

**Department of Education**  
**SPECIAL EDUCATION**  
**Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Request**  
**CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Appropriations Language .....	H-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	H-4
Appropriation, Adjustments, and Transfers .....	H-9
Summary of Changes .....	H-10
Authorizing Legislation.....	H-11
Appropriations History.....	H-12
Summary of Request .....	H-14
Activities:	
State grants:	
Grants to States .....	H-16
Preschool grants .....	H-35
Grants for infants and families .....	H-44
National activities:	
State personnel development.....	H-52
Technical assistance and dissemination.....	H-58
Personnel preparation .....	H-66
Parent information centers.....	H-77
Educational technology, media, and materials.....	H-85
Special Olympics education programs .....	H-94
State Tables*	

State tables reflecting final 2018 allocations and 2019 and 2020 estimates are posted on the Department's webpage at: <https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/statetables/index.html>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

For carrying out the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) [and the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004], [\$13,468,728,000] \$13,451,145,000, of which [\$3,942,129,000] \$3,101,409,000 shall become available on July 1, [2019] 2020, and shall remain available through September 30, [2020] 2021, and of which [\$9,283,383,000] \$10,124,103,000 shall become available on October 1, [2019] 2020, and shall remain available through September 30, [2020] 2021, for academic year [2019-2020] 2020-2021.<sup>1</sup> *Provided*, That the amount for section 611(b)(2) of the IDEA shall be equal to the lesser of the amount available for that activity during fiscal year [2018] 2019, 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 [2018] 2019.<sup>2</sup> *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, without regard to section 611(d) of the IDEA, distribute to all other States (as that term is defined in section 611(g)(2)), subject to the third proviso, any amount by which a State's allocation under section 611, from funds appropriated under this heading, is reduced under section 612(a)(18)(B), according to the following: 85 percent on the basis of the States' relative populations of children aged 3 through 21 who are of the same age as children with disabilities for whom the State ensures the availability of a free appropriate public education under this part, and 15 percent to States on the basis of the States' relative populations of those children who are living in poverty.<sup>3</sup> *Provided further*, That the Secretary may not distribute any funds under the previous proviso to any State whose reduction in allocation from funds appropriated under this heading made funds available for such a distribution.<sup>4</sup> *Provided further*, That the States shall allocate such funds distributed under the second proviso to local educational agencies in accordance with section 611(f).<sup>5</sup> *Provided further*, That the amount by which a State's allocation under section 611(d) of the IDEA is

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

reduced under section 612(a)(18)(B) and the amounts distributed to States under the previous provisos in fiscal year 2012 or any subsequent year shall not be considered in calculating the awards under section 611(d) for fiscal year 2013 or for any subsequent fiscal years:<sup>6</sup> *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provision in section 612(a)(18)(B) regarding the fiscal year in which a State's allocation under section 611(d) is reduced for failure to comply with the requirement of section 612(a)(18)(A), the Secretary may apply the reduction specified in section 612(a)(18)(B) over a period of consecutive fiscal years, not to exceed five, until the entire reduction is applied:<sup>7</sup> *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, in any fiscal year in which a State's allocation under section 611 is reduced in accordance with section 612(a)(18)(B), reduce the amount a State may reserve under section 611(e)(1) by an amount that bears the same relation to the maximum amount described in that paragraph as the reduction under section 612(a)(18)(B) bears to the total allocation the State would have received in that fiscal year under section 611(d) in the absence of the reduction:<sup>8</sup> *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall either reduce the allocation of funds under section 611 for any fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the State fails to comply with the requirement of section 612(a)(18)(A) as authorized by section 612(a)(18)(B), or seek to recover funds under section 452 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1234a):<sup>9</sup> *Provided further*, That the funds reserved under 611(c) of the IDEA 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:<sup>10</sup> *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 under such subpart:<sup>11</sup>

*Provided further*, That States may use funds reserved for other State-level activities under

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

sections 611(e)(2) and 619(f) of the IDEA to make subgrants to local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, other public agencies, and private non-profit organizations to carry out activities authorized by those sections: <sup>12</sup> *Provided further, That, notwithstanding section 643(e)(2)(A) of the IDEA, if 5 or fewer States apply for grants pursuant to section 643(e) of such Act, the Secretary shall provide a grant to each State in an amount equal to the maximum amount described in section 643(e)(2)(B) of such Act:* <sup>13</sup> *Provided further, That if more than 5 States apply for grants pursuant to section 643(e) of the IDEA, the Secretary shall award funds to those States on the basis of the States' relative populations of infants and toddlers except that no such State shall receive a grant in excess of the amount described in section 643(e)(2)(B) of such Act.* <sup>14</sup> (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2019.*)

### NOTE

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

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes**

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>1</sup>...[\$13,468,728,000] <u>\$13,451,145,000</u>, of which [\$3,942,129,000] <u>\$3,101,409,000</u> shall become available on July 1, [2019] <u>2020</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2020] <u>2021</u>, and of which [\$9,283,383,000] <u>\$10,124,103,000</u> shall become available on October 1, [2019] <u>2020</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2020] <u>2021</u>, for academic year [2019-2020] <u>2020-2021</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 are for an advance appropriation that becomes available for obligation on October 1 of the fiscal year following the year of the appropriation.</p>
<p><sup>2</sup> <i>Provided</i>, That the amount for section 611(b)(2) of the IDEA shall be equal to the lesser of the amount available for that activity during fiscal year [2018] <u>2019</u>, increased by the amount of inflation as specified in section 619(d)(2)(B) of the IDEA, or the percent change in the funds appropriated under section 611(i) of the IDEA, but not less than the amount for that activity during fiscal year [2018] <u>2019</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 2019 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 2019 appropriation.</p>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>3</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, 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, 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:</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 State financial support requirements of section 612 of the IDEA and requires that those funds be distributed to other States on the basis of their relative populations of children in the age ranges for which a State ensures a free appropriate public education and those children living in poverty.</p>
<p><sup>4</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, 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:</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 State financial support requirements of section 612 of the IDEA does not receive funds redistributed as a result of another State's failure to meet those same requirements.</p>
<p><sup>5</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That the States shall allocate such funds distributed under the second proviso to local educational agencies in accordance with section 611(f):</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><sup>6</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, 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:</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 State financial support requirements in section 612. This language mitigates the potential long-term impact of one-time reductions in awards.</p>
<p><sup>7</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That, notwithstanding the provision in section 612(a)(18)(B) regarding the fiscal year in which a State's allocation under section 611(d) is reduced for failure to comply with the requirement of section 612(a)(18)(A), the Secretary may apply the reduction specified in section 612(a)(18)(B) over a period of consecutive fiscal years, not to exceed five, until the entire reduction is applied:</p>	<p>This language permits the Secretary to spread out a reduction from a State's award as a result of a failure to meet the maintenance of State financial support requirements of section 612 of the IDEA over a maximum of 5 years.</p>
<p><sup>8</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That the Secretary may, in any fiscal year in which a State's allocation under section 611 is reduced in accordance with section 612(a)(18)(B), reduce the amount a State may reserve under section 611(e)(1) by an amount that bears the same relation to the maximum amount described in that paragraph as the reduction under section 612(a)(18)(B) bears to the total allocation the State would have received in that fiscal year under section 611(d) in the absence of the reduction:</p>	<p>This language permits the Secretary to reduce the maximum State set-aside for State administration by the same percentage as the reduction in the State's overall IDEA section 611 grant.</p>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>9</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That the Secretary shall either reduce the allocation of funds under section 611 for any fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the State fails to comply with the requirement of section 612(a)(18)(A) as authorized by section 612(a)(18)(B), or seek to recover funds under section 452 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1234a):</p>	<p>This language permits the Secretary to:</p> <p>(1) seek to recover non-Federal (State) funds in the amount of the State’s failure to meet the maintenance of State financial support requirements of section 612 under the recovery of funds provision in section 452 of the General Education Provisions Act, or</p> <p>(2) reduce the State’s IDEA section 611 grant.</p>
<p><sup>10</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That the funds reserved under 611(c) of the IDEA 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:</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>
<p><sup>11</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, 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 under such subpart:</p>	<p>This language permits the Secretary to use funds appropriated for the State Personnel Development Grants program under Part D of the IDEA to evaluate program performance.</p>
<p><sup>12</sup> <u><i>Provided further</i>, That States may use funds reserved for other State-level activities under sections 611(e)(2) and 619(f) of the IDEA to make subgrants to local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, other public agencies, and private non-profit organizations to carry out activities authorized by those sections</u></p>	<p>This language permits States to subgrant funds that they reserve for “Other State-level activities” under the Grants to States and Preschool Grants to States programs.</p>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>13</sup> <u>Provided further, That, notwithstanding section 643(e)(2)(A) of the IDEA, if 5 or fewer States apply for grants pursuant to section 643(e) of such Act, the Secretary shall provide a grant to each State in an amount equal to the maximum amount described in section 643(e)(2)(B) of such Act:</u></p>	<p>In years in which five or fewer States apply for funding under the State Incentive Grants program under Part C of the IDEA, this language would allow the Department to provide all States that apply 20 percent of the funds reserved for the program.</p>
<p><sup>14</sup> <u>Provided further, That if more than 5 States apply for grants pursuant to section 643(e) of the IDEA, the Secretary shall award funds to those States on the basis of the States' relative populations of infants and toddlers except that no such State shall receive a grant in excess of the amount described in section 643(e)(2)(B) of such Act.</u></p>	<p>In years in which more than five States apply for funding under the State Incentive Grants program under Part C of the IDEA, this language would allow the Department to ensure that all funds are allocated to eligible States on the relative basis of the number of infants and toddlers in each State.</p>

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**  
**Appropriation, Adjustments, and Transfers**  
(dollars in thousands)

Appropriation/Adjustments/Transfers	2018	2019	2020
<b>Discretionary:</b>			
Appropriation.....	<u>\$13,336,184</u>	<u>\$13,468,728</u>	<u>\$13,451,145</u>
Total, discretionary appropriation.....	13,336,184	13,468,728	13,451,145
<b>Advance:</b>			
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	-9,283,383	-9,283,383	-10,124,103
Advance from prior year .....	<u>9,283,383</u>	<u>9,283,383</u>	<u>9,283,383</u>
Total, budget authority.....	13,336,184	13,468,728	12,610,425

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**Summary of Changes**  
(dollars in thousands)

---

2019 .....	\$13,468,728
2020 .....	<u>13,451,145</u>
Net change .....	-17,583

---

<b>Decreases:</b>	<u>2019 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
<u>Program:</u>		
Elimination of funding for the Special Olympics Education programs	\$17,583	-\$17,583
Net change		-17,583

---

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**Authorizing Legislation**  
(dollars in thousands)

Activity	2019 Authorized	2019	2020 Authorized	2020 Request
<b>State Grants:</b>				
Grants to States ( <i>IDEA-B-611</i> ).....	Indefinite <sup>1</sup>	\$12,364,392 <sup>2</sup>	Indefinite <sup>1</sup>	\$12,364,392 <sup>2</sup>
Preschool grants ( <i>IDEA-B-619</i> ).....	Indefinite	391,120	Indefinite	391,120
Grants for infants and families ( <i>IDEA-C</i> ).....	0 <sup>3</sup>	470,000	0 <sup>3</sup>	470,000
<b>National activities:</b>				
State personnel development ( <i>IDEA-D-1</i> ).....	0 <sup>3</sup>	38,630	0 <sup>3</sup>	38,630
Technical assistance and dissemination ( <i>IDEA-D-2-663</i> ).....	0 <sup>3</sup>	44,345	0 <sup>3</sup>	44,345
Personnel preparation ( <i>IDEA-D-2-662</i> ).....	0 <sup>3</sup>	87,200	0 <sup>3</sup>	87,200
Parent information centers ( <i>IDEA-D-3-671-673</i> ).....	0 <sup>3</sup>	27,411	0 <sup>3</sup>	27,411
Educational Technology, Media, and Materials ( <i>IDEA-D-3-674</i> ).....	0 <sup>3</sup>	28,047	0 <sup>3</sup>	28,047
Special Olympics education programs ( <i>SOSEA 3(a)</i> ) ...	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>17,583</u>	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>0</u>
Total definite authorization .....	0		0	
Total annual appropriation .....		13,468,728		13,451,145
Portion of request subject to reauthorization .....				695,633

<sup>1</sup> Funding for technical assistance on State data collection is limited to \$25,000 thousand adjusted for inflation. This amount is estimated to be \$34,092 thousand for fiscal year 2019 and \$34,843 thousand for fiscal year 2020.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$20,000 thousand for technical assistance on State data collection in fiscal year 2019 and \$10,000 thousand in fiscal year 2020.

