are developing a modified efficiency measure and anticipate it being operational for the FY 2014 data collection. In the meantime, OSEP continues to meet its statutory monitoring responsibilities through the SPP/APR process, fiscal monitoring, and its work with State dispute resolution systems.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

Other Performance Information

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

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

In October 2010, the National Center for Special Education Research released the report, *Access to Educational and Community Activities for Young Children with Disabilities*. As reported in parent interviews, participation in community activities such as sports, organized clubs, art, and music varied significantly by type of disability and by household income. Children from households with annual incomes greater than \$40,000 participated in sports with greater frequency than children from households with lower incomes. Children of parents who perceived their neighborhood to be unsafe or who reported that their transportation did not meet their families' needs were significantly less likely to participate in extracurricular activities. Parents also reported on educational settings, and 69 percent said they sent their children to full day kindergarten. Children from high wealth districts and those from suburban settings were less likely to attend full-day kindergarten than their peers.

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

Teachers also reported on modifications and accommodations provided to children with disabilities. Overall, teachers reported using unmodified grade-level materials in 44 percent of cases, while 14 percent of children received specialized materials or curricula. There was no

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

significant variation in these data across district size or wealth. The study also found that children who received special education services in a regular classroom were in classrooms in which, on average, 82 percent of students were nondisabled (<http://www.peels.org>).

In August 2011, the latest report from this study was released, *A Longitudinal View of the Receptive Vocabulary and Math Achievement of Young Children with Disabilities*. This report was designed to address two PEELS specific research questions:

- How do children who received preschool special education services perform over time on assessments of receptive vocabulary and math skills?
- How does their receptive vocabulary and math performance vary over time by primary disability category?

Children who received preschool special education services showed growth each year in vocabulary and mathematics; however, growth slowed in both math and vocabulary as they got older. Children's performance varied across assessments and across subgroups defined by disability. At age 3, children with a speech or language impairment had higher average scores than those with developmental delays. At age 10, the gap between these subgroups persisted, and there were no statistically significant differences in growth rates between subgroups.

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. 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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

status at entry to school, their transition into school, and their progression through the elementary grades.

Data from ECLS-K on demographic and school characteristics indicate that for the cohort of students beginning kindergarten in 1998, specific learning disabilities and speech or language impairments were the most prevalent primary disabilities over the grades studied. The percentage of the student cohort receiving special education grew from 4.1 percent in kindergarten to 11.9 percent of students in fifth grade. The results also indicate that higher percentages of boys than girls and of poor students than nonpoor students received special education. About 12 percent of students receive special education in at least one of the grades: kindergarten, first, and third grade, including 16 percent of boys, 8 percent of girls, 18 percent of poor children, and 10 percent of nonpoor children. One in three students who receive special education in early grades, first receive special education in kindergarten. Half of those who begin special education in kindergarten are no longer receiving special education by third grade. In addition to students' gender and poverty status, results are presented separately for other student and school characteristics, including race/ethnicity and school control, urbanicity, region, and poverty concentration.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families
 (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part C)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0 ¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$442,710	\$442,710 ²	\$462,710	+\$20,000

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011. The Administration proposes to continue funding in FY 2014 through appropriations language.

² Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

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 (New Mexico and Maryland) elected to make Part C services available to children with disabilities beyond their third birthday and continued to do so in 2010, 2011, and 2012. No additional States elected to implement this option in fiscal years 2010 through 2012.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

In any fiscal year in which the appropriation for Part C exceeds \$460 million, the statute also includes authority for the Secretary to reserve 15 percent of the amount above \$460 million for a State Incentive Grants program. The purpose of this program is to provide funding to assist States that have elected to extend eligibility for Part C services to children with disabilities aged 3 years until entrance into kindergarten or elementary school, or for a portion of this period. No State can receive more than 20 percent of the amount available for State Incentive Grants in a fiscal year. In fiscal year 2009, due to the addition of funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the total of funds appropriated for Part C exceeded the \$460 million level. The States that opted to extend their provision of Part C services beyond age 3 received additional funds through this program, and had until September 30, 2011, to expend these funds. The appropriation for fiscal years 2010 through 2012 did not exceed \$460 million, so the Department did not have authority to award State Incentive Grants in any of these fiscal years.

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

Funds allocated under this program can be used to: (1) maintain and implement the statewide system described above; (2) fund direct early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families that are not otherwise provided by other public or private sources; (3) expand and improve services that are otherwise available; (4) provide a free appropriate public education, in accordance with Part B of the IDEA, to children with disabilities from their third birthday to the beginning of the following school year; (5) continue to provide early intervention services to children with disabilities from their third birthday until such children enter or are eligible to enter kindergarten or elementary school; and (6) initiate, expand, or improve collaborative efforts related to identifying, evaluating, referring, and following up on at-risk infants and toddlers in States that do not provide direct services for these children.

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

Allocations are based on the number of children in the general population aged birth through 2 years in each State. The Department of Education uses data provided by the United States Census Bureau in making this calculation. No State can receive less than 0.5 percent of the funds available to all States, or \$500,000, whichever is greater. The Outlying Areas may receive not more than 1 percent of the funds appropriated. The Secretary of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Education, receives 1.25 percent of the aggregate of the amount available to all States. Interior must pass through all the funds it receives to Indian tribes, tribal 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 on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

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

	(dollars in thousands)
2009.....	\$439,427
Recovery Act.....	500,000
2010.....	439,427
2011.....	438,548
2012.....	442,710
2013.....	442,710 ¹

¹ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$462.7 million for the Grants for Infants and Families program for fiscal year 2014, an increase of \$20 million over the fiscal year 2012 level. The requested amount would provide critical support needed to increase access to high-quality early childhood programs for all 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 amount also would 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.

Administration's Early Learning Agenda

The Administration is proposing to expand the Federal early learning investment by more than \$2 billion in fiscal year 2014 through the creation of the Preschool Development Grants and the Preschool for All programs, proposed for funding in the School Readiness Account. Preschool Development Grants would provide competitive grants to States to support key quality improvement efforts and drive increased access to high-quality preschool programs. This effort would expand the capacity of States to meet eligibility requirements for the Preschool for All program, which would fund grants to States that provide universal access to high-quality preschool programs for children from low- and moderate-income families.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

These new investments would build upon the work of the Race to the Top - Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC), under which the Administration awarded \$500 million to 9 States in fiscal year 2011 and awarded \$133 million in fiscal year 2012 funds to 5 additional States that did not receive funding in the fiscal year 2011 competition. The RTT-ELC provides competitive grants to States for the development of a statewide infrastructure of integrated high-quality early learning supports and services for children from birth through age 5, with a focus on children with high needs, including those with disabilities. States could use their Part C program funds to support improved coordination between State lead agencies and early learning programs, including those participating in RTT-ELC grant projects, to help ensure that the needs of infants and toddlers with disabilities are addressed appropriately through these programs.

State Incentive Grants – FY 2014 Language Proposal

As noted in the Program Description, the 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 2 States, Maryland and New Mexico, that elected to extend eligibility for Part C services to children with disabilities beyond their third birthday. These funds were available to States for obligation until September 30, 2011. The requested increase for 2014 would enable the Department to reserve funds to resume support for these activities in both Maryland and New Mexico, as well as for additional States that might elect to extend eligibility for Part C services.

In order to ensure that sufficient funding is available to support the extension of Part C services in States that elect to do this, the Administration is proposing appropriations language that would allow the Department to reserve any funds appropriated for this program above \$460 million 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 8 States to apply for these funds. At the requested level, no State would receive more than \$542,000 through a State Incentive Grant. Without this language, only \$406,500 would be available for State Incentive Grants, with no State receiving more than \$81,300.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Range in size of awards to States:			
Smallest State regular Part C award ^{1 2 3}	\$2,170	\$2,170	\$2,265
Average State regular Part C award ^{1 2}	\$8,348	\$8,344	\$8,723
Largest State regular Part C award ^{1 2}	\$54,039	\$52,540	\$54,858
Children served ⁴	355,000	360,000	360,000

NOTE: 2013 excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

¹ Allocations in fiscal year 2014 would depend on the number and size of State Incentive Grant awards. Since we do not yet know how many States will apply for State Incentive Grants, estimates of smallest, average, and largest Part C awards do not include the funds set aside for State Incentive Grants.

² The calculations for smallest, average, and largest awards do not include the Outlying Areas or the Department of the Interior.

³ IDEA, section 643(c)(2) provides for a minimum allocation to States of the greater of \$500,000 or ½ of 1 percent of the amount available to States after the reservations for the Outlying Areas and the Bureau of Indian Education are excluded.

⁴ 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 FY 2014 and future years, as well as 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.*

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010		64
2011	65	65
2012	67	
2013	69	
2014	69	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010		68
2011	69	69
2012	71	
2013	73	
2014	73	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2010		68
2011	69	71
2012	71	
2013	73	
2014	73	

Additional information: Through their Annual Performance Reports (APRs), States report on the cognitive, social-emotional, and behavioral development of children with disabilities served through the Part C program. The Department, with the assistance of its grantee, the Early Childhood Outcomes Center, uses these data to assess outcomes for children served through this program. Measuring growth in these outcomes, especially for infants and toddlers, is a complicated endeavor that requires a significant investment of time and technical assistance at both the Federal and State levels to ensure that the data collected are valid, reliable, and meaningful. The Department has been deliberate in developing this measure due to the challenges of assessing program performance based on growth in early childhood outcomes, especially for children with disabilities. In 2005, States began developing systems for collecting

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

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 3 States have received approval from the Department to collect data for a representative sample of the children they serve through the Part C program, all other States are responsible for reporting data on all children served. The APRs submitted by States in February 2010 included the first opportunity for States to have a set of complete entry and exit data for a full cohort of infants and toddlers, but the Department did not publish these data because a large number of States had high percentages of missing data or other data quality concerns.

However, the quality of the data States reported in their APRs in February 2011 and 2012 demonstrated marked improvement. In the APRs submitted in 2010, only 19 States provided high quality data, meaning that they did not have high proportions of missing data, anomalous outcomes, nor were known to have other data quality or collection issues. In 2011, 29 States provided high quality data, increasing to 39 in 2012. Furthermore, there has been a noted trend across all years of this data collection that States with the highest quality data also demonstrated the best results.

Results for program year 2011 across all three outcomes were improved from 2010 across all States. Given that data quality also increased generally across the States, this could indicate that either (1) performance on these measures is actually better than was previously being captured with lower quality data, (2) performance on these measures is improving simultaneously with the increase in data quality, or (3) both. Across all three outcomes, the 39 States with the highest quality data for 2011 presented results 2 to 4 percentage points higher than all States, though slightly less than what the 29 States with the highest quality data reported for 2010. While it is difficult to determine trends with such a small number of data points, it is possible that higher quality data is correlated with better outcomes for students and that the decrease in performance among high quality data States is simply a result of a regression to the mean as more States develop high quality data systems.

States have indicated that they believe the data will be useful in their program improvement efforts. States are engaged in implementing quality control systems to identify and improve the accuracy of local data. The Department acknowledges that some data quality issues persist, particularly concerning missing data. In some instances, States may be unable to collect exit data for all children (e.g., due to a move to another State, withdrawal from the program without prior notice, or death). Through its technical assistance investments, the Department continues to work with the States to resolve implementation issues, improve the validity and reliability of reported data, and use these data to inform program improvements.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

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

Measure: The number of States that serve at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under age one through Part C.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	27	25
2010	27	25
2011	27	26
2012	27	28
2013	27	
2014	28	

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 1. The program made progress in 2012 and exceeded its target. 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 retardation¹; 0.2 percent - hearing impairment; 0.1 percent - visual impairment; 0.2 percent - physical conditions (spina bifida, cerebral palsy, etc.); and 0.1 percent - autism. State lead agencies responsible for the implementation of these programs report data annually to the Department through their APRs on numbers of infants and toddlers with disabilities served under the Grants for Infants and Families program. Through its monitoring and technical assistance efforts, the Department is working with States to ensure that they are appropriately identifying and serving all eligible infants with disabilities and expects the number of States serving at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under age 1 to increase further as a result.

Measure: The number of States that serve at least 2 percent of infants and toddlers in the general population, birth through age 2, through Part C.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	31	35
2010	31	37
2011	32	42
2012	32	44
2013	42	
2014	45	

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

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

bureau on the percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities in the general population. Through its monitoring and technical assistance efforts, the Department helps States enhance their child find systems to ensure that they are appropriately identifying and serving eligible toddlers with disabilities. The Department believes that these efforts are partially responsible for the improved performance of States under this measure and has set higher targets for 2013 and 2014 to reflect the actual performance for the past 3 years.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	87	93
2010	87	94
2011	93	94
2012	93	
2013	94	
2014	95	

Additional information: State lead agencies report annually to the Department on the settings in which children receive services provided under the Part C program. In 2001, States reported that only 76 percent of children receiving early intervention services through the Part C program were served in the home or in programs designed for typically developing peers, so performance on this indicator has improved dramatically in the past 10 years (by 18 percentage points). To assist States to continue to improve their performance in this area, the Department provides technical assistance and disseminates information on effective home visits and other practices related to providing services in natural settings.

Efficiency Measures

Measure: The average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) response to the State.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	79	80
2010	79	60
2011	79	
2012	79	
2013	75	
2014	75	

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

accountability system, including the onsite visit component, in order to increase efficiency and balance our focus on improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. We anticipate having the onsite visit component fully developed and operational for FY 2014. In the meantime, OSEP continues to meet its statutory monitoring responsibilities through the SPP/APR process, fiscal monitoring, and its work with State dispute resolution systems.

Other Performance Information

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

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

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

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

- Referral and identification—The most common outreach activity reported by States was the development and/or dissemination of written materials for pediatricians and other health care providers, followed by Web-based dissemination and outreach to child care providers. States reported family members and primary healthcare providers as the most frequent sources of referral to the Part C program.
- Coordination and transition between IDEA programs—At the time the surveys were conducted, States reported supporting the transition of young children with disabilities from the Part C program to preschool services under section 619 of Part B, but no States reported expanding Part C services to serve eligible children with disabilities until they enter kindergarten. 46 States reported having different coordinators for the Part C and Preschool

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

programs, but 67 percent of Part C coordinators reported meeting at least monthly with the coordinator for the Preschool program.

- Financing—For the 37 States that provided this information, the average percentage of early intervention services funding that came from the Part C program in FY 2009 was 21 percent. 23 States indicated that State early intervention services funding represented the largest source of funding for early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities. The largest sources of funding in other States were: Part C (8 States), Medicaid/Title XIX (8 States), local municipality or county funds (4 States), and Part B (1 State).

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: State personnel development

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0 ¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$43,917	\$43,917 ²	\$45,011	+\$1,094

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011. The Administration proposes to continue funding in FY 2014 through appropriations language.

² Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: State personnel development

years with minimum awards to States of not less than \$500,000 and not less than \$80,000 for Outlying Areas. The maximum award to States is \$4 million per fiscal year. The factors used to determine the ultimate amount of each competitive award are: the amount of funds available; the relative population of the State or Outlying Area; and the types of activities proposed, alignment of proposed activities with the State's personnel standards, alignment of proposed activities with the State's plan and application under sections 1111 and 2112 of the ESEA, and the use, as appropriate, of scientifically-based research.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009	\$48,000
2010	48,000
2011	46,846
2012	43,917
2013	43,917 ¹

¹ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$45 million for the 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 increase funding by more than \$1 million from the 2012 level, would be used to support 37 continuation and 6 new awards. The increase in funding would permit the Administration to provide funding to 43 States, the previous high, last reached in FY 2011. In addition, the Administration is requesting new appropriations language in the 2014 Budget that would provide the Secretary the authority to use SPD funds under section 655 of IDEA to carry out performance evaluation activities. SPD is the only program within Part D of IDEA that does not have the authority to use funds for performance evaluation.

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

Activities funded through this program are intended to support a statewide strategy to prepare, recruit, and retain teachers who are highly qualified under IDEA and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), who are prepared to deliver scientific research-based

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: State personnel development

or evidence-based instruction, and who are effective in improving outcomes for children with disabilities. States must develop SPD activities in a collaborative fashion and seek the input of teachers, principals, parents, administrators, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel.

Funding Priorities

To improve the outcomes of children with disabilities, the Department plans to focus the program's available resources in FY 2014 to support projects that 1) provide evidence-based professional development activities that increase implementation of effective practices and 2) that provide on-going assistance to personnel who have received SPD-supported professional development, including assisting local educational agencies (LEAs) to build upon systems that support implementation of effective practices. Such activities would ensure that personnel receive the necessary support to use the acquired knowledge and skills to implement practices with fidelity. New projects funded in FY 2012 were required to use technology to more efficiently and effectively provide ongoing professional development, including to personnel in rural areas and to other populations that are less likely to receive comprehensive professional development. The SPD program has worked to expand the use of technology that can assist projects in becoming more effective and efficient in their delivery of professional development. With the increased emphasis on ongoing professional development and coaching, increased use of technology is necessary if SPD grantees are to work with more than a few sites and/or work with schools in rural areas.

In addition, to better align the SPD program with the Department's broader efforts supporting teacher effectiveness, in FY 2012, the Department awarded competitive preference points to projects designed to provide professional development targeted to meeting professional development needs as identified through teacher evaluation and support systems that take into account student growth.

Teacher quality is one of the most important factors in improving student achievement and eliminating achievement gaps between our neediest students and their more advantaged peers. Research shows that effective teaching is integral to improving the academic achievement of students who are at greatest risk of not meeting high academic standards. The SPD program provides funding for professional development to improve the knowledge and skills of special education and regular education teachers serving children with disabilities. Specifically, SPD funds are used to provide training in effective interventions. Examples of such interventions include positive behavioral interventions and supports to improve student behavior in the classroom, scientifically-based reading instruction, early and appropriate interventions to identify and help children with disabilities, effective instruction for children with low incidence disabilities, and successful transitioning to postsecondary opportunities. Funds also assist States in utilizing classroom-based techniques to assist children prior to referral for special education.

Personnel Recruitment and Retention

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: State personnel development

of success in helping students with disabilities. Listed below are 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. MiBLSi is a multi-tiered system of supports, which integrates behavior and reading. Over the last 2 years, 159 MiBLSi elementary schools with more than 52,000 students saw improvements in the number of students reading at grade level and reductions in the number of students requiring intensive reading support. The total percentage of students at benchmark levels improved from 63 percent to 68 percent while the total percentage of students requiring intensive reading support dropped from 19 percent to 16 percent. In 2008, middle schools implementing MiBLSi reading supports began with 22 percent of their students at benchmark and 29 percent requiring intensive reading support. Now 51 percent are at benchmark and 18 percent of students require intensive reading supports. Schools implementing the MiBLSi model with fidelity have demonstrated a 33 percent reduction in behavior problems compared to schools not implementing with fidelity. From 2009-10 to 2010-11 the special education referral rate for 43 MiBLSi schools decreased 25 percent while the percentage of students determined to be eligible decreased 6 percent.
- The Kansas SPD supports implementation of a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) at 53 schools statewide. After the first year of implementation of MTSS in 2009-10, the percentage of students with disabilities in the MTSS schools who demonstrated proficiency or better on State assessments in reading was 79.7 percent, which is higher than the State average of 71.64 percent, and is an improvement of more than 14 percent since 2009. The percentage of students with disabilities in the MTSS schools who demonstrated proficiency or better on State assessments in mathematics was 77.4 percent, an improvement of nearly 20 percent since 2009, and higher than the State average of 69.6 percent. MTSS schools also had no students with disabilities expelled in 2010-11, which is lower than the 1.5 percent target.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: State personnel development

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
<u>Project funding:</u>			
New SPD awards	\$24,196	0	\$2,963
Continuation SPD awards	19,711 ¹	\$41,911	41,963
Carryover		2,006 ²	
Performance evaluation	0	0	75
Peer review of new award applications	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>
Total funding	43,917	43,917 ³	45,011
Average award (whole dollars)	\$1,003	\$1,118	\$1,091
<u>Number of awards:</u>			
New awards	22	0	6
Continuation awards	<u>19</u>	<u>40⁴</u>	<u>37</u>
Total awards	41	40	43

¹ About \$2,803 thousand of FY 2012 funds were used to support project continuation costs in FY 2013.

² These funds will be used to support new awards in FY 2014.

³ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

⁴ There are only 40 continuations in FY 2013 because one of the FY 2009 grantees requested only 4 years of funding for its project.

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.*

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: State personnel development

Program Measures: Previously-developed measures 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 professional 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,
- professional development activities on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices that were carried out by the SPD projects, and
- 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) 2009 SPD APR reports for grantees who were funded in 2005, 2006, and 2007. The contractor examined the variability and quality of the data reported on three of the program's annual measures.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: State personnel development

the performance measures may reflect very different levels of effort and scope. Finally, some States did not provide the requested performance data.

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

- benchmarks for use of evidence-based professional development practices in years two to five;
- benchmark for improvement in implementation in their third through fifth years; and
- funding targets to sustain SPD-supported practices. (Efficiency Measure)

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

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

Measure: In States with SPD projects that have special education teacher retention as a goal, the percentage of highly qualified special education teachers who have continued to work in the area(s) for which they were trained for at least 2 years after participating in SPD activities designed to retain highly qualified special education teachers.

Additional Information: To assess performance on this measure, SPD projects that have special education teacher retention as a goal were instructed to report retention data in their final performance report. The Department is unable to assess performance on this measure for the first cohort of 8 SPD grantees whose project periods ended in FY 2010. Only 3 of these 8 projects had teacher retention as a goal and only Alaska and Maine were successful in collecting retention data.

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. The results for the first cohort of teachers, who began their participation in the ASMP in the 2005-2006 school year, indicate that 69 percent continued teaching special

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: State personnel development

education in the Alaska public school system after 2 years (2007-2008) and 53 percent were still teaching in the Alaska public school system after 4 years (2009-2010). State data indicates that 41 percent of new special education teachers leave the Alaskan school system after 4 years. Alaska plans to continue to follow the later cohorts of teachers who participated in the project.