<sup>3</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011; continued funding is proposed for this program in fiscal year 2020 through appropriations language.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Appropriations History (dollars in thousands)

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2011	12,846,190	12,564,953 <sup>1</sup>	12,787,035	12,526,672 <sup>2</sup>
2011 Advance for 2012 Rescission (P.L. 112-74)	(8,592,383)	(8,592,383)	(8,592,383)	(8,592,383) (-16,240)
2012 (2012 Advance for 2013)	12,861,351 (9,433,103)	13,757,844 <sup>3</sup> (8,592,383)	12,553,066 <sup>3</sup> (8,592,383)	12,640,709 (9,283,383)
2013 2013 Advance for 2014	12,687,307 (10,124,103)	12,640,709 <sup>4</sup> (9,283,383)	12,770,709 <sup>4</sup> (9,283,383)	11,982,364 (9,283,383)
2014 2014 Advance for 2015	12,657,307 (10,124,103)	N/A <sup>5</sup>	12,803,387 (9,283,383)	12,497,300 (9,283,383)
2015 2015 Advance for 2016	12,600,627 (10,124,103)	N/A <sup>5</sup>	12,555,044 <sup>6</sup> (9,283,383)	12,522,358 (9,283,383)
2016 2016 Advance for 2017	12,822,358 (9,283,383)	13,024,510 <sup>7</sup> (9,283,383)	12,636,817 <sup>7</sup> (9,283,383)	12,976,858 (9,283,383)
2017 2017 Advance for 2018	13,066,858 (9,283,383)	13,406,517 <sup>8</sup> (9,283,383)	13,066,858 <sup>8</sup> (9,283,383)	13,001,315 (9,220,340)
2018 2018 Advance for 2019	12,942,125 (10,124,103)	13,251,691 <sup>9</sup> (9,283,383)	13,066,858 <sup>9</sup> (9,283,383)	13,038,681 <sup>9</sup> (9,283,383)

<sup>1</sup> The level for the House allowance reflects the House passed full-year continuing resolution.

<sup>2</sup> The level for appropriation reflects the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (P.L. 112-10).

<sup>3</sup> The level for the House allowance reflects an introduced bill and the level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Committee action only.

<sup>4</sup> The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2013 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress only through the House Subcommittee and the Senate Committee.

<sup>5</sup> The House allowance is shown as N/A because there was no Subcommittee action.

<sup>6</sup> The level for the Senate allowance reflects Senate Subcommittee action only.

<sup>7</sup> The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2016 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress only through the House Committee and Senate Committee.

<sup>8</sup> The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect Committee action on the regular annual 2017 appropriations bill.

<sup>9</sup> The level for the House allowance reflects floor action on the Omnibus appropriations bill; the Senate allowance reflects Committee action on the regular annual 2018 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115-141).

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

Year	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2019	\$13,051,776	13,422,651 <sup>10</sup>	13,493,684	13,468,728
2019 Advance for 2020	(10,124,103)	(9,283,383)	(9,283,383)	(9,283,383)
2020	\$13,451,145			
2020 Advance for 2021	(10,124,103)			

---

<sup>10</sup> The levels for the House and Senate allowance reflect Committee action on the regular annual 2019 appropriations bill; the Appropriation reflects enactment of the Department of Defense and Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 115-245).

[Click here for accessible version](#)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2020 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

(in thousands of dollars)

	Cat Code	2018 Appropriation	2019 Appropriation	2020 President's Budget	2020 President's Budget Compared to 2019 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent
<b>Special Education</b>						
1. State grants:						
(a) Grants to States (IDEA B-611)						
Annual appropriation	D	2,994,465	3,081,009	2,240,289	(840,720)	-27.29%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year <sup>1</sup>	D	9,283,383	9,283,383	10,124,103	840,720	9.06%
Subtotal		12,277,848	12,364,392	12,364,392	0	0.00%
(b) Preschool grants (IDEA B-619)	D	381,120	391,120	391,120	0	0.00%
(c) Grants for infants and families (IDEA C)	D	470,000	470,000	470,000	0	0.00%
Subtotal, State grants		13,128,968	13,225,512	13,225,512	0	0.00%
2. National activities (IDEA D):						
(a) State personnel development (subpart 1)	D	38,630	38,630	38,630	0	0.00%
(b) Technical assistance and dissemination (section 663)	D	44,345	44,345	44,345	0	0.00%
(c) Personnel preparation (section 662)	D	83,700	87,200	87,200	0	0.00%
(d) Parent information centers (sections 671-673)	D	27,411	27,411	27,411	0	0.00%
(e) Educational technology, media, and materials (section 674)	D	28,047	28,047	28,047	0	0.00%
Subtotal, National activities		222,133	225,633	225,633	0	0.00%
3. Special Olympics education programs (Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act)	D	15,083	17,583	0	(17,583)	-100.00%
<b>Total, Appropriation</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>13,366,184</b>	<b>13,468,728</b>	<b>13,451,145</b>	<b>(17,583)</b>	<b>-0.13%</b>
Total, Budget authority	D	13,366,184	13,468,728	12,610,425	(858,303)	-6.37%
Current		4,082,801	4,185,345	3,327,042	(858,303)	-20.51%
Prior year's advance		9,283,383	9,283,383	9,283,383	0	0.00%

NOTES: D = discretionary program; M = mandatory program  
Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The amount for Advance for succeeding fiscal year in the 2020 President's Budget column is increased to account for the proposed elimination of advances in Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants in the School Improvement Programs 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 2020 President's request for Special Education of \$13.5 billion is aimed at making this goal a reality by helping States and school districts improve results for children with disabilities. This request is a decrease of \$17.6 million from the fiscal year 2019 appropriation.

The Administration requests \$12.4 billion for the **Grants to States** program, the same as the fiscal year 2019 appropriation, to assist States and schools in covering the excess costs of providing special education and related services to children with disabilities ages 3 through 21. The request would provide an average of \$1,758 for each of the 7.0 million children with disabilities who are estimated to be served in 2020. Under this request, the Federal contribution toward meeting the excess cost of special education and related services would be approximately 13 percent of the national average per pupil expenditures.

The request of \$391.1 million for **Preschool Grants** would assist States and schools in providing special education services to children ages 3 through 5. The request of \$470.0 million for **Grants for Infants and Families** would provide assistance to States to help them implement statewide systems of early intervention services for children from birth through age 2. Both requests are level with the fiscal year 2019 appropriation.

The \$225.6 million request for **National Activities** programs would maintain support at the fiscal year 2019 level for 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. The Administration's request eliminates funding for the **Special Olympics Education Programs**.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### State grants: Grants to States

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2020 Authorization: Indefinite <sup>1,2</sup>

Budget Authority:

	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$3,081,009	\$2,240,289	-\$840,720
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	<u>9,283,383</u>	<u>10,124,103</u>	<u>+840,720</u>
Total	12,364,392	12,364,392	0

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 611(c) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act limits technical assistance activities to \$25,000 thousand, increased by the amount of inflation from year to year. It is estimated that the maximum amount authorized for fiscal year 2020 would be \$34,843 thousand.

<sup>2</sup> Section 611(b)(2) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act requires that from the funds appropriated for Grants to States, 1.226 percent shall be set aside for the Department of the Interior. It is estimated that the maximum amount authorized for fiscal year 2020 would be \$151,587 thousand.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Grants to States program provides formula grants to assist the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Department of the Interior, the 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 they are not required to serve children aged 3 through 5 or 18 through 21 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.

Funding Formula – Funds are allocated among States in accordance with a variety of factors, as outlined under section 611(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). First, each State is allocated an amount equal to the amount that it received for fiscal year 1999. If the total program appropriation increases over the prior year, 85 percent of the remaining funds are allocated based on the number of children in the general population in the age range for which the States guarantee FAPE to children with disabilities. Fifteen percent of the remaining funds are allocated based on the number of children living in poverty that are in the age range for which the States guarantee FAPE to children with disabilities.

The IDEA also includes several maximum and minimum allocation requirements that are triggered when the amount available for distribution to States increases. 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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

---

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.

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 local educational agencies (LEAs). However, a portion of the funds may be used for State-level activities. Any funds not reserved 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 2019, the latter amount is estimated to be approximately \$1.1 million.

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.

Since 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 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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

---

50 percent of any increase in its allocation under the Grants to States program over the prior year. The Department 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 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 (ESEA) of 1965, as amended. Also, if a State educational agency (SEA) determines that an LEA is not meeting 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.

Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) – LEAs typically may 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 comprehensive coordinated early intervening services.

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 Department 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.

IDEA requires that, from the funds appropriated for Grants to States, 1.226 percent must be set aside for the Department of the Interior to meet the need for assistance for the education of children with disabilities aged 5 through 21, inclusive, on reservations and enrolled in elementary and secondary schools for Indian children operated or funded by that Department. It is estimated that the maximum amount authorized for fiscal year 2019 would be approximately \$152 million.

Grants to States is a forward-funded program that includes advance appropriations. A portion of the funds becomes available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated, and remains available for Federal obligation for 15 months. The remaining funds become available on October 1 of the following fiscal year and remain available for Federal obligation for 12 months, expiring at the same time as the forward-funded portion. For fiscal

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

---

year 2020, school districts will use both the forward- and advance-funded amounts primarily during the 2020-2021 school year.

Both forward-funded and advance funds remain available for obligation at State and local levels for an additional year. Hence, States and LEAs will have until September 30, 2022, to obligate their fiscal year 2020 awards.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2015.....	\$11,497,848
2016.....	11,912,848
2017.....	11,939,805
2018.....	12,277,848
2019.....	12,364,392

### **FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2020, the Administration requests \$12.4 billion for Grants to States, the same as the fiscal year 2019 level. The request would maintain the Federal government’s commitment to support States and local educational agencies in providing special education and related services to an estimated 7.0 million students with disabilities nationwide in 2020.

Prior to the enactment of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as many as 1 million children with disabilities were excluded from educational services. The IDEA requires that States and school districts provide any child identified as having a disability covered by the Act with access to a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. The Grants to States program is aimed at assisting States and districts in meeting this mandate.

The request would assist all States in providing special education and related services for children with disabilities. In 2018, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) released the “OSERS Rethink” framework designed to focus its work and to raise expectations and improve outcomes for individuals with disabilities. As part of the framework, OSERS is working in partnership with States to identify, prioritize, and implement evidence-based strategies intended to improve outcomes for children with disabilities, including efforts identified in State Systemic Improvement Plans (SSIP). As part of the Department’s Results Driven Accountability (RDA) framework, States submit SSIPs to the Department to evaluate their results for children with disabilities, their capacity to improve those results, and the steps necessary to improve State support systems and local service delivery systems. OSERS is emphasizing the flexibility States have in using funds reserved for other State-level activities to support a wide range of activities, including to enhance implementation of their SSIPs. The Department estimates that States would be allowed to reserve approximately \$52 million more for such activities in fiscal year 2020 than they could in fiscal year 2018. The Department intends to work with States by providing technical assistance to help States leverage these additional funds to best support their implementation of State-directed reforms designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

The request would provide an average of \$1,758 per child with a disability. This average is based on the assumption that the number of children aged 3 through 21 who will be served will

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

continue to increase through 2020 to approximately 7.0 million. The Federal share toward offsetting the cost of special education and related services for children with disabilities would be approximately 13 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure (APPE) based on the anticipated growth of APPE through fiscal year 2020.