The Maine SPD project provided the following information on its teacher retention activities in its fiscal year 2012 final report. Extended Teacher Education Program (ETEP) Unified is a 2-year program leading to dual certification in both regular and special education at the University of Southern Maine. The ETEP program has maintained a list of graduates over the past 5 years who are still working as evidence of retention. Of the 97 students who completed the ETEP program from 2006 to 2010, 77 graduates are currently employed in educational settings.

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

- The percentage of States that have retention of highly qualified special education teachers as a goal that reach their targets for retention of special education teachers 2 years after their initial participation in SPD activities.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$46,781 ²	\$46,781 ^{2,3}	\$46,781	0

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011. The Administration proposes to continue funding in FY 2014 through appropriations language.

² Excludes \$8,000 thousand from the funds provided for this program in FY 2012 and FY 2013, which the Department is using to support the Special Olympics. For FY 2014, the Administration requests funding under a separate line item for Special Olympics. For comparability, FY 2012 and FY 2013 funding for Special Olympics is shown in the Special Olympics activity.

³ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Technical Assistance and Dissemination program is the Department's primary vehicle under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) for providing educators, policymakers, other service providers, and parents of children with disabilities with information on effective practices for meeting the needs of children with disabilities and their families. The program makes competitive awards to provide technical assistance, support model demonstration projects, disseminate useful information, and implement activities that are supported by scientific research. These awards are intended to improve services provided under the IDEA, including the practices of professionals and others involved in providing services that promote academic achievement and improve results for children with disabilities.

A majority of the grants currently funded under the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program support technical assistance centers that focus on a particular topic, population, or age range, such as early intervening services, dispute resolution, early childhood, college- and career-readiness, and positive behavioral interventions and supports. Most centers use a service model that provides three levels of technical assistance: intensive/sustained, targeted/specific, and general/universal. At the intensive/sustained level, a handful of States receive on-site, ongoing planned assistance designed to reach an outcome desired by the recipient. Through targeted/specific services, centers support activities based on the topical or technical needs common to multiple recipients and can be one-time or short-term events such as consultation services or presentations at conferences. The centers also provide general/universal technical assistance services that permit a broader audience to access information and services through presentations, newsletters, or research syntheses that are made available on center websites. Most activities supported through this program are designed to address the needs of a variety of audiences. While these audiences vary, in

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

general, they include teachers, related services personnel, early intervention personnel, administrators, parents, and individuals with disabilities.

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

The technical assistance and dissemination activities supported through this program are based on the best information available. One source of the scientifically-based research findings that are used to inform technical assistance and dissemination activities is the What Works Clearinghouse in the Institute of Education Sciences. This is particularly true in cases where there is alignment between the topical focus of a center and work being supported through the What Works Clearinghouse, such as dropout prevention.

The duration of awards varies with the award's purpose. Most individual awards are made for a period of 5 years.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009.....	\$48,549
2010.....	49,549
2011.....	48,806
2012.....	46,781 ¹
2013.....	46,781 ^{1 2}

¹ The amount shown for FY 2012 and FY 2013 excludes \$8,000 thousand in funds used to support the Special Olympics. Funds are requested in FY 2014 in the Special Olympics Activity.

² Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2014, the Administration is requesting \$46.78 million for the Technical Assistance and Dissemination (TA&D) program, the same level as FY 2012. The request includes about \$12.1 million (including peer review costs) for new technical assistance and dissemination projects, and \$34.6 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. TA&D activities combine the identification and dissemination of evidence-based practices with an effort to build capacity at the State and local levels to implement, sustain, and scale-up such practices. These activities have facilitated the adoption and spread of evidence-based practices such as positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), which have been implemented in over 16,000 schools nationwide. The funds requested for new awards would support Regional Resource Centers to provide technical

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

assistance to help States and local educational agencies (LEAs) meet requirements of IDEA and connect them to resources in the TA&D network.

The Department's new awards in FY 2014 will continue ongoing efforts to maximize the impact of TA&D investments through fewer but larger awards in areas of greatest need. For example, the Department plans to fund a Transition to College and/or Careers Center that will consolidate the work of three previous centers (Transition to College and Careers Project, Dropout Prevention Center, and the Post-School Outcomes Center) that provide services to support college and career readiness.

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

Projects focusing on particular topical areas:

Support for the Comprehensive Centers administered by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) – OSEP will provide \$750,000 for activities related to the Comprehensive Centers in 2014. A portion of the funds will be used to supplement the Comprehensive Center on Effective Teachers and Leaders. The Comprehensive Center on Effective Teachers and Leaders will use the OSEP funds to support the Center's work on developing effective teacher evaluation systems for special education personnel as part of the Center's overall work on teacher evaluation.

Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE) – CADRE provides SEAs and Part C Lead Agencies with resources that can help them in effectively implementing a range of dispute resolution options, including strategies that other SEAs and Part C Lead Agencies are using to address the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Review (APR) indicators related to dispute resolution. CADRE helps ensure that parents and families get the information they need about various methods for resolving disputes and helps avoid costly adversarial due process hearings.

Projects focusing on children with disabilities by age or grade:

Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center – This center provides technical assistance to States to help them develop early childhood data systems. Its focus is on helping States develop the capacity to use data for program improvement to improve early learning outcomes, to enable more data-based decision making, and to support programs or practices with strong or moderate evidence of effectiveness.

Projects focusing on children with particular needs:

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
<u>Program Funding:</u>			
Specialized technical assistance and Dissemination:			
New	\$4,900	\$7,270 ¹	0
Continuation	<u>4,958</u>	<u>8,000</u>	<u>\$11,741</u>
Subtotal	9,858	15,270	11,741
Model demonstration centers:			
New	1,183	0	1,200
Continuation	<u>2,431</u>	<u>2,916</u>	<u>2,733</u>
Subtotal	3,614	2,916	3,933
Regional/Federal Resource Centers:			
New	0	0	7,683
Continuation	<u>7,735</u>	<u>7,756</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	7,735	7,756	7,683
Early childhood technical assistance:			
New	6,416 ²	0	0
Continuation	<u>800</u>	<u>1,784</u>	<u>4,500</u>
Subtotal	7,216	1,784	4,500
Secondary, transition and postsecondary technical assistance:			
New	0	665	2,485
Continuation	<u>3,900</u>	<u>3,200</u>	<u>1,300</u>
Subtotal	3,900	3,865	3,785
Technical assistance for children who are both deaf and blind:			
New	0	11,350	0
Continuation	<u>11,350</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>11,350</u>
Subtotal	11,350	11,350	11,350

¹ About \$1,764 thousand of these funds will be used to pay 2014 continuation costs.

² About \$2,716 thousand of these funds will be used to pay 2013 continuation costs.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands) (continued)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Transfers to Elementary and Secondary Education for comprehensive centers:			
New	\$750	0	0
Continuation	<u>0</u>	<u>\$750</u>	<u>\$750</u>
Subtotal	750	750	750
Federal technical assistance, technical assistance on data analysis, State, and Federal information exchange, other:			
SISEP Center (grant) ¹	1,100	1,100	1,100
Leadership Conference contract	0	490	490
ACDM contract ²	665	675	650
Performance Measures contract	87	89	90
CIPP contract ³	47	135	135
Annual Report to Congress contract	<u>344</u>	<u>454</u>	<u>454</u>
Subtotal	2,243	2,943	2,919
<i>New, Subtotal</i>	1,531	625	650
<i>Continuation, Subtotal</i>	712	2,318	2,269
Peer review of new award applications:	115	147	120
Total program funding:			
New	14,780	19,910	12,018
Continuations	31,886	26,724	34,643
Peer review	<u>115</u>	<u>147</u>	<u>120</u>
Total	46,781 ⁴	46,781 ^{4 5}	46,781

¹ State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices Center.

² Analysis, Communications, Dissemination, and Meetings contract.

³ Center to Improve Project Performance contract.

⁴ Excludes \$8,000 thousand for the Special Olympics in FY 2012 and FY 2013.

⁵ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

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 2014 and future years, as well as 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 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 and beyond were revised in 2010 to reflect strong performance that exceeded targets.

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

For each of the three annual performance measures that follow, 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 22 TA&D centers and 10 State Deaf-Blind programs. Each TA&D center included in the sample submits a list of every new product and service from the previous year,

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

from which one new product and service are selected to be reviewed. Each State Deaf-Blind grantee included in the sample is asked to submit a list of every new service from the previous year, from which one product is selected to be reviewed. 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.

Panels of experts review all products and services and score them based on an OSEP-designed rubric that is specific to each performance measure, rating the products and services on the extent to which they meet the measure's performance indicators. Data for each indicator are calculated by dividing the number of technical assistance and dissemination center products and services that received an average quality rating of 6 or better, out of 9 possible points, by the total number of products and services reviewed. The Department performs the same calculation for the State Deaf-Blind grantees, assigns weights to each of these calculations to correspond to the proportion of total program funds expended in each area, and then adds the figures together to produce an overall quality rating for the program. The specific rubric used to assess products and services for each measure is identified below in the Additional Information section following the Measure.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	77	87
2010	78	85
2011	90	91
2012	92	
2013	94	
2014	95	

Additional information: Expert panels review all products and services and score them based on a rubric that assesses the extent to which the content of these materials is: evidence-based, valid, complete, and up-to-date. Specifically, the panels assess the quality of the materials on the following dimensions: (1) Substance (Does the product reflect the best of current research and theory or policy guidance, as demonstrated by a scientifically- or evidence-based approach, a solid conceptual framework, appropriate citations and other evidence of conceptual soundness?); and (2) Communication (Does the product have clarity in its presentation, as evidenced by being free of editorial errors, appropriately formatted, and well organized?). The total score for any individual product or service reviewed is the sum of the two quality dimension sub-scores. The Department considers any individual product or service that receives a total score of 6 or higher out of 9 possible points to be of high quality.

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 a decrease in 2009 and 2010 from the

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

2008 performance. However, actual performance has exceeded performance targets for this measure over the past 3 years. This suggests grantees better understand the expectations for the quality of products and services they provide. The Department will continue to monitor individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	94	96
2010	94	100
2011	94	100
2012	95	
2013	95	
2014	95	

Additional information: Expert panels review the products and services and score them based on a rubric that assesses 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.

Overall performance under this measure has been strong in every year for which data have been collected. Since the performance data for 2010 and 2011 indicate that all products and services are relevant to the needs of practitioners, the Department seeks to maintain current levels of performance for this measure and will monitor any individual grantees that receive lower scores more aggressively to ensure that these grantees take steps to improve the relevance of their products and services.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	52	85
2010	86	88
2011	89	93
2012	92	
2013	95	
2014	95	

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

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

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

- The percentage of effective evidence-based program models developed by model demonstration projects that are promoted to States and their partners through the TA&D Network.

In 2010, the Department began developing a new long-term pilot measure because the previous measure did not provide meaningful data for program improvement. This new measure will provide the Department valuable data on how well model demonstration projects are disseminating effective practices, a key component of this program. In November 2012, the Department began collecting the new data using a revised

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

methodology, and will use the results to continue to refine the measure and set a performance target for future years.

- The percentage of school districts and service agencies receiving technical assistance and dissemination services regarding scientifically- or evidence-based practices for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities that implement those practices.

In 2009, the first year data were collected for this measure, 79 percent of districts and agencies sampled were implementing evidence-based practices. In 2011, this figure increased to 86 percent of districts and agencies sampled. The Department used this data to develop a target of 86 for 2013, and will aggressively monitor any individual grantees that receive relatively lower scores to ensure that they take steps to improve over time.

Measure: The percentage of school districts and service agencies receiving technical assistance and dissemination services regarding scientifically- or evidence-based practices for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities that implement those practices

Year	Target	Actual
2009		79
2011		86
2013	86	

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 22 TA&D centers and 10 State Deaf-Blind programs each year.

Since 2008, the first year of data collection, the Department has struggled to produce a reliable cost per unit of target audience results. Due to concerns about data quality, compliance, and methodology, the Department has since enhanced guidance and changed methodologies. Beginning in 2009, the Department realized that aggregate data were not useful because the cost of providing technical assistance varies significantly based on the sample and decided instead to disaggregate the cost per unit based on three levels of intensity of technical assistance (intensive/sustained, targeted/specific, and general/universal). In 2009, the cost per unit was \$1,556, which subsequently rose to \$5,789 in 2010, and fell to \$651 in 2011. These variable results demonstrate the lack of reliability in the current measure and a need for an improved methodology. The Department is exploring different alternatives to evaluate the efficiency of TA&D investments and is developing a new measure to be piloted in 2013.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

Other Performance Information

In connection with the ongoing National Assessment of IDEA, the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) launched an evaluation of the IDEA TA&D program and various 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*¹, and through new surveys of TA&D grantees, SEA officials responsible for IDEA implementation, and school district special education directors. The final report is scheduled to be published in 2014.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$88,299	\$88,299 ²	\$85,799	-\$2,500

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2012. The Administration proposes to continue funding in FY 2014 through appropriations language.

² Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Personnel Preparation program helps meet State-identified needs for adequate numbers of fully certified personnel to serve children with disabilities by supporting competitive awards to:

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

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

Personnel Development. This broad authority requires the Secretary to support at least one of the following activities: (a) promoting partnerships and collaborative personnel preparation and training between institutions of higher education (IHEs) and local educational agencies (LEAs), (b) developing, evaluating, and disseminating innovative models for the recruitment, induction, retention, and assessment of highly qualified teachers, (c) providing continuous training and professional development to support special education and general education teachers and related services personnel, (d) developing and improving programs for paraprofessionals to become special educators, (e) promoting instructional leadership and improved collaboration

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

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.

Beginning Special Educators. The Secretary also is 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 5th 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, as well as children with intensive educational needs across all 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,

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

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 designed primarily to increase the supply of personnel, center-based awards tend to focus on enhancing the quality of work in a particular topical area through such activities as professional development, technical assistance, partnerships, or the development of materials and best practices.

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009.....	\$90,653
2010.....	90,653
2011.....	88,466
2012.....	88,299
2013.....	88,299 ¹

¹ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2014, the Administration requests \$85.8 million for the Personnel Preparation program, a reduction of \$2.5 million from the fiscal year 2012 level. Of this amount, approximately \$25.9 million would be used for new projects (including peer review costs of approximately \$430,000) and \$59.9 million would support the continuation of grants made in prior years.

Program Funding Priorities

The Administration is currently exploring how funds available to support new activities under this program can be better targeted to support human capital systems that effectively prepare, recruit, support, evaluate, compensate and retain effective educators, and to address Administration priorities relating to the special education personnel workforce. Administration

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

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 and principal evaluation and support systems that take into account student growth and provide useful feedback to inform instruction and professional development; alleviating ongoing personnel shortages by targeting funds on training programs that provide for alternative certification and dual certification; increasing the supply of principals who are adequately prepared to ensure the provision of evidence-based services for children with disabilities; and improving the quality of teacher pre-service preparation programs through the use of data on the effectiveness of graduates in the classroom.

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

The Administration continued these efforts to bolster highly-effective human capital systems in fiscal year 2011 in a number of different grant areas by requiring preparation programs supported under this program to track the impact that program completers had on students after they completed their training and entered the field. Specifically, grantees were required to track impacts on student growth and social, emotional, and academic development, as appropriate. In FY 2012, the Administration funded a new technical assistance center to, among other things, assist States and institutions of higher education in evaluating and improving personnel preparation programs by using data on outcomes for students with disabilities.

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.

Data on Personnel Shortages

Available data relating to personnel shortages in special education, including State-reported data outlining the percentage of special education teachers fully certified in States and Outlying Areas, strongly support the need for continued Federal investment in this area. Persistent shortages of qualified personnel have been reported since the enactment of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 1975. While States and local educational agencies across the country experience personnel shortages, recruiting and retaining special educators is particularly challenging for schools in high-poverty districts. Data from "Teacher Quality Under

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

No Child Left Behind: Final Report,” illustrate the challenge. According to this study, completed by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) for the Department in January 2009, approximately half of all districts in the country reported difficulty attracting highly qualified special education teachers in the 2006-2007 school year, while 90 percent of high-poverty districts reported the same difficulty (see <http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/teaching/nclb-final/index.html>).

In order to address shortages of highly qualified personnel, States often issue certification waivers to increase the pool of eligible teachers. According to data that States are required to report pursuant to Title II of the Higher Education Act (HEA), through the 2006-2007 academic year, a higher percentage of certification waivers were issued to special education teachers (4 percent of all special education teachers) than teachers in any other subject area, indicating a larger shortage of highly qualified personnel in special education than in other fields. Additionally, nationwide, teachers who receive waivers of certification requirements are more likely to be employed in high-poverty districts (see <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/teachprep/t2r7.pdf>). These data show that there is a particularly significant need for qualified special education teachers in high-poverty districts.

The National Assessment of IDEA also found that 51 percent of district Part B special education administrators reported that their districts routinely had difficulty finding qualified special application applicants over the past 3 years, and approximately 5 percent of preschool-age and school-age special education teacher full-time positions were left vacant in the 2008-2009 academic year (see <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20114026/pdf/20114026.pdf>).

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
<u>Program Funding:</u>			
Low incidence disabilities grants:			
New	\$2,313	\$3,303	TBD
Continuations	<u>12,085</u>	<u>11,931</u> ¹	<u>\$10,265</u>
Subtotal	14,398	15,234	TBD
Leadership training grants:			
New	4,429	6,050	TBD
Continuations	<u>11,730</u>	<u>12,506</u>	<u>10,129</u>
Subtotal	16,159	18,556	TBD
Minority institution grants: ²			
New	1,868	2,466	TBD
Continuations	<u>9,258</u>	<u>7,456</u> ¹	<u>6,715</u>
Subtotal	11,126	9,922	TBD

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands) (continued)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Program improvement grants:			
New	\$6,500	0	TBD
Continuations	<u>10,992</u>	<u>\$15,313</u>	<u>\$13,036</u>
Subtotal	17,492	15,313	TBD
Early childhood grants:			
New	4,853	4,823	TBD
Continuations	<u>15,174</u>	<u>15,784</u> ¹	<u>14,335</u>
Subtotal	20,027	20,607	TBD
Other personnel development grants:			
New	1,256	1,658	TBD
Continuations	<u>5,217</u>	<u>5,014</u> ¹	<u>4,515</u>
Subtotal	6,473	6,672	TBD
National Activities:			
New	1,035	135	690
Continuations	<u>1,220</u>	<u>1,426</u>	<u>893</u>
Subtotal	2,255	1,561	1,583
Peer review of new award applications	369	434	430
<u>Total program funding:</u>			
New	22,254	18,435	25,481
Continuations	65,676	69,430	59,888
Peer review	<u>369</u>	<u>434</u>	<u>430</u>
Total	88,299	88,299	85,799

NOTES: 2013 excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175. Amounts listed as "TBD" in FY 2014 reflect topical areas for which decisions on FY 2014 competitions are not yet final.

¹ The FY 2013 continuation awards totals include approximately \$2,500 thousand in FY 2013 funds across all categories used to support FY 2014 continuation costs.

² 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.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

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

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

Long-Term Performance Measures

The program has two long-term measures that are designed to provide information on the quality of the program by looking at the skills of scholars supported using program funds.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

Measure: Percentage of degree/certification recipients who maintain employment for 3 or more years in the area(s) for which they were trained and who are fully qualified under IDEA.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	91	65
2010	93	
2011	95	
2012	35	
2013	35	
2014	35	

Additional Information: Through 2009, the Department collected data for this measure using a temporary collection methodology that involved surveying a small sample of the largest IHEs that receive program funds to support student training. This measure was calculated by dividing the total number of degree recipients from the 9 largest grantees that, according to those institutions, maintained employment for 3 years in the area(s) for which they were trained and who are highly qualified by the total number of degree recipients who graduated in any single year from those programs. For example, for 2009 the numerator is the total number of degree recipients who received degrees in 2004, maintained employment for 3 or more years in the area for which they were trained, and who are fully qualified under IDEA (n=280), and the denominator is the total number of degree recipients graduating from these 9 institutions in 2004 (n=431). Because these data were collected from only 9 grantees, they are not comparable to the data presented in the other program performance measures.

Beginning in 2010, the Department began obtaining data from all currently funded program grantees through the National Center for Service Obligation (NCSO). NCSO is the Office of Special Education Programs(OSEP)-supported contractor that tracks scholars post-graduation to determine whether they comply with the program's service obligation requirement. NCSO began tracking graduates from institutions receiving grants in FY 2005, shortly after the Department assumed responsibility for this task under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (P.L. 108-446). However, because the NCSO did not have data on 2005 graduates eligible for inclusion in this measure, data available for 2010 may not have been an accurate representation of the actual proportion of scholars who maintain employment for 3 or more years in the area for which they were trained.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

FY 2010 because data were unavailable for 154 of the 155 FY 2006 graduates who may have had a service obligation of 3 or more years. By FY 2011, the number of FY 2006 graduates for whom data were not available dropped from 154 to 42, reflecting increased outreach efforts from both OSEP and NCSO to program graduates and project directors to enter applicable information into the NCSO tracking system.

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

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	45	85
2010	48	93
2011	51	
2012	85	
2013	85	
2014	85	

Additional Information: Grantees submit data annually through the Department Personnel Preparation Data Report (PPD) Web-based data collection (see: <http://www.oseppdp.ed.gov>). This measure presents information on the percentage of scholars completing programs who passed an independent exam, such as the Praxis II, that is designed to assess the knowledge and skills of special educators. This measure is calculated by dividing the total number of scholars who graduated in a given year and pass an exam demonstrating knowledge and skills in evidence-based practices for children with disabilities (2,143 students in fiscal year 2010) by the total number of students who completed training programs – including students who passed a test (2,143 students), students who did not pass a test or whose testing status or results are missing or unknown (28 students), and students for whom testing was not applicable (2 students).

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

Annual Performance Measures

The program has five annual performance measures. All five of these measures are designed to provide information on various aspects of program quality, including scholars who receive funding through the program.