From 1975, when the IDEA was enacted, through 2005, the rate of growth in the number of children with disabilities served outpaced the rate of growth in the general population aged 3 through 21. In the 2004-2005 school year, the number of children served peaked at 6.8 million, and this number generally declined through the 2011-2012 school year to a low of 6.5 million. Since that time, the number of children with disabilities served under the IDEA has generally increased, with an all-time high of 6.9 million children being served in the 2017-2018 school year. In estimating future trends in the number of children served under the IDEA, the Department uses a rolling three-year average growth rate. Using this methodology, the Department estimates that approximately 7.0 million children with disabilities will be served in fiscal year 2020.

One of the primary objectives of the Grants to States program is to improve the quality of the education provided to children with disabilities so that they can be educated in, and make progress in, the general education curriculum. This includes helping to ensure that eligible children have access to challenging grade-level academic content; meet the same rigorous standards that have been established for all children to help prepare them for college or careers; and are prepared to lead productive, independent adult lives to the maximum extent possible.

The funds requested under the Grants to States program and the National Activities programs would help enhance Statewide technical assistance, professional development, or other coordinated activities across a broad range of service providers; build the evidence base for promising interventions; and ensure that LEAs and early childhood providers have additional resources to provide high quality, direct services to children with disabilities and their families.

### **FY 2020 Proposed Appropriations Language**

The Administration is proposing to continue appropriations language provided in previous years regarding State maintenance of effort (MOE) requirements, the technical assistance set-aside under section 616(i) of the IDEA, and the allocation provided to the Department of the Interior. In addition, the Administration is proposing appropriations language initially included in the Fiscal Year 2019 President's Budget to provide States with greater flexibility to more efficiently distribute funds they reserve for Other State-level Activities.

### **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 Department is required to reduce that State's award under the Special Education Grants to States program. Appropriations language first provided in fiscal year 2013 and continued in the current request would allow the Department to provide these funds to other States that 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 in those States. The

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

---

proposed language also provides continued flexibility in enforcing MOE requirements while protecting the services supported with Federal funds.

#### Technical Assistance

As in previous years, the Administration is proposing appropriations language that would allow the Department to continue 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 language would maintain the existing authority enacted through appropriations language in fiscal year 2019, which is currently being used in several of the Department's technical assistance investments.

#### Department of the Interior Set-Aside

Consistent with previous years, the Administration proposes appropriations language limiting the amount of funding provided to the Department of the Interior (Interior). The 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. At the request level, the uncapped allocation to Interior would provide an average of approximately \$24,119 for each child with a disability served in the fall of 2017, which is more than 13 times the average amount per child with a disability that States would receive. With the proposed cap, Interior would receive per child about 8.8 times the average amount that States would receive, which translates into an average of \$15,513 for each child with a disability, or about 119 percent of the national APPE compared to 13 percent of the APPE for States overall.

#### Other State-Level Activities Subgranting Authority

Under section 611(e)(2) of the IDEA, States are allowed to reserve a portion of their allocations under the Grants to States program to carry out State-level activities including, but not limited to: monitoring, enforcement, and complaint investigation; providing support and direct services, including technical assistance, personnel preparation, and professional development and training; and assisting LEAs in delivering positive behavioral interventions and supports. For many of the required and authorized uses of these funds, States have historically found that subgranting is a more efficient and effective way to manage these funds and carry out the activities prescribed in the statute. However, 34 CFR §76.50(b) prohibits grantees from making subgrants unless explicitly authorized to do so by the statute. As such, the current statute and regulations require States to engage in potentially costly and time-consuming direct expenditure of funds or negotiation and management of contracts, both of which can divert limited State resources away from effective management of other parts of the Grants to States program. Therefore, the Administration is requesting appropriations language that would allow States to subgrant funds that they reserve under section 611(e)(2) of the IDEA to promote the efficient use of both State and Federal resources.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Formula grants:			
Formula grants to States	\$12,119,147	\$12,202,300	\$12,212,300
Formula grants to Outlying Areas	\$34,304	\$38,011	\$38,011
Grants to Freely Associated States	\$6,579	\$6,579	\$6,579
Department of the Interior	<u>\$96,818</u>	<u>\$97,500</u>	<u>\$97,500</u>
Subtotal, formula grants	\$12,256,848	\$12,344,392	\$12,354,392
Technical Assistance	<u>\$21,000<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>\$20,000<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>\$10,000<sup>3</sup></u>
Total	\$12,277,848	\$12,364,392	\$12,364,392
Number of children with disabilities served ages 3 through 21 <sup>4</sup>	6,904,232	6,974,617	7,028,993
Average Federal share per child (whole dollars) <sup>4</sup>	\$1,775	\$1,770	\$1,758
Average per pupil expenditure (APPE) (whole dollars) <sup>4</sup>	\$12,537	\$12,793	\$13,084
Federal funding as a percentage of APPE <sup>4</sup>	14%	14%	13%

<sup>1</sup> The Department carried over \$15,565 thousand of the remaining fiscal year 2018 multiyear appropriation into fiscal year 2019.

<sup>2</sup> The Department plans to carry over \$13,797 thousand of the remaining fiscal year 2019 multiyear appropriation into fiscal year 2020.

<sup>3</sup> The Department plans to carry over \$2,097 thousand of the remaining fiscal year 2020 multiyear appropriation into fiscal year 2021.

<sup>4</sup> Estimate.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

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

<u>Basis:</u>	School Year					
	2014-2015	2014-2015	2015-2016	2015-2016	2016-2017	2016-2017
	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>
Graduating with regular diploma	45.2%	252,172	44.9%	269,246	45.7%	278,704
Graduating through certification	6.7%	37,590	7.1%	42,590	7.0%	42,682
Transferred to regular education	9.7%	53,999	9.3%	56,113	10.3%	62,465
Dropped out, or moved but not known to have continued in education	11.6%	64,850	11.2%	67,305	11.1%	67,753
Moved, but known to have continued in education	25.6%	142,847	26.5%	158,889	24.9%	151,589
Reaching maximum age for services and other reasons	<u>1.1%</u>	<u>6,054</u>	<u>1.0%</u>	<u>6,284</u>	<u>1.0%</u>	<u>6,173</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>557,512</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>600,427</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>609,366</b>

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

NOTE: Percentages may not add to 100 percent due to rounding.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

#### History of Children Served and Program Funding—FYs 1987 through 2020

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Children Served</u> <u>(thousands)</u>	<u>Appropriation</u> <u>(dollars in thousands)</u>	<u>Federal</u> <u>Share Per Child</u> <u>(whole dollars)</u>	<u>Percentage</u> <u>of APPE</u>
1987	4,167	\$1,338,000	\$321	9%
1988	4,236	1,431,737	338	9%
1989	4,347	1,475,449	339	8%
1990	4,419	1,542,610	349	8%
1991	4,567	1,854,186	406	9%
1992	4,727	1,976,095	418	8%
1993	4,896	2,052,728	419	8%
1994	5,101	2,149,686	421	8%
1995	5,467	2,322,915	425	8%
1996	5,629	2,323,837	413	7%
1997	5,806	3,107,522	535	9%
1998	5,978	3,807,700	636	11%
1999	6,133	4,310,700	701	11%
2000	6,274	4,989,685	793	12%
2001	6,381	6,339,685	991	14%
2002	6,483	7,528,533	1,159	15%
2003	6,611	8,874,398	1,340	17%
2004	6,723	10,068,106	1,495	18%
2005	6,820	10,589,746 <sup>1</sup>	1,558	18%
2006	6,814	10,582,961 <sup>1</sup>	1,551	18%
2007	6,796	10,782,961 <sup>1</sup>	1,584	17%
2008	6,718	10,947,511 <sup>1</sup>	1,609	17%
2009	6,599	22,805,211 <sup>1,2</sup>	3,453 <sup>2</sup>	33% <sup>2</sup>
2010	6,614	11,505,211 <sup>1</sup>	1,736	16%
2011	6,558	11,465,960 <sup>1</sup>	1,745	16%
2012	6,543	11,577,855 <sup>1</sup>	1,766	16%
2013	6,574	10,974,866 <sup>1</sup>	1,674	15%
2014	6,593	11,472,848 <sup>1</sup>	1,743	16%
2015	6,697	11,497,848 <sup>1</sup>	1,715	15%
2016	6,814	11,812,848 <sup>1</sup>	1,745	15%
2017	6,808	12,002,848 <sup>1</sup>	1,760	15%
2018	6,904	12,277,848 <sup>1</sup>	1,775	14%
2019	6,974 <sup>3</sup>	12,327,848 <sup>1</sup>	1,770 <sup>3</sup>	14% <sup>3</sup>
2020	7,029 <sup>3</sup>	12,327,848 <sup>1</sup>	1,758 <sup>3</sup>	13% <sup>3</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$10,000 thousand for technical assistance activities in 2005, \$15,000 thousand in 2006 through 2009 and 2014, \$25,000 thousand in 2010 through 2012, \$23,693 thousand in 2013, \$13,000 in 2015, \$20,000 thousand in 2016, \$21,400 thousand in 2017, \$21,000 thousand in 2018, \$20,000 thousand in 2019, and \$10,000 in 2020.

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

<sup>3</sup> Estimate

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2020 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.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	37%	34%
2011	39	32
2013	40	31
2015	40	33
2017	40	32
2019	40	

**Measure:** The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic on the NAEP in mathematics.

Year	Target	Actual
2009	35%	36%
2011	37	35
2013	38	34
2015	38	32
2017	38	30
2019	38	

**Additional information:** 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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

---

of Indian Education schools and Department of Defense Education Activity schools.” NAEP is a biennial assessment.

Students with disabilities score well below other students on NAEP assessments. On the 2017 fourth-grade reading assessment, only 32 percent of students with disabilities scored at or above Basic, while 72 percent of other students scored at or above Basic. On the 2017 math assessment, only 30 percent of eighth-graders with disabilities scored at or above Basic, while 75 percent of other eighth-grade 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 have declined over the past 20 years, which may partly explain the continuing low scores of students with disabilities.

### Elementary and Secondary Education Measures

Data on the following measures are collected annually through the Education Data Exchange Network and made available through *EDFacts*. Targets have been based on a straight-line trajectory toward the No Child Left Behind goal to have all children performing at proficient or advanced levels by 2014. With the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act, which reauthorized ESEA, and the removal of the statutory requirement of 100 percent proficiency by 2014, the Department established new and ambitious targets based on actual performance reported by States.

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
2015	100%	22%
2016	100	21
2017	Baseline	
2018	Baseline	
2019	Baseline	
2020	35	

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

---

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	100%	22%
2016	100	22
2017	Baseline	
2018	Baseline	
2019	Baseline	
2020	35	

**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
2015	0	30
2016	0	31
2017	Baseline	
2018	Baseline	
2019	Baseline	
2020	20	

**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
2015	0	26
2016	0	28
2017	Baseline	
2018	Baseline	
2019	Baseline	
2020	20	

**Additional information:** Despite progress with respect to the performance of students with disabilities on State reading and mathematics assessments through 2013, results declined substantially in 2015 with the implementation of new State assessments in the 2014-2015 academic year. However, as evidenced by data collected under the latter two measures above, the 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 remained relatively consistent, demonstrating that the drop in performance on the first two measures captures a wider phenomenon than one only affecting students with disabilities.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	65.0%	69.9%
2016	66.0	70.1
2017	68.0	
2018	70.0	
2019	72.0	
2020	72.0	

**Additional information:** Performance on this measure has improved consistently over the past 5 years, with a total increase of 6.2 percentage points during that period. However, the graduation rate for students with IEPs still lags behind all students, who graduated high school at a rate of 84 percent in the 2015-2016 school year.