While several years of data have been collected for most of these annual measures, the Department recently recalculated all years of actual performance to ensure that the appropriate

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

subcategories of “unknowns” were included in the denominators. In most cases, because the actual data changed substantially, new targets also had to be established. These measures are:

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	65	91
2010	80	100
2011	90	74
2012	95	
2013	90	
2014	90	

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

In the fiscal year 2012 review, 31 syllabi from fiscal year 2011 grantees were included from the following types of projects: early childhood (6 syllabi scored), leadership (11 syllabi scored), low incidence (5 syllabi scored), minority institutions (5 syllabi scored), secondary transition (3 syllabi scored), and program improvement (6 syllabi scored).

The increase in performance under this measure in recent years is due, in part, to a concerted effort by the Department both to ensure adequate technical assistance to grantees and sufficient instructions to reviewers. Beginning with the review of fiscal year 2009 grantees, 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. Performance under this measure in 2009 and 2010 was well above established targets, leading OSEP to increase the criteria for a set of syllabi to be identified as “evidence-based” across all five domains for the review of 2011 grantees – from 50 percent panel agreement to at least two-thirds. As a result, performance under this measure decreased from the prior year. However, the Department believes that this higher standard will ultimately lead to better data on this measure and the quality of projects funded under this program.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

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.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	1.9	2.0
2010	1.9	1.9
2011	1.9	
2012	1.9	
2013	1.9	
2014	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 1.9 percent of all scholars receiving program funds exited their training programs early due to poor academic performance in 2010, down from 2.0 percent in 2009, but still higher than 1.4 percent in 2007 and 1.6 percent in 2008. This measure is calculated by dividing the total number of scholars exiting their training program in fiscal year 2010 due to poor academic performance (n=52) and dividing it by the total number of scholars completing a training program in fiscal year 2010 (n=2,307) and the number of scholars exiting their training program prior to completion for any reason (n=498).

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.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	78	75
2010	81	78
2011	84	
2012	84	
2013	85	
2014	85	

Additional Information: Grantees submit data annually through the PPD Web-based data collection. This measure is calculated by dividing the total number of degree and certification recipients who were working in the area(s) for which they received training at the completion of the program by all degree and certification recipients who were employed in their area of training, recipients who were not employed in their area of training, recipients for whom grantees did not know if they were employed upon program completion, recipients who were not employed, and recipients for whom employment data were missing. Individuals who received only an endorsement are excluded from all calculations. Due to a coding error, prior year data had to be adjusted. Data for 2009 previously indicated 77 percent of degree/certification recipients were working in the area for which they were trained upon program completion.

Approximately 4 in 5 degree/certification recipients funded through this program work in the area for which they were trained upon graduation. However, it is difficult to determine the ultimate driver of this trend. The program has in place a service obligation requirement that mandates that degree recipients work in the field in which they were trained upon graduation or pay back the full amount of support received. Additionally, teaching assignments are not wholly at the discretion of the program's graduates, but are instead largely at the discretion of LEAs and schools that may opt to place a teacher in an assignment that is out of area. Given the continuing impacts of the recession, shrinking local and State government tax bases, and the increased number of teacher layoffs, we are likely to see a number of teachers placed "out-of-field" as LEAs attempt to cope with smaller numbers of personnel. With smaller local budgets and fewer LEAs hiring, program graduates may accept teaching positions outside of their field of training in order to secure employment with a view to transition to their area of expertise in a number of years. The Department is currently conducting a review to determine if those graduates who are not working in the area for which they were trained are nevertheless employed in special education or if they are working in non-special education placements. The Department is also considering additional steps to ensure that grantees more effectively recruit and train students who will work in the area for which they received training; to improve training courses and curricula to ensure that graduates are competitive in the market; and to promote high quality residency programs that help graduates build relationships with LEAs and increase their competitiveness.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	74	72
2010	77	76
2011	80	
2012	83	
2013	83	
2014	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 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 or licensure requirements. 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 training, are excluded from all calculations because highly qualified status does not apply to these individuals.

Due to a coding error, prior year data had to be adjusted. Data for 2009 previously indicated 73 percent of degree/certification recipients were working in the area for which they were trained upon program completion and were fully qualified under IDEA.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

funds are used to support high quality programs. Additionally, through the program's Preservice Training Improvement grants and a new technical assistance center funded in fiscal year 2012, the Department is providing support to a number of teacher and paraprofessional training programs to restructure their curricula to align with State standards for certification and accreditation.

Efficiency Measures

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	\$25,000	\$27,398
2010	25,000	22,333
2011	25,000	
2012	25,000	
2013	25,000	
2014	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.

The data used to calculate this measure come from the Department's PPD Web-based data collection. The cost per degree/certification program recipient is calculated for individual cohorts of grantees by dividing the sum of all project costs supported with Federal funds (across all years of each individual scholar's training) (\$72,940,703 in fiscal year 2010) by the number of degree recipients who successfully completed funded training programs closing in that year and who are fully qualified (3,266 in 2010). Given the historical trends in this measure, the Department believes that 2009 represents an outlier, as is evidenced by the decline seen in 2010.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

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 late summer 2012.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$24,505	\$24,505 ²	\$24,505	0

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011. The Administration proposes to continue funding in FY 2014 under appropriations language.

² Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

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.

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

Community parent resource centers are parent training and information centers, operated by local parent organizations, that help ensure that underserved parents of children with disabilities, including low-income parents, parents of children who are English learners, and parents with disabilities, have the training and information they need to enable them to participate effectively in helping their children. Community parent resource centers are required to establish cooperative partnerships with the other parent training and information centers in their States.

Technical assistance is authorized to assist parent training and information centers, including community centers, in areas such as coordinating parent training efforts, disseminating scientifically-based research and information, and the effective use of technology. These technical assistance services enhance the capacity of parent centers to serve parents effectively. The parent technical assistance center network maintains a Web site with a wide variety of information and materials for parents and professionals, as well as a directory of the parent centers (<http://www.parentcenternetwork.org/>).

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

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

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009.....	\$27,028
2010.....	28,028
2011.....	27,972
2012	28,917
2013.....	28,917 ¹

¹ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's request for the Parent Information Centers program is \$28.9 million, the same as the fiscal year 2012 level. Family involvement in children's learning is critical to achieving high-quality education. Decades of research show that positive school-family partnerships can be built to inform families about and involve families in their children's learning. Studies show that all families can take concrete steps that significantly help their children succeed in school, regardless of their income, education, disability status, or knowledge of the English language.

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

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which includes provisions that affect all children, emphasizes the role of parents in education through provisions that stress shared accountability between schools and parents for high student achievement, educational options, local development of parental involvement plans, and building parents' capacity for using effective practices to improve their children's academic achievement. For a non-regulatory guidance document that provides a detailed overview of parent involvement in the context of ESEA, see: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/parentinvguid.doc>. The Administration's proposal for the reauthorization of ESEA would further strengthen family engagement by doubling the amount of Title I, Part A funding that districts must reserve for family engagement and requiring districts to develop and implement comprehensive family engagement plans, as well as allowing States to fund programs that support family engagement and identify and disseminate best practices.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

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 improve their websites and make their resources available in languages other than English, particularly Spanish (see <http://www.neparentcenters.org/glossary/index.html>).

The parent centers also play an important role in dispute resolution by explaining to parents the benefits of alternative methods of dispute resolution, such as mediation, which States are required by IDEA to make available. Parent center staff attended or facilitated over 1,000 alternative dispute resolution sessions last year. These alternative methods of dispute resolution can help avoid costly litigation. As part of that role, parent centers are required, if State educational agencies choose, to contract with those State educational agencies to provide individuals who will meet with parents to explain the IDEA-mandated mediation process.

The 2014 request includes \$8.5 million for new awards to parent training and information centers, \$14.5 million for continuing awards to these centers, \$3.0 million for continuing community parent resource centers, and \$2.7 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 (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
<u>Program Funding:</u>			
Parent Training & Information Centers:			
New	\$9,937	\$487	\$8,462
Continuations	<u>13,280</u>	<u>22,484</u>	<u>14,481</u>
Subtotal	23,217	22,971	22,943
Community Parent Resource Centers:			
New	1,100	0	0
Continuations	<u>1,900</u>	<u>2,999</u>	<u>3,000</u>
Subtotal	3,000	2,999	3,000
Technical Assistance Centers:			
New	0	2,657	0
Continuations	<u>2,484</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2,657</u>
Subtotal	2,484	2,657	2,657

NOTE: 2013 excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands) (continued)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Other (contracts):			
New	\$58	\$100	\$92
Continuations	<u>105</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>160</u>
Subtotal	163	250	252
Peer Review of new award applications:	53	40	65
Total program funding:			
New	11,095	3,244	8,554
Continuations	17,769	25,633	20,298
Peer Review	<u>53</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>65</u>
Total	28,917	28,917	28,917
 <u>Number of Projects:</u>			
Parent Training & Information Centers:			
New	25	2	32
Continuations	46	68	40
Community Parent Resource Centers:			
New	11	0	0
Continuations	19	30	30
Technical Assistance Centers:			
New	0	8	0
Continuations	7	0	8
Other (contracts):			
New	1	1	1
Continuations	3	3	3
Total number of projects:			
New	37	11	33
Continuations	<u>75</u>	<u>101</u>	<u>81</u>
Total	112	112	114

NOTE: 2013 excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

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 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

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

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

Six performance measures have been developed for the Parent Information Centers 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 2014 have been established based on performance data from 2007 to 2010. The measures are:

Measure: The percentage of materials used by Parent Information Centers projects that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	60	84
2010	63	76
2011	76	89
2012	78	96
2013	80	
2014	82	

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

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 2012 were representative of all grantees, 1 product and 1 service were drawn from a stratified random sample of community parent resource centers (CPRCs) and parent training and information centers (PTIs), for a total of 34 products and 34 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.

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of individual products and services that received an average quality rating of 6 or better (65) by the total number of products and services reviewed (68), multiplied by 100 percent. For 2012, this score was 96 percent ($65/68 = .894 \times 100\% = 95.6\%$), which is an increase compared to 2011 and exceeds the target level. The Department is using the feedback from the expert panel to work with grantees to continue to improve their products and services. Data for fiscal year 2013 will be available in October 2013.

Measure: The percentage of Parent Information Centers products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified members of the Parent Information Centers target audience.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	96	89
2010	96	98
2011	96	99
2012	96	100
2013	96	
2014	97	

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 2012 were representative, 1 product and 1 service were

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

drawn from a stratified random sample of CPRCs and PTIs, for a total of 34 products and 34 services reviewed.

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

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of individual products and services that received an average relevance rating of 6 or better (68) by the total number of products and services reviewed (68), multiplied by 100 percent. For FY 2012, this score was 100 percent. ($68/68 = 1.00 \times 100\% = 100\%$).

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 and maintain the high standard achieved in 2012. Data for fiscal year 2013 will be available in October 2013.

Measure: The percentage of all Parent Information Centers products and services deemed to be useful by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	95	86
2010	95	95
2011	95	92
2012	95	100
2013	96	
2014	96	

Additional Information: Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using a panel of six to eight parent stakeholders who assess grant implementation by reviewing a randomly selected sample of materials (n = 68) disseminated by the centers. In an effort to ensure that the sample materials reviewed were representative, 1 product and 1 service were drawn from a stratified random sample of 33 CPRCs and PTIs, for a total of 33 products and 33 services reviewed.

All materials are reviewed and scored on the basis of a rubric, developed by OSEP, that is designed to yield ratings on the extent to which the content can be easily and quickly adopted or

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

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

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of individual products and services that received an average usefulness rating of 6 or better (68) by the total number of products and services reviewed (68), multiplied by 100 percent. For FY 2012, this score was 100 percent. ($68/68 = 1.00 \times 100\% = 100\%$).

Based on the most recent years of data it appears that the program's grantees generally produce products and services that are useful to target audiences. The actual percentage of materials judged to be of high relevance increased from the prior year and exceeded the target. The Department is using the feedback from the expert panel to work with grantees to improve their products and services and maintain the high standard achieved in 2012. Data for fiscal year 2013 will be available in October 2013.

Long-Term Measures

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

Measure: The percentage of parents receiving Special Education Parent Information Centers services who promote scientifically- or evidence-based practices for their infants, toddlers, children and youth.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	74	79
2011	75	77
2013	76	

Additional Information: Data are collected by the parent centers every 2 years using telephone interviews with 25 randomly selected parent stakeholders per center (n = 3,394). The National PTI Technical Assistance Center developed the survey. To calculate the measure, a weighted sum of the number of parents whose answers displayed an enhanced knowledge of

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

evidence-based practices is divided by the total number of parents who responded to four relevant survey questions. Baseline data for this relatively new measure were first collected in 2007 and used to establish targets for later years.

Based on the most recent years of data it appears that program grantees do a reasonably good job of ensuring that parents receiving parent information centers services promote sound practices for their children. The Department uses the results of this measure and the annual quality measure to provide the centers with feedback on how they can better align their products and services with evidence-based practices. Data for fiscal year 2013 will be available in October 2013.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	85	91
2011	87	85
2013	89	

Additional Information: Data are collected for this measure by the parent centers every 2 years using telephone interviews with 25 randomly selected parent stakeholders per center (n = 3,294). The National PTI Technical Assistance Center developed the survey. To calculate the measure, a weighted sum of the number of parents whose answers displayed an enhanced knowledge of IDEA rights and responsibilities is divided by the total number of parents who responded to three relevant survey questions. The targets were established based on results from the survey in prior years.

Data for this measure suggest that most of the parents receiving services from the grantees believe they enhanced their understanding of their rights and responsibilities under IDEA. However, the actual percentage of parents who reported enhanced knowledge declined from last year and fell below the target level. Data for fiscal year 2013 will be available in October 2013.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

Efficiency Measure

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009	\$2.24	\$1.06
2010	2.24	1.13
2011	1.14	1.13
2012	1.12	1.26
2013	1.10	
2014	1.08	

Additional Information: The efficiency measure for the Parent Information Centers program is “the cost per output, by category, weighted by an intensity rating.” In 2012, the cost per unit of services for the program was \$1.26, which exceeded the target level. The increase in cost per unit from 2011 to 2012 may have been caused by a drop in the number of visitors to the websites of parent centers or recipients of newsletters, which together count as one component of this measure. A small percentage drop in web traffic or newsletter recipients can cause a relatively large shift in efficiency because the absolute number of these activities is so large (greater than 19 million). Starting in 2011, targets were adjusted downward based on the consistent low level of the cost per unit from 2008 to 2010. Data for fiscal year 2013 will be available in October 2013.

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 funds 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 ($\$27,971,944/22,166,981 = \1.26). The intensity weights represent the amount of interaction and support required to render each type of service. High intensity services such as IEP facilitation meetings receive a weight of 4; medium intensity services such as group trainings and counseling phone calls receive a weight of 3 and 2, respectively; and low intensity services such as visits to parent center websites receive a weight of 1. However, these whole number intensity weights do not reflect precise estimates of the relative amounts of time and resources associated with different types of services. The Department has examined revising these weights, but an analysis of data and input from performance measures specialists and parent center directors found that the weights could have a wide range of possible values, depending on the mix of services and costs at each parent center. In light of these findings, the Department has kept the weights unchanged to preserve the simplicity and transparency of this measure.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Educational Technology, Media, and Materials

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$29,588	\$29,588 ²	\$29,588	0

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011. The Administration proposes to continue funding in FY 2014 through appropriations language.

² Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Educational Technology, Media, and Materials program (formerly known as 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 products 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 and materials activities include closed captioning, video description, the timely provision of books and other educational materials in accessible formats, and other activities that improve access to education for students with disabilities.

The Educational Technology, Media, and Materials program ensures that educational media that are not otherwise required to be made accessible are available to students with disabilities. Despite the passage of the 21st Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010, which expanded the range of media that must be closed captioned and updated accessibility standards to include emerging Internet and mobile technologies, significant gaps in captioning coverage remain. Mandatory captioning still does not apply to video produced for classroom viewing rather than broadcast television or to video broadcast exclusively over the Internet. Funding for this program supports the captioning and nationwide distribution of thousands of titles of educational media per year.

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,

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Educational Technology, Media, and Materials

including increasingly popular Internet media, are not subject to description requirements. In 2012, over 1,200 hours of educational video were described by grantees funded through this program. The IDEA requires that description and captioning funds be used only for programs that are suitable for use in a classroom setting. These funds may not be used to describe or caption news programs even when they are suitable for use in classrooms.

Educational materials activities include maintaining the standard used in the preparation of electronic files suitable for efficient conversion into specialized accessible formats. The educational materials and related printed core materials provided by this program are written and published primarily for use in elementary and secondary schools for instructional purposes and are required by a State educational agency or local educational agency to be used by students with disabilities in the classroom. As such, the timely delivery of these materials supports students' access to the general curriculum and participation in statewide assessments. The single largest grant in this program provides funding for the production and distribution of textbooks and other educational materials in accessible formats to students with visual impairments and other print disabilities. These activities can be accomplished more rapidly and cheaply than ever before due to recent advances in digital technologies. In 2012, this grantee provided over 1,180,000 accessible books and other materials at no cost to eligible students across the country.

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009	\$38,615
2010	43,973
2011	28,644
2012	29,588
2013	29,588 ¹

¹ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's request for the Educational Technology, Media, and Materials program is \$29.6 million, the same as the 2012 level. The fiscal year 2014 request would provide approximately \$3.2 million for about 7 new awards and approximately \$26.3 million for 31 continuation projects. Projects funded under the Educational Technology, Media, and Materials program support improved 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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Educational Technology, Media, and Materials

education guaranteed for them under the IDEA. This program funds innovations in accessible technologies and new understandings of how these technologies can be effectively applied to increase academic achievement. The Administration believes that improved access and participation result in higher expectations and improved outcomes for children with disabilities.

Educational Technology

The request includes \$15.8 million for Technology activities, which promote the development, demonstration, and use of technology. This is accomplished primarily through research, for which at least \$11.1 million is proposed. This includes \$2.0 million for several new model demonstration projects under the Stepping Up Technology Implementation priority. This competition, first launched in 2012, is a successor to the Steppingstones of Technology Innovation grants. These model demonstration projects build on the development work of the Steppingstones grants by focusing on validating and scaling up technology-based products or interventions such as curriculum materials, accessible products, or instructional methodologies. Projects will receive assistance with technology dissemination and implementation from the Model Demonstration Coordinating Center, which is funded by the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program. The assistance provided to Stepping Up projects by this Center will help ensure that promising technologies can overcome barriers to implementation and mature into widely available interventions and products for special education teachers, families, and students.

The request would also support continuation funding in fiscal year 2014 for research grants awarded in prior years. Of the \$11.1 million for continuation funding, \$1.5 million will support the Center on Online Learning for Students with Disabilities. This project investigates how the rapid growth of instruction delivered through the Internet affects students with disabilities, both positively and negatively, and develops promising practices for delivering online instruction to these students (project website: <http://centerononlinelearning.org/>). The Technology Research and Development Center on Literacy Achievement for Middle School Students with Disabilities would also receive about \$2 million of continuation funding to support its work to expand the research base about technology-based instructional methods that can improve literacy outcomes. Approximately \$6.4 million of the continuation funding would support 13 Stepping Up Technology Implementation projects and \$1.2 million would provide continuing funding for early childhood technology model demonstration grants first awarded in prior years.

In addition to research projects, the request for Technology activities includes \$1.7 million for a continuation award to support technical assistance and dissemination activities carried out by a project awarded in fiscal year 2013 that will assist parents and educators with using best practices with new products and services for students with disabilities.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Educational Technology, Media, and Materials

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.”

Educational Media and Materials

Media and materials activities includes a variety of activities targeted toward providing educational materials, such as textbooks, in accessible formats for individuals with disabilities, particularly deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals and blind and other visually impaired individuals. In fiscal year 2014, \$13.1 million would be allocated to these activities.

Approximately \$1 million of this funding will support a new project to provide technical assistance to States and other entities on the provision of books and other educational materials in accessible formats. In prior years, the Department has funded similar projects that develop and support the widespread use of 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 a variety of accessible formats.

The 2014 request for continuation activities in educational media and materials includes a total of \$7.5 million for accessible books and other instructional materials. Of this, \$6.5 million is for an award to support the development, production, and distribution of educational materials in accessible formats to students with visual impairments and other print disabilities. The current grantee under this priority, Bookshare for Education (<http://www.bookshare.org>), has transformed the provision of educational materials in accessible formats by nationally providing free educational media, including textbooks, much more efficiently and quickly than was previously possible. The remaining funds in this area would support a \$1 million continuation award to support the Digital Images and Graphic Resources for Accessible Materials (DIAGRAM) Center. The goal of this research and development project is to enhance students' access to images and graphics. This content is considerably more difficult to make accessible than basic text. The DIAGRAM Center develops innovative accessibility solutions appropriate for a variety of educational media formats (<http://www.diagramcenter.org/>).

Continuation projects also include \$4 million to support six awards that provide video description and closed captioning of educational television programming. These projects not only close caption and describe educational media, but also efficiently distribute the media to schools via the Internet and other resources. The support for video description of educational programming is particularly important for individuals with visual impairments because, unlike closed captioning, there are very few Federal requirements for providing video descriptions. Information on one of the current captioning and description projects is available at <http://www.dcmp.org>.