### Postsecondary Outcomes

One of the purposes of the IDEA is to help prepare children with disabilities for further education, employment, and independent living. In 2011, the Department developed an indicator on employment and postsecondary education. This indicator tracks the median percentage of students who are no longer in secondary school who 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 were 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 were competitively employed or in some other form of employment, within 1 year of leaving high school. Data for this indicator is 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.

**Measure:** The median percentage of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within 1 year of leaving high school.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	74.5	77.5%
2016	75.0	77.6
2017	76.0	
2018	78.0	
2019	80.0	
2020	80.0	

**Additional information:** The Department collected baseline data in fall 2011 and 2012 and identified numerous data quality and collection issues across States. The Department worked with States to provide technical assistance to identify improvement activities to produce meaningful and reliable data on postsecondary outcomes and set baseline data in 2014, and

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

---

States met the target in that year. However, States continue to struggle to collect a representative sample in the surveys through which data for this measure are collected. The Department continues to work with States to improve the reliability of their data on this measure.

### Efficiency Measure

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

Year	Target	Actual
2016	Baseline	171
2017	Baseline	143
2018	Baseline	276
2019		
2020		

**Additional information:** The Department did not conduct regular site visits to States from 2011 through 2015. During that time, OSEP continued to meet its statutory monitoring responsibilities through the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) process, fiscal monitoring, and its work with State dispute resolution systems. In 2016, OSEP began conducting site visits using a risk-based approach to monitoring. In 2018, OSEP conducted 11 site visits (7 Part B and 4 Part C). To date, OSEP has issued eight responses (5 Part B and 3 Part C) with an average response time of 276 days (337 days for Part B and 175 days for Part C). The remaining three responses will be issued more than 90 days after the completion of the site visit. In that year, response times for all but one site visit exceeded the average from the prior year. In 2010, the average response time was 66 workdays. (Note that data reported for 2016 through 2018 reflects total days, not just workdays). The Department will establish targets for this measure after sufficient baseline data are available, which is expected in spring 2020.

### 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 were used to conduct an independent evaluation of the program. This evaluation 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:

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

---

Analytic Support: A report published in January 2010, “Patterns in the Identification of and Outcomes for Children and Youth with Disabilities (Patterns)”<sup>1</sup>, provided a synthesis of existing evidence and new analyses of extant data sources to address research questions for the IDEA National Assessment, targeting three topic areas: (1) identification of children for early intervention and special education, (2) declassification of children for early intervention and special education services, and (3) developmental and academic outcomes for children with disabilities.

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 by disability type were in the areas of autism and developmental delay. Autism showed a 400 percent increase among children ages 10 to 17 years, and developmental delay showed an almost 2,000 percent increase among children ages 3 to 9 years. The study cited research on declassification that showed almost 50 percent of children eligible in kindergarten were no longer eligible for services by third grade.<sup>2</sup> 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 found that children with disabilities were performing 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 percentage 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.

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. Of the districts that implement CEIS, funds were used at the elementary school level in 93 percent of districts and focuses on literacy instruction in 84 percent of districts. The study found that the use of Response to Intervention (RtI) was also widespread, and was being used in 71 percent of districts nationally. Similar to CEIS, RtI was 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> see <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20104005/index.asp>

<sup>2</sup> Holt, McGrath, and Herring 2007

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

---

The study looked at qualifications and distribution of “highly qualified” special education personnel. Almost 90 percent of special education teachers met 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 in working with students with emotional disturbances and with autism. The most common method districts used 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, was to provide professional development. No other approach was used by more than 25 percent of districts.

Finally, the study found that dispute resolution events were 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 was steady at about 21 requests per 10,000 students, but the frequency of due process hearings completed 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 (Rtl) is a multi-step approach to providing early and more intensive intervention and monitoring within the general education setting. In principle, Rtl 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 Rtl and also permits districts to use Rtl to inform decisions regarding a child’s eligibility for special education.

The Rtl evaluation employed a quasi-experimental design to examine the natural variations in elementary school reading instruction, intervention, and support in schools that may already be implementing Rtl in 13 States. We note that concerns have been raised in the field regarding the strength of the research design of this study, particularly its focus on students just below reading proficiency and not those with moderate or significant needs.

The final report found that, for the 2011-12 school year, schools implementing three or more years of Rtl approaches in reading provided more support to students reading below grade-level standards than those reading at or above grade-level standards. For those students reading just below the grade-level standards (as measured by a school-determined eligibility cut point on a screening test) in Grade 1, Rtl reading interventions did not improve reading outcomes, but actually produced negative impacts (e.g., lower scores compared to the initial screening test) for such students. For Grades 2 and 3, the estimated effects on reading outcomes were not statistically significant. Researchers stated that some plausible factors that may be related to negative impacts of assignment to intervention on some Grade 1 students include: (1) false or incorrect identification of students for intervention, (2) mismatch between reading intervention and the instructional needs of students near the cut point, and (3) poor alignment between reading intervention and core reading instruction. Overall, the study found that the estimated impacts of reading interventions on reading outcomes vary significantly across schools. It is also worth noting that this study focused on a very specific population in one subject area and did not assess whether Rtl may be effective in improving student outcomes in other subjects

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

---

areas and grade levels, or whether RtI elementary literacy interventions may be effective for students performing well below grade-level standards.

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 (NCSEER), 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 NCSEER 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 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.

The National Longitudinal Transition Study 2012 (NLTS 2012) is the third in a series examining the characteristics and school experiences of a nationally representative sample of youth with disabilities. NLTS 2012 focuses on students ages 13 to 21 (in December 2011). It also includes a small sample of students without disabilities and of those on 504 plans to enable direct comparisons of students with and without IEPs. The study collected baseline data in the spring of 2012 through the summer of 2013 on a nationwide sample of youth. The study is addressing such questions as:

- What are the personal, family, and school characteristics of youth with disabilities in public schools across the country?
- What regular education, special education, transition planning, and other relevant services and accommodations do youth with disabilities receive?

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State Grants: Grants to States

---

- How do the services and accommodations differ from those of youth not served under IDEA, including those identified for services under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act?
- How do the services and accommodations for youth with disabilities vary with the characteristics of youth?
- How much have the services and accommodations of youth with disabilities changed over time?

Post-High School Outcomes for Youth with Disabilities: Helping students, particularly those with disabilities, to complete high school prepared to pursue postsecondary education or begin productive jobs is a national priority. IDEA emphasizes transition services focused on improving the academic and functional achievement of students with disabilities to facilitate their transition from school to post-school activities, including postsecondary education and employment. The study, awarded in 2015, will address such questions as:

- To what extent do youth with disabilities who receive special education services under IDEA make progress through high school compared with other youth, including those identified for services under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act? For students with disabilities, has high school course taking and completion rates changed over the past few decades?
- Are youth with disabilities achieving the post-high school outcomes envisioned by IDEA, and how do their college, training, and employment rates compare with those of other youth?
- How do these high school and postsecondary experiences and outcomes vary by student characteristics, including their disability category, age, sex, race/ethnicity, English Learner status, income status, and type of high school attended (including regular public school, charter school, career/technical school, special education school, or other State or Federally-operated institution)?

This new study will utilize administrative records data to follow a sample of youth with disabilities beyond high school. The sample for this study will focus on the youth who participated in the baseline study of the NLTS 2012.

Study of School Accountability for Students with Disabilities: As part of the IDEA National Assessment, IES studied changes in student outcomes after schools adopted programs focused on improving academic outcomes for students with disabilities. The focus of the study was 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).

An interim report was released in May 2012; an update with information through the 2009–10 school year was released in October 2013; and a third report that provided the results of analysis of 2011 survey data on school practices in 12 States was released in February 2015.<sup>1</sup> The study found that, when surveyed in 2011, elementary schools accountable for the SWD subgroup were 15.8 percentage-points more likely than never-accountable elementary

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20154006/>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

schools to report moving students with disabilities from self-contained settings to regular classrooms over the previous 5 years. Middle schools accountable for the SWD subgroup were 16.7 percentage-points more likely than never-accountable middle schools to report moving students with disabilities from self-contained settings to regular classrooms over the previous 5 years.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

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

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2020 Authorization: Indefinite

Budget Authority:

<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$391,120	\$391,120	0

---

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Preschool Grants program provides formula grants to States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico for the provision of 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 have provided assurances to the Department that they 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) and need special education and related services. If consistent with State policy, State and local educational agencies also may use funds received under this program to provide FAPE to 2-year olds with disabilities who will turn 3 during the school year.

IDEA requires that, to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities are educated with children who are not disabled. Removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment is only warranted 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, is not possible. 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 child care facilities.

### **Funding Formula**

Funds are distributed to eligible entities through a formula based on general population and poverty. Each State is first allocated an amount equal to its fiscal year 1997 allocation. For any year in which the appropriation is greater than the prior year level, 85 percent of the funds above the fiscal year 1997 level are distributed based on each State's relative percentage of the total number of children aged 3 through 5 in the general population. The other 15 percent are distributed based on the relative percentage of children aged 3 through 5 in each State who are

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

living in poverty. The formula provides several floors and ceilings regarding the amount a State can receive in any year. When appropriations increase, 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 either: (1) the percent the appropriation increased over the prior year, minus 1.5 percent, or, (2) 90 percent of the percentage increase over the prior year. The formula also provides for a minimum increase in State allocations of one-third 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. Specifically, no State may be allocated an increase above the prior year greater than the percent increase 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 are no radical shifts in resources among the States. States must distribute the bulk of their grant awards to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs).

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 for Federal obligation for 15 months, through September 30 of the following year.

### State-Level Activities

States may retain a portion of funds allocated to them in any given year for State-level activities. More specifically, the amount that may be used for State-level activities is capped at an amount equal to 25 percent of the amount they received under the program for fiscal year 1997 under the Preschool Grants program, adjusted upward by the lesser of the rate of increase in the State's allocation or the rate of inflation. Likewise, the amount that may be used for administration is limited to 20 percent of the funds 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 a wide range of activities that are critical to effective administration of the program, including: (1) support services, such as 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) a supplement for the development and implementation of a statewide coordinated services system designed to improve results for children and families, including children with disabilities and their families. This supplement cannot 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 pre-literacy, language, and numeracy skills. In addition, such services must be provided, in accordance with the Grants for Infants and Families program, to children who are eligible for services under the Preschool Grants program and who previously received services under Part C until such children enter or are eligible to enter kindergarten and, at a State's discretion, may include continued service coordination or case management for families who received such services under Part C.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

#### Numbers of Children Served

The number of children served under this program increased slightly from 762,802 in fiscal year 2016 to 773,595 in fiscal year 2017. The increase is consistent with trends since 2009. The variations in the total number of children served make it difficult to forecast the number of children being served in future fiscal years. In the absence of better information, the Department assumes that the number of children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 will remain at the 2017 level for fiscal years 2018 through 2020.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2015.....	\$353,238
2016.....	368,238
2017.....	368,238
2018.....	381,120
2019.....	391,120

#### **FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2020, the Administration requests \$391.1 million for the Preschool Grants program, the same as the fiscal year 2019 appropriation. The request would provide an average of \$506 per eligible child, based on the assumption that the number of children ages 3 through 5 who will be served will remain constant at the 2017 level of 773,595. These funds supplement funding available under the Grants to States program under IDEA, Part B, for which the Department is requesting \$12.4 billion in fiscal year 2020 to help States and local educational agencies serve children with disabilities ages 3 through 21.

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Number of Children Served	773,595	773,595	773,595
Share per child (whole dollars)	\$493	\$506	\$506

---

NOTES: States may, at their discretion, provide a free appropriate public education 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 who are 2 years old at the time of the count, but will turn 3 during the school year.