The IDEA requires the Department to support the National Instructional Materials Access Center (NIMAC), which is awarded noncompetitively to the American Printing House for the Blind. The NIMAC is a national electronic file repository that makes electronic files that comply with the NIMAS available for the production of print instructional materials in specialized formats (<http://www.nimac.us/>). NIMAC receives source files in NIMAS format from textbook publishers and provides these files to State and local educational agencies for use in producing materials

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Educational Technology, Media, and Materials

in accessible media, such as braille, audio, and digital text. NIMAC contained 31,883 books and other items as of October 2012. The request includes \$604,000 for a continuation award for this project in fiscal year 2014.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
<u>Program funding:</u>			
Technology:			
Research:			
New	\$4,588	\$3,000	\$2,000
Continuations	<u>5,247</u>	<u>10,707</u>	<u>11,123</u>
Subtotal	9,835	13,707	13,123
Technical assistance and dissemination:			
New	0	1,935	0
Continuations	<u>1,600</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>1,699</u>
Subtotal	1,600	2,935	1,699
Projects to address the postsecondary, vocational, technical, and adult education needs of individuals with deafness:			
Continuations	<u>1,000</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>1,000</u>
Subtotal	1,000	1,000	1,000
Subtotal, Technology:			
New	4,588	4,935	2,000
Continuations	<u>7,847</u>	<u>12,707</u>	<u>13,822</u>
Subtotal	12,435	17,642	15,822
Media and Materials:			
Captioned & described accessible media:			
Continuations	<u>4,995</u>	<u>3,998</u>	<u>3,998</u>
Subtotal	4,995	3,998	3,998
Books and other instructional materials in accessible formats:			
New	8,579 ¹	0	1,000
Continuations	<u>2,400</u>	<u>6,821¹</u>	<u>7,500</u>

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Educational Technology, Media, and Materials

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
National Instructional Materials Access Center (NIMAC) – Statutory earmark			
Continuations	<u>\$533</u>	<u>\$567</u>	<u>\$604</u>
Subtotal	533	567	604
Subtotal, Media and Materials:			
New	8,579 ¹	0	1,000
Continuations	<u>7,928</u>	<u>11,386</u> ¹	<u>12,102</u>
Subtotal	16,507	11,386	13,102
Other (e.g. program evaluation contracts):			
New	380	130	155
Continuations	<u>186</u>	<u>309</u>	<u>389</u>
Subtotal, Other	566	439	544
Peer review of new award applications:	80	121	120
Total program funding: ²			
New	13,547	5,065	3,155
Continuations	15,961	24,402	26,313
Peer review	<u>80</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>120</u>
Total	29,588	29,588	29,588

¹ Approximately \$2,100 thousand of the fiscal year 2012 funds for media services cover a portion of the continuation costs for this activity in fiscal year 2013.

² Subtotals may not add to total due to rounding.

NOTE: 2013 excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

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 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Educational Technology, Media, and Materials

Seven performance measures have been developed for the Educational Technology, Media, and Materials program. Three of these measures are annual measures, two are long-term, and the last two are measures 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 Educational Technology, Media, and Materials program.*

Measure: The percentage of Educational Technology, Media, and Materials projects judged to be of high quality.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	82	100
2010	83	97
2011	97	97
2012	97	92
2013	98	
2014	98	

Additional Information: The percentage of products judged to be of high quality decreased and fell below the target in fiscal year 2012. However, a high percentage of products were still reported to be of high quality. The reviewers judged 24 of the 26 products in the sample to be of high quality. The decrease may have been caused by the issuance of new, more detailed instructions to this year's expert panel reviewers. The Department set higher targets starting in fiscal year 2011 based on the high percentages achieved in prior years. Fiscal year 2013 data are expected for this program in October 2013.

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 26 of the program's projects. Each project submitted a product or multiple products that represents the primary or typical products/services released by that grantee during the prior fiscal year. All of the selected products are reviewed and scored on whether the product content is evidence-based, valid, complete, and up-to-date. The quality dimensions measured are (1) Substance – Does the product/service description reflect the best of current research and theory or policy guidance, as demonstrated by a scientifically- or evidence-based approach, a solid conceptual framework, appropriate citations and other evidence of conceptual soundness?; and (2) Communication – Does the product/service description have clarity in its presentation, as evidenced by being free

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Educational Technology, Media, and Materials

of editorial errors, appropriately formatted, and well organized? OSEP reports that the measured inter-rater reliability of the panel members has been excellent during the last few years, indicating substantial agreement among the experts about the quality of the sampled products.

Measure: The percentage of Educational Technology, Media, and Materials projects judged to be of high relevance to improving outcomes of infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	93	100
2010	95	97
2011	97	91
2012	97	100
2013	98	
2014	98	

Additional information: In fiscal year 2012, the percentage of products judged to be of high relevance for this measure increased and exceeded the target level. The reviewers judged all 26 of the products in the sample to be highly relevant for the intended users. The Department set higher targets for this measure starting in fiscal year 2011 based on the consistent results obtained during the 3 prior years of data. In recent years, a large majority of the projects funded under this authority scored highly on this measure.

The scores appearing in the actual data column were produced by a panel of six to eight special education external experts who reviewed a sample of products from 26 Educational Technology, Media, and Materials projects, selected so as to be representative of the program's topical portfolio of grants. Each project submitted a product or multiple products that represents the primary or typical products/services released by that grantee during the prior fiscal year. All of the selected products were assessed on whether the product content was responsive to priority issues and challenges confronting the target groups and judged on three dimensions of relevance: (1) Need – Does the content of the material attempt to solve an important problem or critical issue?; (2) Pertinence – Does the content of the material match the problem or issue facing the target group or groups?; and (3) Reach – Is the content of the material applicable to diverse populations within the target group?

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Educational Technology, Media, and Materials

Measure: The percentage of Special Education Educational Technology, Media, and Materials projects that produce findings, products, and/or services that contribute to improving results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	83	100
2010	84	97
2011	97	97
2012	97	92
2013	98	
2014	98	

Additional information: The actual percentage for fiscal year 2012 did not meet the target and decreased from the prior year. The decrease may have been caused by the issuance of new, more detailed instructions to this year's expert panel reviewers. The last few years of data indicate that the projects are doing a reasonably good job of creating useful products or services for their target populations. Data for fiscal year 2013 are expected in October 2013.

The percentages in the actual data column were produced by a panel of six to eight special education external experts, who reviewed 26 samples of technology products. Each project submitted a product or multiple products that represents the primary or typical products/services released by that grantee during the prior fiscal year. All selected products were reviewed and scored on whether the product content could be easily and quickly adopted or adapted by the target group and produce the desired result. The products were judged on three dimensions of usefulness: (1) Ease – Does the content of the product or service description address a problem or issue in an easily understood way, with directions or guidance regarding how a problem or issue can be addressed?; (2) Replicability – Is it likely that the information derived from the product or service will eventually be used by the target group to achieve the benefit intended?; and (3) Sustainability – Is it likely that the information derived from the product or service will eventually be used in more than one setting successfully over and over again to achieve the intended benefit?

Long-Term Measures

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

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Educational Technology, Media, and Materials

Measure: The percentage of Special Education Educational Technology, Media, and Materials projects that validate their products and services.

Year	Target	Actual
2009		73
2010		63
2011		50
2012	50	70
2013	52	
2014	54	

Additional information: The Department set targets for this measure after reviewing trends in data from prior years. For this measure, a panel of six to eight special education external experts reviews evidence submitted by each project that their products or services improve outcomes for the target population, are evidence based, and are validated by empirical findings. This measure only includes projects that have entered the dissemination phase of their grants or completed the final year of their grants and submitted a final report. Of the ten projects that were rated in fiscal 2012, seven submitted acceptable evidence of validity; the other three projects struggled with collecting sufficient evidence of validity within the 1 year time frame. Evidence about outcomes of the target population may take more than 1 year to become available. Fiscal year 2013 data for this long term measure are expected in October 2013.

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2009		94
2010		100
2011		100
2012	100	83
2013	100	
2014	100	

Additional information: A panel of six to eight special education external experts reviews and scores the extent to which each project rated in the measure above as “validated” has submitted evidence of the availability of, and customer support for, their technology-based products and services. In fiscal year 2012, the panel reviewed evidence from six centers that entered the dissemination phase of their projects or completed the final year of their grants and submitted a

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Educational Technology, Media, and Materials

final report. Five centers that were rated as “validated” submitted sufficient evidence of the availability of their products or services to the target population. Fiscal year 2013 data for this long term measure are expected in October 2013.

Efficiency Measures

The Department has established two efficiency measures for the Educational Technology, Media, and Materials program. The two measures provide data on accessible book distribution and video captioning and description projects, respectively. The Department recently eliminated a measure on the efficiency of research projects due to concerns about the transparency and validity of the measure’s calculation methodology.

Measure: The Federal cost per download from the accessible educational materials production and distribution project funded by the Educational Technology, Media, and Materials program.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		\$7.0
2012		5.5
2013	TBD	
2014	TBD	

Additional Information: One of the major activities supported by this program is the development, production, and distribution of educational books and materials in accessible formats to students with visual impairments and other print disabilities. The current grantee performing activities under the Department’s accessible educational materials priority is Bookshare, Inc. This measure, new in 2011, is calculated as the annual amount of Federal funding for the project divided by the number of files downloaded from the project by eligible students or teachers and sponsors on behalf of eligible students (In 2012: \$6,515,185 / 1,184,126 = \$5.50). After downloading these files, eligible students can access the content in specialized formats, such as audiobooks or braille. Bookshare is the most widely used accessible book producer and distributor in the country. This project works in conjunction with other Department funded projects, such as the National Instructional Materials Access Center (NIMAC), to ensure that eligible students have appropriate materials needed to access the general curriculum. The Department will establish targets for this new measure when another year of data become available in November 2013.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Educational Technology, Media, and Materials

Measure: The Federal cost per hour of video description funded by the Educational Technology, Media, and Materials program.

Year	Target	Actual
2009		\$1,393
2010		2,255
2011		2,258
2012		1,962
2013		
2014	\$1,669	

Additional information: The educational media measure is calculated as the total amount of funding provided for description activities (\$2,499,066 in 2012) divided by the total number of hours of accessible described media produced (1,274 hours in 2012). The cost of an hour of media description decreased from fiscal years 2011 to 2012. Recent advances in technology have increased automation in the descriptioning process and may continue to bring down costs. Actual values for 2011 and 2010 have been corrected. In those years, the amount of funding used in the numerator was incorrectly reported and the number of hours in the denominator inappropriately included some media captioning hours. The updated values shown above include the accurate amount of funding and only media description activities. No target is shown for 2013 because the target in that year was based on the incorrectly reported data. Targets in 2014 and subsequent years are based on the corrected data. We anticipate that fiscal year 2013 data for this measure will be available by October 2013.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Special Olympics education programs

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0 ¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$8,000 ²	\$8,000 ^{2 3}	\$8,000	0

¹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2010. The Administration proposes to continue funding in FY 2014 through appropriations language.

² In FY 2012 and FY 2013, funding for Special Olympics was provided under Technical Assistance and Dissemination. Funding is shown here for purposes of comparability.

³ Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Special Olympics education programs

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(dollars in thousands)
2009.....	\$8,095
2010.....	8,095
2011.....	8,079
2012	8,000 ¹
2013.....	8,000 ¹²

¹ In FY 2012 and FY 2013, funding for Special Olympics was provided under Technical Assistance and Dissemination. Funding is shown here for purposes of comparability.

² Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$8.0 million for Special Olympics education programs, the same as the amount for this activity in fiscal year 2012. The Administration's request would support efforts to promote the expansion of Special Olympics and the design and implementation of Special Olympics education programs, especially the Special Olympics National Youth Activation Demonstration Project (Project UNIFY).

Project UNIFY, a national youth sports demonstration program, is the major activity funded by this direct appropriation. Besides sports and physical education in integrated settings, this project also provides opportunities for youth to participate in leadership development, service learning, and structured interpersonal communication and socialization activities. The Administration believes the activities supported under this program assist individuals with intellectual disabilities in becoming productive members of their communities by dispelling negative stereotypes and promoting positive and inclusive learning environments.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

<u>Measures</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Project UNIFY			
Number of funded State programs	38	38	38
Number of schools participating	2,150	2,275	2,400

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Special Olympics education programs

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 2014 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department has recently established two output measures, two outcome measures, and two efficiency measures for this program. These are the first formal performance measures for this program, and the Department believes that they provide valuable information on the scope, quality, progress, and effectiveness of program services. The first year of formal data collection for these measures was 2011.

Objective: *The Special Olympics will increase the inclusion and awareness of students with intellectual disabilities.*

Measure: The percent of school liaisons who report that Project UNIFY helps raise awareness about students with intellectual disabilities.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		66
2012		65
2013	TBD	
2014	TBD	

Measure: The percent of school liaisons who report that Project UNIFY increases opportunities for students with intellectual disabilities to be involved in school activities.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		52
2012		58
2013	TBD	
2014	TBD	

Additional information: Data were reported for these new measures starting in 2011. To gather the data, Special Olympics engaged external evaluators to survey school liaisons at the end of the program year. School liaisons are volunteers, typically teachers, who administer Special Olympics programming at the school level. Their perceptions are not direct indicators of programmatic outcomes. However, they are informed by close experience with participating students and the Special Olympics organization. These measures provide perspectives on the level of success that the Special Olympics is having at promoting positive and inclusive learning environments. The Department will establish targets when another year of data is available for analysis. FY 2013 data will be available by January 2014.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Special Olympics education programs

Objective: *The Special Olympics will promote the expansion of opportunities provided by Special Olympics programs for students with intellectual disabilities to participate in service learning, character education, and structured interpersonal communication and socialization activities that can be integrated into classroom instruction and are consistent with academic content standards.*

Measure: The number of schools participating in Project UNIFY.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		2,025
2012		2,150
2013	TBD	
2014	TBD	

Measure: The number of schools participating in a Project UNIFY High Activation Program.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		810
2012		924
2013	TBD	
2014	TBD	

Additional information: Special Olympics has aggressively expanded the reach of Project UNIFY during recent years to over 2,100 locations in 38 states. There were 777 elementary schools, 481 middle schools, and 689 high schools, and 30 other schools participating in Project UNIFY in 2011. Schools typically offer programming at one of two intensity levels: High Activation or Building Bridges. High Activation schools feature a higher intensity and variety of activities, and therefore are likely to have a larger impact on participating students. Building Bridges schools offer fewer activities and tend to be new to the program. Schools with High Activation programs also generally require a greater commitment of resources. In 2012, 43 percent of all participating schools were in the High Activation category, an increase of 3 percent from 2011. The Department will establish targets when another year of data is available for analysis. FY 2013 data will be available by January 2014.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Special Olympics education programs

Objective: *The Special Olympics will develop efficient programs at the national, State, and school level.*

Measure: The average total Federal cost per school.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		\$3,997
2012		3,758
2013	TBD	
2014	TBD	

Measure: The percent of Federal funds spent on administration.

Year	Target	Actual
2011		33
2012		29
2013	TBD	
2014	TBD	

Additional information: These two measures provide basic information on the efficiency of the program. The decrease in the cost per school reflects an increase in the number of participating schools and a slight decline in the Federal appropriation for this program. The measure on administrative costs includes administrative expenses at the State level and national level charged to the Federal grant. These administrative expenses pay for management, oversight, and coordination functions that make possible the ongoing implementation of programming in schools. Administrative costs vary among the Department's grants with respect to the type of entity, activity performed, structure of the grantee, and the efficiency of the project's operations. Data were reported for these new measures starting in 2011. The Department will establish targets when another year of data is available for analysis. FY 2013 data will be available by January 2014.

Other Performance Information

Project reports indicate that State and local coordinators were given significant latitude in developing programs. This flexibility has resulted in significant differences in the approaches taken to achieving Project UNIFY's goals and presented challenges for evaluating success. For example, the intensity of services offered varied substantially among participating schools.

Project UNIFY has engaged external evaluators from the University of Massachusetts to conduct a formative evaluation. Data from surveys of school liaisons in 954 schools indicated that Project UNIFY had an inconclusive impact on the attitudes and behaviors of participating students toward individuals with intellectual disabilities. The evaluators commented that the effect of Project UNIFY may be limited by the self-selection into the program by students who already had positive attitudes and behaviors. It is difficult to avoid this self-selection effect

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Special Olympics education programs

because participation in Special Olympics activities is voluntary and non-random. The project's impact on academic outcomes was not measured because improving academic achievement was not the primary goal of this program.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI
(Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2012)

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2014 Authorization: 0¹

Budget Authority:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>Change from 2012</u>
\$1,996	\$1,996 ²	0	-\$1,996

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2013 through appropriations language. No appropriation or authorizing language is sought for this activity under the Special Education account in FY 2014.

² Excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI (PROMISE) is a joint pilot demonstration program with the Social Security Administration (SSA) and the Departments of Health and Human Services and Labor. The goal of the program is to improve the education and post-school outcomes of children who receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments, including completion of postsecondary education and employment, and to improve family or household outcomes through improved services and supports, such as education and job training for the parents.

PROMISE is being implemented in two phases. The first phase is a planning stage that has focused on knowledge generation and development of the proposed priority for the grant competition. The second phase will begin in spring of fiscal year 2013 and will focus on implementing the PROMISE pilot projects, including soliciting grant applications, and reviewing and selecting projects for grant awards. Competitive grants will be awarded to a small number of States for a period of 3 to 5 years to develop partnerships and implement interventions designed to improve the provision and coordination of services and supports for children who receive SSI and their families and achieve outcomes that lead to increased economic self-sufficiency and a reduction in their dependence on SSI payments. 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. Projects will be required to collaborate with the national evaluation of PROMISE to be conducted under a contract with SSA, in collaboration with the Department.

PROMISE has a number of distinguishing features. First, the planning stage involved input from Federal partners as well as stakeholders into the design of the program. Second, the program will entail continued collaboration among four Federal agencies. Third, it will provide services to both youth and their families. This feature will require the involvement of programs that do not

SPECIAL EDUCATION

PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI

typically serve youth with disabilities. Fourth, it will use a rigorous evaluation design to guide implementation of randomized controlled assignment and data collection.

FY 2014 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting funds for PROMISE under the Special Education account in fiscal year 2014. The fiscal year 2012 appropriation under the Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research account allowed the Secretary to use amounts that remained unobligated subsequent to the reallocation of funds to States under the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) State Grants program pursuant to section 110(b) of the Rehabilitation Act to support PROMISE grants. We believe that the funds that became available for obligation under the PROMISE program on October 1, 2013, and remain available through September 30, 2013, are sufficient to support the first year and a significant portion of the second year of project funding for a small number of grants to States.

In addition, the fiscal year 2013 request included language that would allow the Secretary to use remaining funds subsequent to the reallocation of VR funds to support innovative activities aimed at improving outcomes for individuals with disabilities (Disability Innovation Fund), including, if needed, funds for improving the outcomes of children receiving SSI and their families through PROMISE. These funds would remain available for Federal obligation until September 30, 2014. The Administration is proposing similar language in its fiscal year 2014 request for the VR State Grants program, including authority to test the Pay for Success approach. However, funds would not be set aside for this purpose unless the necessary conditions exist and investors show interest. These conditions include:

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

The FY 2012 Special Education appropriation provided \$2 million to support planning, outreach, and other activities needed to implement the PROMISE program. The Department reviewed and compiled existing research on relevant evidence-based practices, knowledge gained from its research, evaluation, technical assistance, and demonstration investments made by the Institute of Education Sciences, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, and other offices. In addition, meetings, social media, and other formats were used to solicit broad public input from researchers, practitioners, potential grantees, and other stakeholders, including the posting of a draft public notice that requested feedback on program, application, and selection requirements. In addition, SSA is using its research funds to support the PROMISE evaluation. About 75 percent of the fiscal year 2012 funds appropriated for

SPECIAL EDUCATION

PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI

PROMISE under the Special Education account will be transferred to SSA to support technical assistance to PROMISE project grantees on participant outreach, random control assignment, and data collection in conjunction with the evaluation. The remaining fiscal year 2012 funds will be used by the Department to provide technical assistance to applicants and to cover peer review and other associated costs. Fiscal year 2013 funds, which would remain available until September 30, 2014, will be used to support technical assistance to PROMISE project grantees and, if needed, to help cover PROMISE grant continuation costs.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (dollars in thousands)

Measures

<u>Program Funding:</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Transfer to SSA for evaluation technical assistance	\$1,500	0	0
Other technical assistance and peer review	496	\$1,996	0
Project funds	<u>0¹</u>	<u>0¹</u>	<u>0</u>
Total program funding	1,996	1,996	0

¹ PROMISE project awards will be made in FY 2013 with funds that became available at the end of FY 2012 from unobligated funds remaining subsequent to the reallocation of State VR Grant funds under the Rehabilitation Services and Disability account. Similarly, VR funds that are unobligated at the end of FY 2013 will be made available to help support project continuation costs.

NOTE: 2013 excludes 0.612 percent across-the-board increase provided in P.L. 112-175.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

Program performance measures will be developed in the initial year of the pilot and will reflect the goals for this program, including intermediate and longer term outcome measures of progress toward self-sufficiency. Each project grantee will be required to track its progress on the key outcomes to be evaluated under the PROMISE program as well as the other outcomes that a project proposes to measure. In collaboration with the national evaluator, the performance of the PROMISE program will be assessed on the basis of established key outcome measures for participating child SSI recipients and their families, as reflected in the goals of the program provided in the priority. These key outcome measures are:

- (1) Increase educational attainment (high school completion, graduation (diploma or equivalent) and enrollment and persistence in postsecondary education, training, or the military);
- (2) Increase the number of individuals earning credentials after high school (e.g., postsecondary degree, technical certification, occupational licensure, or other industry-recognized credential);

SPECIAL EDUCATION

PROMISE: Promoting Readiness of Minors in SSI

(3) Improve employment outcomes (e.g., competitive employment, average earnings, number of hours worked per week, job retention);

(4) Changes in the use of public benefits provided to the individual or family (e.g., cash benefits and other benefits with directly measurable economic value);

(5) Changes in total gross income of all the members of a household who are 15 years old and older. (Included in the total are amounts reported separately for wage or salary income; net self-employment income; interest, dividends, or net rental or royalty income or income from estates and trusts; Social Security or Railroad Retirement income; Supplemental Security Income; public assistance or welfare payments; retirement, survivor, or disability pensions; and all other income.); and

(6) Post-program reduction in SSI payments (e.g., differences between amounts of payments to children and their families who participated in the demonstration project interventions and the amounts paid to the other group randomly assigned to receive typical services).

In addition to the key program outcome measures, each project must develop project measures that assess the project's performance in achieving its goals consistent with the purpose of the priority and the project's logic model. The set of project measures will also include interim measures that assess progress toward achieving the project's outcomes, including the attainment of milestones and benchmarks consistent with the logic model. For example, projects could consider including measures related to school attendance, project attrition, work experiences, enrollment in education or workforce development programs, or the use of partner-provided services for which the child participants and their families are eligible.