The numbers of children served are estimates based on fiscal year 2017.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

#### History of Children Served and Program Funding

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Children Served</u> <u>(thousands)</u>	<u>Appropriation</u> <u>(dollars in thousands)</u>	<u>Federal</u> <u>Share per Child</u> <u>(whole dollars)</u>
1988	288	\$201,054	\$698
1989	322	247,000	767
1990	352	251,510	715
1991	367	292,766	798 <sup>1</sup>
1992	398	320,000	804
1993	441	325,773	739
1994	479	339,257	709
1995	522	360,265	689
1996	549	360,409	656
1997	562	360,409	642
1998	572	373,985	654
1999	575	373,985	651
2000	589	390,000	662
2001	599	390,000	652
2002	617	390,000	632
2003	647	387,465	599
2004	680	387,699	571
2005	702	384,597	548
2006	704	380,751	546
2007	714	380,751	533
2008	710	374,099	527
2009	709	774,099 <sup>2</sup>	1,092
2010	732	374,099	511
2011	738 <sup>3</sup>	373,351	508
2012	745 <sup>3</sup>	372,646	500
2013	749 <sup>3</sup>	353,238	472
2014	745 <sup>3</sup>	353,238	474
2015	753 <sup>3</sup>	353,238	469
2016	763 <sup>3</sup>	368,238	483
2017	760 <sup>3</sup>	368,238	485
2018	773 <sup>3</sup>	381,120	493
2019	773 <sup>3,4</sup>	391,120	506
2020	773 <sup>3,4</sup>	391,120	506

<sup>1</sup> Beginning in fiscal year 1991, the IDEA required that services be made available to all eligible children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 as a condition for receiving funding for children in this age range under the Grants to States program.

<sup>2</sup> These figures include funds provided under the Recovery Act in fiscal year 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Beginning in fiscal year 2011, this table reports the number of children served by the 50 States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Prior fiscal years also include the number of children served in the Outlying Areas, Freely Associated States, and the Bureau of Indian Education, which are no longer eligible to receive Preschool Grant awards.

<sup>4</sup> Estimate based on number of children served in fiscal year 2018.

## 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 2020 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.*

**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
2015	84%	80%
2016	84	81
2017	84	
2018	84	
2019	84	
2020	85	

**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
2015	84%	80%
2016	84	81
2017	84	
2018	84	
2019	84	
2020	85	

## 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
2015	84%	79%
2016	84	79
2017	84	
2018	84	
2019	84	
2020	84	

**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.

In 2016, States maintained or improved performance across all three domains: positive social/emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge, and the use of appropriate behavior. While performance on these metrics did not meet established targets in 2016, the Department believes that continued work on the part of States to improve service delivery for young children with disabilities, combined with improved data collection, analysis, and use, will lead to continued improvement over time.

**Measure:** The percentage of children with disabilities (ages 3 through 5) attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of hours of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	45%	45%
2016	46	45
2017	46	45
2018	46	
2019	50	
2020	50	

**Additional information:** The results in 2017 (44.9 percent) represent a slight decrease in performance from 2016 (45.2 percent). Overall performance on this measure has been stable for the past four years.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	46	45
2016	47	41
2017	47	
2018	47	
2019	47	
2020	47	

**Additional information:** While performance on this measure had increased for three consecutive years, the number of States meeting the 90 percent threshold in the 2016-2017 academic year declined from the prior year. This measure includes the 50 States, D.C., Puerto Rico, the Outlying Areas and the Bureau of Indian Education.

### Efficiency Measure

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

Year	Target	Actual
2016	Baseline	171
2017	Baseline	143
2018		276
2019		
2020		

**Additional information:** The Department did not conduct regular site visits to States from 2011 through 2015. During that time, OSEP continued to meet its statutory monitoring responsibilities through the State Performance Plan (SPP)/APR process, fiscal monitoring, and its work with State dispute resolution systems. In 2016, OSEP began conducting site visits using a risk-based approach to monitoring. In 2018, OSEP conducted 11 site visits (7 Part B and 4 Part C). To date, OSEP has issued eight responses (5 Part B and 3 Part C) with an average response time of 276 days (337 days for Part B and 175 days for Part C). The remaining three responses will be issued more than 90 days after the completion of the site visit. In that year, response times for all but one site visit exceeded the average from the prior year. In 2010, the average response time was 66 workdays. (Note that data reported for 2016 through 2018 reflects total days, not just workdays). The Department will establish targets for this measure after sufficient baseline data are available, which is expected in spring 2020.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

#### Other Performance Information

##### Pre-Elementary Longitudinal Study (PEELS)<sup>1</sup>

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 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.

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 found that 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 investing in the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study program through the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).<sup>2</sup> This program involves two complementary cohort studies, a Birth Cohort (ECLS-B) and a Kindergarten Cohort (ECLS-K), that focus on

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://www.peels.org>

<sup>2</sup> See <https://nces.ed.gov/ecls>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

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 age 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 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.

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. 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 non-poor 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 non-poor 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, school, 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 2020 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$470,000	\$470,000	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011; continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2020 through appropriations language.

---

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Grants for Infants and Families program (Part C) awards formula grants to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Department of the Interior, and Outlying Areas to assist them in implementing statewide systems of coordinated, comprehensive, multidisciplinary, interagency programs. 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 within a 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, States define “developmental delay” and 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.

Funds can be used to: (1) implement and maintain 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 existing services; (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. The natural environment includes the home and community settings where children would be participating if they did not have a disability. These

## **SPECIAL EDUCATION**

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

---

services can be provided in another setting only when early intervention cannot be achieved satisfactorily for the infant or toddler in a natural environment. 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.

The statewide system also must comply with additional statutory requirements, including designating a lead agency with responsibility for the coordination and administration of funds, and developing and maintaining 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 in coordinating payment for early intervention services from Federal, State, local, and private sources, including public and private insurance coverage. These sources include Medicaid, the State Children's Health Insurance Program, Supplemental Security Income, and Early Head Start.

The 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 both: (1) an educational component that promotes school readiness and incorporates pre-literacy, language, and numeracy skills; and (2) a written notification to parents of their rights regarding the continuation of services under Part C and eligibility for services under section 619.

### **Funding Formula**

Allocations are based on the number of children in the general population aged birth through 2 years in each State. The Department 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 Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Education, receives 1.25 percent of the aggregate of the amount available to all States. Interior must pass through all the funds it receives to Indian tribes, tribal organizations, or consortia for the coordination of early intervention services on reservations with Interior schools. Tribes and tribal organizations can use the funds they receive to provide (1) help to States in identifying Indian infants and toddlers with disabilities, (2) parent training, and (3) early intervention services.

This is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available for 15 months, through September 30 of the following year.

### **State Incentive Grants**

In any fiscal year in which the appropriation for Part C exceeds \$460 million, the statute includes authority for the Department to reserve 15 percent of the amount above \$460 million for a State Incentive Grants (SIG) 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 SIG in a fiscal year. In fiscal years 2018 and 2019, the total of funds appropriated for Part C exceeded the \$460 million level.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

For fiscal year 2018, the two States that opted to extend their provision of Part C services beyond age 3 received additional funds through this program and have until September 30, 2020 to expend these funds. The Department anticipates that at least two States will opt to extend the provision of Part C services in fiscal year 2019.

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

Fiscal year	(dollars in thousands)
2015 .....	\$438,556
2016 .....	458,556
2017 .....	458,556
2018 .....	470,000
2019 .....	470,000

### **FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2020, the Administration requests \$470.0 million for the Grants for Infants and Families (Part C) program, the same as the fiscal year 2019 level. These funds would continue to support early intervention programs that provide services to infants and toddlers with disabilities. Such programs are also generally designed to mitigate the need for more extensive services in the future and ensure that infants and toddlers with disabilities receive the supports and services they need to prepare them to enter formal education.

These funds would also help States address the growing population of infants and toddlers likely to require early intervention services due to the rise in opioid addiction. A 2016 report from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found that from 1999 to 2013, the number of babies born addicted to opioids increased by almost 300 percent in the 28 States included in the study, putting them at a higher risk for developmental delays or disabilities that affect educational outcomes and life opportunities.<sup>1</sup>

At the requested level, the median State award would be just under \$5.7 million, with a minimum award of approximately \$2.3 million and a largest award of \$55.0 million. These funds will help States maintain their systems for identifying infants and toddlers with disabilities, determining appropriate services, and facilitating coordination with other programs serving young children.

### **State Incentive Grants**

Under Section 643(e), the amount of SIG funds provided to States is based on the number of infants and toddlers in the State compared to the number of infants and toddlers in all States receiving SIG funds. However, no State may receive more than 20 percent of the amount reserved for SIG in a fiscal year. The IDEA contains no SIG provision for redistributing funds made available as a result of the imposition of the 20 percent cap. As a result, in any year in which a State's population of infants and toddlers is more than 20 percent of the infants and toddlers in States receiving SIG funds, the Department does not have the authority to redistribute the remaining reserved funds among the other participating States not limited by the

---

<sup>1</sup> See <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/65/wr/pdfs/mm6531a2.pdf>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

cap. Any funds reserved for SIG that cannot be allocated in accordance with section 643(e) are distributed among all States in accordance with the Part C statutory formula in section 643(a) through (d).

In fiscal year 2018, the total amount of funds appropriated for Part C exceeded the \$460 million level by \$10 million, leading the Department to reserve \$1.5 million for SIG. The two States that participated in SIG received a total of \$462,414 in SIG funding; one State received \$300,000 (20 percent of the amount reserved), while the second State received only \$162,414 in SIG funds due to its small population of infants and toddlers relative to the total population of infants and toddlers in the two States. As a result, the Department was unable to distribute \$1,037,586 of the funds reserved for SIG, and these funds were distributed among all States in accordance with the statutory formula.

The Administration proposes appropriations language that would allow the Department to maximize the amount of funds distributed for SIG and provide a stronger incentive for States with small to medium populations to participate. Had the proposed appropriations language been in place in fiscal year 2018, the Department would have redistributed an additional \$137,586 to the second State for SIG, providing \$300,000 to each participating State, and distributing \$900,000 among all States in accordance with the Part C statutory formula.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Range in size of awards to States: <sup>1</sup>			
Smallest State regular Part C award <sup>2</sup>	\$2,302	\$2,301	\$2,301
Average State regular Part C award	\$8,861	\$8,861	\$8,861
Largest State regular Part C award	\$55,507	\$54,983	\$54,968
Children served <sup>3</sup>	388,694	388,694	388,694

<sup>1</sup> The calculations exclude funds for the Outlying Areas and the Department of the Interior.

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

<sup>3</sup> Estimates.

### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2020 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

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

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

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	70%	66%
2016	70	65
2017	70	66
2018	70	
2019	70	
2020	70	

**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
2015	75%	71%
2016	76	71
2017	76	72
2018	76	
2019	76	
2020	76	

**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
2015	75%	73%
2016	77	72
2017	77	74
2018	77	
2019	77	
2020	77	

**Additional information:** Data are from the States' Annual Performance Reports (APRs). Two States have current approval from the Department to collect data for a representative sample of the children they serve through the Part C program; all other States report data on all children served.

## 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 1 through Part C.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	30	33
2016	32	36
2017	32	37
2018	34	
2019	36	
2020	37	

**Additional information:** For a number of years, only 24 or 25 States served at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under the age of 1. The program made progress from 2012 through 2017, exceeding its targets. The 1 percent threshold for this measure is based on data collected by the U.S. Census bureau on prevalence rates for 5 conditions: 0.4 percent - severe mental retardation<sup>1</sup>; 0.2 percent - hearing impairment; 0.1 percent - visual impairment; 0.2 percent - physical conditions (spina bifida, cerebral palsy, etc.); and 0.1 percent - autism. State lead agencies responsible for the implementation of these programs report data annually to the Department through their APRs on the 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
2015	45	45
2016	46	47
2017	46	48
2018	47	
2019	47	
2020	48	

**Additional information:** Data are submitted by States in their APRs.

---

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	95%	96%
2016	95	97
2017	95	97
2018	95	
2019	95	
2020	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. Current performance represents a significant improvement since 2001, when 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.

### Efficiency Measures

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

Year	Target	Actual
2016	Baseline	171
2017	Baseline	143
2018	Baseline	276
2019	Baseline	
2020	Baseline	

**Additional information:** In 2016, OSEP began conducting site visits using a risk-based approach to monitoring. In 2018, OSEP conducted 11 site visits (7 Part B and 4 Part C). To date, OSEP has issued eight responses (five Part B and three Part C) with an average response time of 276 days (337 days for Part B and 175 days for Part C). The remaining three responses will be issued more than 90 days after the completion of the site visit. In that year, response times for all but one site visit exceeded the average from the prior year. The Department will establish targets for this measure after sufficient baseline data are available, which is expected in spring 2020.

### 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 provides data on the early development of these children, their preparation for school, and key transitions experienced by these children during

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

the early childhood years. The study includes detailed data on the physical, cognitive, social, and emotional development of these children.<sup>1</sup>

In July 2011, the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) published the final report for the “IDEA National Assessment Implementation Study.”<sup>2</sup> This congressionally mandated study provides a national picture of State agency implementation of early intervention programs for infants and toddlers under Part C of IDEA, as well as 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. 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. Forty-six States reported having different coordinators for the Part C and Preschool programs, but 67 percent of Part C coordinators reported meeting at least monthly with the coordinator for the Preschool program.
- Financing—For the 37 States that provided this information, the average percentage of early intervention services funding that came from the Part C program in fiscal year 2009 was 21 percent. Twenty-three 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).

---

<sup>1</sup> More information is available at: <http://nces.ed.gov/ECLS/birth.asp>

<sup>2</sup> See <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 2020 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$38,630	\$38,630	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011; continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2020 through appropriations language.

---

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The State Personnel Development (SPD) program makes competitive awards to help State educational agencies (SEAs) reform and improve 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, and each State grantee must spend at least 90 percent of its funds on professional development activities, including the recruitment and retention of qualified special education teachers. The remaining 10 percent of the State's funds is available for State-level 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, as amended (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 for the SPD program is less than \$100 million. However, if the amount appropriated is \$100 million or greater, funds would be distributed as formula grants, with allotments based on the relative portion of the funds the State received under Part B of IDEA. Competitive awards are made for periods of 1 to 5 years with minimum awards to States of not less than \$500,000 and not less than \$80,000 for Outlying Areas. The maximum award that can be made to States is \$4 million per fiscal year. Factors used to determine the amount of each competitive award are: the amount of funds available; the relative population of the State or Outlying Area; the types of

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

activities proposed; alignment of proposed activities with the State’s personnel standards; alignment of proposed activities with the State’s consolidated ESEA Title I and Title II plans; and as appropriate, the use of evidence-based programs and research.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2015.....	41,630
2016.....	41,630
2017.....	38,630
2018.....	38,368
2019.....	38,368

### **FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2020, the Administration requests \$38.6 million for the SPD grants program, the same as the fiscal year 2019 appropriation. This request would support approximately \$10.1 million in new awards and \$28.5 million in continuation awards. The request includes appropriations language that would provide authority to use SPD funds under section 655 of IDEA to carry out evaluation activities, including support for improved grantee evaluations. SPD is the only program within Part D of IDEA that does not have statutory authority to use funds to evaluate program performance.

Personnel shortages and inadequately trained teachers in special education are among the most pressing and chronic problems facing the field.<sup>1</sup> SPD projects assist in addressing critical State and local needs to improve personnel preparation, induction to the local educational agency (LEA), and ongoing professional development identified in the State’s Personnel Development Plan. Projects provide personnel with the knowledge and skills to meet the needs 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 IDEA. Support for special education personnel preparation activities is also provided through the Personnel Preparation program, under which the Department makes competitive awards—primarily to institutions of higher education—to help States train and employ adequate numbers of fully certified personnel to serve children with disabilities.

SPD activities are intended to support statewide strategies to prepare, recruit, and retain teachers who are qualified under IDEA and the (ESEA. Qualified teachers generally: (1) meet the applicable State certification and licensure requirements (including any requirements for certification obtained through alternative routes); (2) are prepared to deliver instruction supported by evidence; and (3) are effective in improving outcomes for children with disabilities. States must collaborate and seek the input of teachers, principals, parents, administrators, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel when developing SPD activities.

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; for this reason, SPD funds are used to provide training in effective interventions. Examples include positive

---

<sup>1</sup> Teacher Shortage Areas Nationwide Listing, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, August 2016: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/tsa.pdf>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

behavioral interventions and supports to improve student behavior in the classroom, evidence-based reading instruction, early and appropriate interventions to identify and help children with disabilities, effective instruction for children with low-incidence disabilities, and strategies for 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

In addition to effective interventions, the SPD program supports States in developing and implementing effective strategies for the recruitment and retention of qualified special education teachers, 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 track record of success in helping students with disabilities.

The following examples of projects first awarded in fiscal year 2012 illustrate how SPD funds are improving the knowledge and skills of teachers serving children with disabilities:

- The **California SPD grant, Project READ**, focused on secondary literacy strategies. By the end of Year 4, 36 sites (88 percent) reached full implementation of their secondary literacy strategies. The number of all students who “Met or Exceeded” standards for the statewide English Language Arts assessment increased at 31 sites (76 percent), while “Not Met” decreased at 28 sites (68 percent). For students with disabilities, “Met or Exceeded” increased at 21 sites (52 percent), while “Not Met” decreased at 26 sites (65 percent).
- The **Maryland SPD grant** similarly raised the number of special education students who “Met or Exceeded” State standards. Four out of eight grades (50 percent) increased in the percentage of special education students who “Met” or “Exceeded” standards. Additionally, seven of the eight grades decreased the percentage special education students “Partially” or “Not Meeting” expectations. The Maryland SPD grant also increased family engagement for students with disabilities; 75 percent of family members responding to a survey indicated that their level of involvement had increased over the past 2 years.
- In **New Mexico**, 94 percent of families in schools implementing a tiered model of academic and behavioral supports with fidelity “agreed” or “strongly agreed” on a survey that they participated meaningfully in processes and procedures related to the multi-tiered model.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
<b>Project funding:</b>			
New	0	0	\$10,049
Continuations	\$38,577 <sup>1</sup>	\$38,577 <sup>1</sup>	\$28,519

---

<sup>1</sup> The fiscal year 2018 continuation awards total includes approximately \$2,201 thousand in fiscal year 2018 funds for support of fiscal year 2019 continuation costs.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

Performance evaluation	\$53	\$53	\$53
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>\$9</u>
Total funding	\$38,630	\$38,630	\$38,630
Average award	\$1,171	\$1,171	\$1,134
<b>Number of awards:</b>			
New	0	0	10
Continuation	<u>33</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>24</u>
Total awards	33	33	34

<sup>1</sup> The fiscal year 2019 continuation awards total includes approximately \$1,141 thousand in fiscal year 2019 funds for support of fiscal year 2020 continuation costs.

## PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2020 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

**Objective 1:** *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.*

**Objective 2:** *Improve the quality of professional development available to meet the needs of personnel serving infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.*

**Objective 3:** *Implement strategies that are effective in meeting the requirements of section 612(a)(14) of IDEA to take measurable steps to retain highly qualified personnel in areas of greatest need to provide special education and related services.*

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

**Measure:** The percentage of SPD-funded initiatives that meet the benchmarks for use of evidence-based professional development practices over time.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	Baseline	72%
2016	70%	75
2017	70	92
2018	77	86
2019	82	
2020	85	

**Additional information:** In 2018, 41 initiatives were subject to the benchmarks defined by the program office. An outside contractor used a random sampling process to select one professional development (PD) initiative for review from each of 29 randomly selected SPD grants. Of the 29 SPD grants reviewed, a total of 24, or 86 percent, were determined to “meet their respective benchmarks for use of evidence-based PD practices.”

**Measure:** The percentage of SPD-funded initiatives that meet the benchmark for improvement in implementation over time.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	Baseline	58%
2016	60%	74
2017	60	72
2018	65	55
2019	70	
2020	70	

**Additional information:** Of the 22 PD initiatives in their third year of implementation in 2018, a total of 12, or 55 percent, were deemed to “meet the benchmark for improvement of evidence-based PD practices.”

**Measure:** The percentage of initiatives that meet targets for their use of funds to sustain SPD-supported practices.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	Baseline	90%
2016	85%	78
2017	85	83
2018	85	90
2019	85	
2020	85	

**Additional information:** Grantee-submitted data describing the cost of the fidelity activities designed to sustain individual initiatives is used to support this measure. Targets for each initiative are set in conjunction with the grantee. Expert panels review the data to determine whether the grantee has met the target for spending on that initiative within 5 percent of the

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

target. In 2018, this measure applied to all SPD grants in their second through final years of funding.

**Measure:** The percentage of SPD grant-funded projects that meet targets for retention of special education teachers.

**Additional information:** Beginning in the 2016 report, the information for this measure has been provided qualitatively.

Some SPD grantees have special education teacher retention as a goal and are required to report the number of qualified special education teachers who remain as special education teachers two or more years following their initial participation in grant activities and the total number of teachers who participated in grant activities designed for teacher retention at least two years prior to the annual performance reporting period (APR).

In 2017, this measure applied to five SPD grants. An outside contractor commissioned two reviewers with expertise in special education, PD, and program evaluation to assess the extent to which each grantee had met their respective target for retaining special education teachers.

The program office used a standardized rubric to determine whether or not each grantee met their benchmark for retaining special education teachers after their participation in grant activities. Reviewers extracted data from the APR to complete the rubric and then discussed their individual assessments until reaching consensus on each grantee's response to each question.

In 2017, of the five SPG grants listing teacher retention as a goal, three met their target for teacher retention.

Given the low number of grants listing teacher retention as a goal, the Administration will no longer report on this measure through the annual budget justifications beginning in 2021. However, the Department will continue to monitor the progress of these grantees toward meeting their benchmarks.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

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

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2020 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$44,345	\$44,345	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011; continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2020 through appropriations language.

---

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Technical Assistance and Dissemination (TA&D) program is the Department's primary vehicle under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) for identifying, providing, and disseminating information on effective practices to educators, policymakers, service providers, and families of children with disabilities. 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 IDEA, promote academic achievement, and improve results for children with disabilities.

The majority of TA&D program investments support national and regional technical assistance centers that are intended to support the field in implementing Parts B and C of IDEA by expanding the use of evidence-based and promising practices. Centers focus on a variety of critical topics, such as behavior, assessment, inclusive practices, secondary transition, literacy, and early childhood education. Most centers use a service model that provides three levels of technical assistance: (1) intensive, sustained; (2) targeted, specific; and (3) general, universal. At the intensive, sustained level, a small number 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. Targeted, specific services can include one-time or short-term events, such as consultation services or presentations at conferences. The centers also provide general, universal technical assistance services that are intended to help broader audiences access information and services through presentations, newsletters, or research syntheses that are made available on center websites. Activities supported through this program are designed to address the needs of a variety of audiences, including teachers, related service personnel, early intervention personnel, administrators, parents, and individuals with disabilities.

The TA&D program also funds model demonstration projects that evaluate the implementation of research findings in typical settings. Models that are found to be effective can then be promoted by the network of TA&D centers. In recent years, the program also has sought to leverage existing resources through improved collaboration and coordination with other related, Federally funded technical assistance and dissemination activities. TA&D activities promote the

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

application of knowledge to improve practice by: determining areas where technical assistance and information are needed, 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 duration of awards varies with the award's purpose, though most individual awards are made for a period of 5 years.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2015 .....	44,345 <sup>1</sup>
2016 .....	44,345 <sup>1</sup>
2017 .....	44,345 <sup>1</sup>
2018 .....	44,345 <sup>1</sup>
2019 .....	44,345 <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Excludes funding for the Special Olympics program, which is discussed elsewhere in this account.

### **FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2020, the Administration requests \$44.3 million for the TA&D program, the same as the fiscal year 2019 appropriation. Nearly all funds (\$43.1 million) would be used to support continuation awards for grants and contracts made in prior years.

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. Through TA&D, the Department focuses on identifying and disseminating evidence-based practices and building capacity at the State and local levels to implement, sustain, and scale-up such practices, thereby improving results for children with disabilities. These activities have successfully facilitated the expanded use of evidence-based practices such as positive behavioral interventions and supports, which have been implemented in nearly 26,000 schools nationwide; and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, which have been implemented and widely used throughout the country as a framework for delivering differentiated instruction.

#### **Model Demonstration Projects**

As States refine their systems for administering and providing special education and related services and use data to identify areas for improvement in their State Systemic Improvement Plans (SSIPs), which are a required component of the Department's Results Driven Accountability framework, there is growing demand for evidence-based interventions that can be implemented in schools to help meet the specific needs of children with disabilities. While TA&D has made significant contributions to this effort over the years, there continues to be a critical need for interventions that have demonstrated success in a variety of school settings, particularly in non-traditional public school settings (e.g., charters, magnets, virtual schools) and in private schools.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

Just as important, the growing field of implementation science suggests that fidelity of implementation—including an understanding of how to accommodate variations inherent in the different educational settings in which programs are implemented—can be as critical as identifying evidence-based practices in the first place. Few schools or programs can successfully implement evidence-based practices effectively without detailed implementation strategies. Research studies, however, do not often address what it takes to implement and sustain a practice in typical early intervention, preschool, classroom, and school settings.

Model demonstrations are an effective and efficient way to bridge the gap between existing research and the implementation of interventions in areas of critical need. The focus areas for model demonstrations are selected based on emerging areas of research, needs identified by the Department, and input from the special education field. The fiscal year 2020 request will provide \$1.2 million for new model demonstration awards and \$3.6 million to fund nine continuation awards that help address areas such as improving mathematics and English language arts outcomes of students with disabilities in inclusive public schools, including charter schools. Cohorts also will identify and address the implementation challenges across a variety of choice environments throughout the country. For more information on model demonstration project continuations, see below.

### Additional Technical Assistance Activities

The Department's technical assistance investments focus on meeting the needs of States and local educational agencies (LEAs) that serve children with disabilities and include support in priority areas such as early learning, post-secondary transition, and low-incidence disabilities like deaf-blindness. The Department takes a number of factors into consideration when funding technical assistance centers including: meeting statutory requirements; addressing the needs of the field (including States, LEAs, parents and families, and other disability stakeholders); and avoiding duplication across programs. Projects and centers funded under this program are required to coordinate with other relevant technical assistance investments funded by the Department.

Approximately \$39.5 million in the fiscal year 2020 request will support continuation awards for a variety of technical assistance and dissemination projects under this program, including:<sup>1</sup>

- Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)—helps State educational agencies (SEAs) and LEAs successfully implement and sustain PBIS practices and policies, which support the use of evidence-based interventions for students with the most significant behavioral challenges that interfere with their ability to fully participate in the learning environment.
- National Center for Dispute Resolution—provides SEAs and Part C Lead Agencies with resources that can help them effectively implement a range of dispute resolution options, including strategies that other SEAs and Part C Lead Agencies use to address SSIP indicators related to dispute resolution. This center helps ensure parents and families receive the information they need about various methods for resolving disputes and avoid costly adversarial due process hearings.

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information on the OSEP TA&D investments, visit: [www.OSEPIdeasthatwork.org](http://www.OSEPIdeasthatwork.org).

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

- Postsecondary Education Center for Individuals who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing**— supports postsecondary education through collaborations with postsecondary institutions, SEAs, LEAs, State vocational rehabilitation (VR) agencies, VR service providers, and other relevant organizations and public agencies to more effectively address the postsecondary, vocational, technical, continuing, and adult education needs of individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing. Of the remaining fiscal year 2020 continuation funds requested, \$200,000 will be transferred to the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE) to continue support for an interagency technical assistance investment to improve academic, employment, and behavioral outcomes for justice-involved youth. Approximately \$1.1 million would support new and continuing contracts for peer review, performance evaluation, reporting, and dissemination.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
<b>Program Funding:</b>			
Model demonstration centers:			
New	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$1,200
Continuations	<u>3,466</u>	<u>3,142</u>	<u>3,576</u>
Subtotal	4,666	4,342	4,776
Behavior:			
New	1,850	0	0
Continuations	<u>1,100</u>	<u>2,950</u>	<u>2,950</u>
Subtotal	2,950	2,950	2,950
Early childhood:			
New	0	0	0
Continuations	<u>3,400</u>	<u>5,400</u>	<u>5,400</u>
Subtotal	3,400	5,400	5,400
Assessment:			
New	0	0	0
Continuations	<u>1,000</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>1,000</u>
Subtotal	1,000	1,000	1,000
Inclusive Practices:			
New	1,350	6,772	0
Continuations	<u>13,834</u>	<u>7,202</u>	<u>13,541</u>
Subtotal	15,184	13,974	13,541
Secondary transition:			
New	0	2,100	0
Continuations	<u>3,400</u>	<u>1,300</u>	<u>3,400</u>
Subtotal	3,400	3,400	3,400

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Technical assistance for children who are both deaf and blind:			
New	\$11,100	0	0
Continuations	<u>0</u>	<u>\$11,100</u>	<u>\$11,100</u>
Subtotal	11,100	11,100	11,100
Transfers to Elementary and Secondary Education for comprehensive centers:			
New	0	0	0
Continuations	<u>750</u>	<u>750</u>	<u>750</u>
Subtotal	750	750	750
Transfers to Career, Technical, and Adult Education for corrections collaboration:			
New	0	0	0
Continuations	<u>200</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>200</u>
Subtotal	200	200	200
National Activities			
New	350	410	0
Continuations	<u>1,182</u>	<u>749</u>	<u>1,158</u>
Subtotal	1,532	1,159	1,158
Peer review of new award applications	163	70	70
Total program funding:			
New	15,850	10,482	1,200
Continuations	28,332	33,793	43,075
Peer review	<u>163</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>70</u>
Total	44,345	44,345	44,345

## 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 2020 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.*

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

**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.*

Five performance measures were developed for the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program. Three of these measures are annual measures, and two are long-term.

#### Annual Performance Measures

The three annual measures deal with the quality, relevance, and usefulness of products and services funded by the program. These measures were developed as part of an effort to make measures relating to technical assistance and dissemination activities more consistent Department-wide but have been adapted to reflect the unique purposes of the TA&D program. Targets for 2016 and beyond were revised in 2015 to reflect reductions in the number of grantees in the program due to consolidations. Consequently, the targets are lower due to the reduced number of unique products and service reviewed, and not because of lower performance expectations. The actual data and targets for these measures reflect the performance in the year that the activity took place; in this case, the year the product or service was developed or delivered.

For each of the three annual performance measures, expert panels review a sample of products and services developed by grantees against a listing of evidence-based practices in areas the Department has identified as critical. The sample of grantees included in this measure for each year consists of TA&D centers in their second year or later and 10 State Deaf-Blind programs.

The expert panels review and score all products and services 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. Scores are weighted by the size of the investment in each program area reviewed.

**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
2015	95%	77%
2016	90	75
2017	90	72
2018	90	
2019	90	
2020	90	

**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.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

Based on the most recent data available for products and services developed with fiscal year 2017 funds, the program fell substantially short of the target, with only 23 out of 32 products and services meeting the standard for high quality (i.e., 72 percent). The Department plans to address this shortfall by providing enhanced monitoring for grantees that receive lower scores that will include recommendations to improve the quality of their products and services.

**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
2015	95%	93%
2016	90	100
2017	90	97
2018	90	
2019	93	
2020	93	

**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, including challenges confronting the target groups.

Overall performance under this measure has been strong in every year for which data have been collected. Thirty one of the 32 products and services in the sample from fiscal year 2017 met the standard for high relevance.

**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
2015	95%	93%
2016	90	86
2017	90	91
2018	90	
2019	90	
2020	90	

**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. Based on the most recent data available on products and services from fiscal year 2017, the program met the target, with 29 out of 32 products and services meeting the standard for high usefulness.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

#### Long-term Performance Measures

The Department established two long-term measures for this program. Data for the long-term measures are collected every 2 years.

**Measure:** 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 developed this 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 methodology. It will use the results to continue to refine the measure and set performance targets for future years. The Department is analyzing the data to ensure the establishment of an appropriate baseline, and expects to publish results for 2014 through 2018 in the 2021 President's Budget Request.

**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
2011		86%
2013	86%	83
2015	86	100
2017	86	100
2019	83	

**Additional information:** Experts review data from States that have received intensive technical assistance from OSEP TA&D Centers in six focus areas. These areas include assessment, literacy, behavior, instructional strategies, early intervention, secondary transition, and inclusive practices. Performance has improved significantly since 2009, the first year data were collected for this measure, when 79 percent of districts and agencies sampled were implementing evidence-based practices for which they received technical assistance.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

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

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2020 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$87,200	\$87,200	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011; continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2020 through appropriations language.

---

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

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

- provide research-based training and professional development to prepare special education, related services, early intervention, and regular education personnel to work with children with disabilities;
- ensure that those personnel are fully 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.

In addition, the Department is required by statute to make competitive grants that support training activities in a few high priority areas, including personnel development, beginning special educators, personnel to serve children with low incidence disabilities, and leadership personnel. These grants are typically 5 years in length.

Personnel Development: This broad authority requires the Department to support at least one of the following activities:

- promoting partnerships and collaborative personnel preparation and training between institutions of higher education (IHEs) and local educational agencies (LEAs);
- developing, evaluating, and disseminating innovative models for the recruitment, induction, retention, and assessment of teachers;
- providing continuous training and professional development to support special education and general education teachers and related services personnel;
- developing and improving programs for paraprofessionals to become special educators;
- promoting instructional leadership and improved collaboration between general and special education;

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

- supporting IHEs with minority enrollments of not less than 25 percent; and
- developing and improving programs to train special educators to develop expertise in autism spectrum disorders.

Beginning Special Educators: The Department is also required to provide support to beginning special educators. Specifically, the Department 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 high-quality personnel by providing financial aid as an incentive for 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; however, beginning in fiscal year 2014, the Department expanded the definition to include persistent and severe learning and behavioral problems that need the most intensive individualized supports. In carrying out this authority, the Department 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; 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 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 total funding available under the program has been used to directly support student scholarships.

A significant percentage of the grants awarded through this program go to IHEs to provide scholarships to train additional special education and early intervention 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 and dissemination of materials and best practices.

Additional support for personnel preparation activities is provided through the State Personnel Development Grants program, under which the Department makes competitive awards to help SEAs reform and improve in-service training and professional development activities for teachers, including the recruitment and retention of special education teachers.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2015.....	\$83,700
2016.....	83,700
2017.....	83,700
2018.....	83,700
2019.....	87,200

### **FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2020, the Administration requests \$87.2 million for the Personnel Preparation program, the same as the fiscal year 2019 appropriation. Of the funds requested, approximately \$14.9 million (including peer review costs) would be used for new projects, and \$72.3 million would support the continuation of grants made in prior years.

#### **Program Funding Priorities**

The Department is exploring how funds available to support new activities under this program can be targeted to support human capital systems that prepare, recruit, support, evaluate, compensate, and retain effective educators. Administration priorities in this area include partnering with States, LEAs, and grantees under the program to: ensure teachers enter the classroom with the necessary skills to be effective; address inequities in the distribution of effective teachers; and alleviate ongoing personnel shortages of teachers and principals who are prepared to provide evidence-based services for children with disabilities.

Since fiscal year 2017, the Department has required preparation programs supported under this program to plan and implement interdisciplinary programs that prepare scholars in two or more graduate programs in either (a) special education or early intervention and one or more related services, or (b) two or more related services, with a focus on shared coursework, group assignments, and coordinated field experiences. These requirements will be continued in new competitions in fiscal year 2020.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

The funds available through this program are primarily used to support ongoing development of best practices, improvements in the quality of training offered, and the scholarship support for training additional special education, related services, and leadership personnel in high priority areas, including 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. Persistent shortages of qualified personnel have been reported since the enactment of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 1975. While many States and LEAs across the country experience personnel shortages, recruiting and retaining qualified special educators is particularly challenging for schools, especially those in high-poverty districts. Data from “Teacher Quality Under No Child Left Behind: Final Report,” illustrate this challenge. According to this study, completed by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) for the Department in January 2009, approximately one-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.<sup>1</sup>

The most recent National Assessment of IDEA, published in 2011, also found that 51 percent of district Part B special education administrators reported that their districts routinely had difficulty finding qualified special education applicants over the past 3 years, and approximately 5 percent of full-time preschool-age and school-age special education teacher positions were left vacant in the 2008-2009 academic year.<sup>2</sup>

Since those studies were published, States continue to report shortages of special education staff at higher rates than almost any other subject area specialization.<sup>3</sup>

While the funds available through this program are by no means sufficient to resolve ongoing shortages in special education nationwide, they have played a critical role in increasing the supply of personnel in specific areas where the demand for additional staff are especially critical, such as in the area of low incidence disabilities at both the K-12 and postsecondary levels. Further, 81 percent of fiscal year 2016 degree/certification recipients supported under this program were employed in a high-need school district.

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/teaching/nclb-final/index.html>

<sup>2</sup> See <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20114026/pdf/20114026.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> See <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/tsa.pdf>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
<b>Program Funding:</b>			
Low incidence disabilities grants:			
New	\$500	\$3,900	0
Continuations	<u>3,905</u>	<u>976</u>	<u>\$6,100</u>
Subtotal	4,405	4,876	6,100
Leadership training grants:			
New	3,829	7,000	4,270
Continuations	<u>15,941</u>	<u>16,353</u>	<u>15,854</u>
Subtotal	19,770	23,353	20,124
Training improvement grants:			
Continuations	<u>5,450</u>	<u>5,450</u>	<u>5,450</u>
Subtotal	5,450	5,450	5,450
Early childhood grants:			
New	900	0	0
Continuations	<u>2,000</u>	<u>2,899</u>	<u>2,899</u>
Subtotal	2,900	2,899	2,899
Pre-service training grants			
New	9,108	11,500	10,250
Continuations	<u>39,911</u>	<u>36,898</u>	<u>40,205</u>
Subtotal	49,019	48,398	50,455
National Activities:			
New	143	760	0
Continuations	<u>1,734</u>	<u>1,097</u>	<u>1,772</u>
Subtotal	1,877	1,857	1,772
Peer review of new award applications			
	281	368	400
<u>Total Program Funding:</u>			
New	14,479	23,160	14,520
Continuations	68,940	63,672	72,280
Peer review of new award applications	<u>281</u>	<u>368</u>	<u>400</u>
Total	83,700	87,200	87,200

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

## 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 2020 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.*

### 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. These measures are:

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	90%	95%
2016	90	95
2017	90	
2018	90	
2019	90	
2020	90	

**Additional Information:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor using a panel of five to seven experts, who review a randomly selected sample of grantee course syllabi submitted by funded applicants in the same cohort of grantees.

In the fiscal year 2016 review, 20 syllabi from fiscal year 2016 personnel development grantees were included from the following types of projects: early childhood (4 syllabi scored), leadership (8 syllabi scored), and low incidence (8 syllabi scored). Only one grant (in the low incidence area) did not meet the established standard for incorporating scientifically- or evidence-based

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

practices in their curricula. In fiscal year 2017, new personnel development grantees were allowed the option of one year to develop new curricula to meet the interdisciplinary focus of that competition; consequently, performance data for the 2017 cohort are not expected until fall 2019.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	1.9%	1.3%
2016	1.9	1.0
2017	1.9	
2018	1.9	
2019	1.9	
2020	1.9	

**Additional Information:** Grantees submit data annually through the Department Personnel Preparation Data Report Web-based data collection.<sup>1</sup> No calculation is necessary.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	85%	91%
2016	85	94
2017	85	
2018	85	
2019	85	
2020	85	

**Additional Information:** In January 2015, the Department changed its data collection for this measure to a new online survey instrument which is intended to increase data reliability and validity.

Data for 2016 do not include 869 scholars who have not yet entered employment records into the system. The Department is taking proactive steps to resolve the issues with missing data in this measure. The contractor is still in the process of fully implementing its procedures for following up with non-responsive program completers. In addition, the contractor is continuing to work to ensure that all program completers have access to the online survey instrument.

---

<sup>1</sup> see: <http://www.oseppdp.ed.gov>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

**Measure:** Percentage of degree/certification recipients who are employed in high-need districts.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	Baseline	88%
2016	85%	81
2017	85	
2018	85	
2019	85	
2020	85	

**Additional information:** In calculating this measure, the Department uses employment records submitted by scholars and matches that employment data to school districts in the Common Core of Data, which were then classified as high-need using free and reduced-price lunch data.

In 2016, 1,593 scholars completed their programs and 424 were employed in high-need districts. As noted above, to date, 869 of those scholars have not yet entered data into the data collection system. Of the remainder, 190 scholars did not work in a school district, but worked in some other type of organization (e.g., a clinic, hospital, or State or Federal education agency).

**Measure:** Percentage of degree/certification recipients who are rated as effective by their employers.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	Baseline	80%
2016	80%	82
2017	80	
2018	80	
2019	80	
2020	80	

**Additional information:** In 2016, 514 scholars were rated as effective by their employers. The denominator for this measure includes scholars who did not report employment after their program (6 scholars in 2016), scholars whose employment records had not been verified by their employers (105 scholars in 2016), scholars who had been deemed as “less than effective” or “ineffective” by their employer (4 scholar in 2016), and scholars who had been deemed “effective” by their employer (514 scholars in 2016).

### Long-Term Performance Measures

The program currently has one long-term measure that is designed to provide information on the quality of the program by looking at the skills of scholars supported with program funds. The Department also is currently piloting a new long-term outcome measure – the percentage of degree/certification recipients who are employed in the field of special education for at least 2 years – that is not expected to be in place until fall 2019 at the earliest.

## 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
2015	90%	96%
2016	90	98
2017	90	
2018	90	
2019	90	
2020	90	

**Additional Information:** Grantees submit data annually through the Department Personnel Preparation Data Report Web-based data collection.<sup>1</sup> 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.

### Efficiency Measures

**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
2015	\$25,000	\$35,851
2016	30,000	38,928
2017	32,500	43,149
2018	32,500	
2019	32,500	
2020	32,500	

**Additional Information:** Results on this measure have increased over the last five years, far exceeding the growth in average graduate tuition. From fiscal year 2011 through fiscal year 2017, average graduate tuition increased by approximately 23 percent, according to data from the National Center on Education Statistics.<sup>2</sup> During that same time period, the average Federal cost per degree or certification recipient increased by approximately 93 percent. Beginning in fiscal year 2018, the Department began to include matching requirements in some of their training competitions to address this increase.

---

<sup>1</sup> See: <http://www.oseppdp.ed.gov>

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), "Fall Enrollment Survey" (IPEDS-EF:89-99); "Completions Survey" (IPEDS-C:90-99); "Institutional Characteristics Survey" (IPEDS-IC:89-99); IPEDS Fall 2000 through Fall 2016, Institutional Characteristics component; and IPEDS Spring 2001 through Spring 2017, Fall Enrollment component. (This table was prepared June 2018.)

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

#### 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 included two separate components: a study of IHEs that have applied for funds to train personnel under the program, and a study of the national centers funded under the program. The study of the national centers included all 12 of the centers funded between 2001 and 2008.

The study<sup>1</sup> made the following determinations about fiscal year 2006 and 2007 competitions.

- Certain types of applicants tended to be more successful than other types.
  - Public IHEs were more successful than private IHEs (37 percent versus 32 percent).
  - Doctorate-granting IHEs were more successful than non-doctorate-granting IHEs (38 percent versus 25 percent).
  - Minority institutions were more successful than non-minority institutions (38 percent versus 34 percent).
- Fifty-three percent of funded applicants proposed new courses of study.
- Seventy-three percent of grant funds were used for monetary support for scholars in funded training programs for which scholar stipends were required, with 88 percent of enrolled students receiving monetary support (averaging \$11,558 per scholar).
- By the 2008-2009 academic year, on average, 17 scholars per program had completed their training program, with 86 percent receiving State-issued credentials and 46 percent receiving a master's or education specialist degree.

The study also assessed the work of national centers funded under this program between fiscal years 2001 and 2007.

- Of the "signature" products/services of these centers:
  - seventy-seven percent were "high" or "very high" quality; and
  - eighty-two percent were "high" or "very high" relevance/usefulness.
- Of the "non-signature" products/services of these centers:
  - Seventy-three percent were "high" or "very high" quality; and
  - Sixty-eight percent were "high" or "very high" relevance/usefulness.

The study also examined the costs of various products and services provided by the centers, where possible. The largest number of products and services identified were presentations and webinars (47 percent of all identified). Only 10 of 12 centers were able to provide individualized costs for products and services, and they reported them for 51 percent of the total produced by

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://ies.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=NCEE20144007>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

all 12 centers. The largest share of costs reported by the centers was for 69 conferences, institutes, or workshops, totaling 48 percent of the identified costs. These included center-produced events for the purposes of training recipients, providing general TA, or disseminating information to targeted recipients.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

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

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2020 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$27,411	\$27,411	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011; continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2020 through appropriations language.

---

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

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

- children with disabilities and their parents receive training and information designed to assist these children in meeting developmental and functional goals and challenging academic achievement goals, and in being prepared to lead productive independent adult lives;
- children with disabilities and their parents receive training and information on their rights, responsibilities, and protections under IDEA, in order to develop the skills necessary to participate effectively 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 competitive projects: parent training and information centers, community parent resource centers, and technical assistance for parent centers. The award period for these projects is typically 5 years.

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 needs of parents of children with disabilities living in 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 typically have multiple centers that serve designated counties.

The centers also play an important role in dispute resolution by sharing information on the benefits of alternative methods of dispute resolution, such as mediation, which States are

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

required to make available under IDEA and which can help avoid costly litigation. Parent center staff attend or facilitate more than 1,700 alternative dispute resolution sessions every year. As part of that role, parent centers are required to meet with parents to explain the IDEA-mandated mediation process. In States where parent centers provide this service, they typically do so through contracts with State educational agencies.

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 most centers receiving a minimum of \$200,000. No center will receive a reduction of more than 20 percent below the amount of their fiscal year 2014 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 in smaller geographically defined areas. They are operated by local parent organizations that help ensure 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 parent training and information centers in their States.

Parent technical assistance centers are authorized to assist parent training and information centers and community parent resource centers in areas such as coordinating parent training efforts, disseminating evidence-based research and information, and ensuring 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 website with a wide variety of information and materials for parents and professionals, as well as a directory of the parent centers.<sup>1</sup> Two technical assistance centers provide assistance to parent information centers so that they can better meet the needs of military families and Native American families respectively.

An applicant for a parent center grant must be a parent organization that has a board of directors, the majority of which must consist of parents of children with disabilities under the age of 26. 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.

In addition to providing direct resources for parents and families, parent centers also act as referral points to other resources such as those available under the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program, which coordinates its activities with Parent Information Centers 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://www.parentcenterhub.org/>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2015.....	\$27,411
2016.....	27,411
2017.....	27,411
2018.....	27,411
2019.....	27,411

### FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2020, the Administration requests \$27.4 million for the Parent Information Centers program, the same as the fiscal year 2019 appropriation. This request would support awards for a total of 98 Centers, including 64 Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs), 29 continuing Community Parent Resource Centers (CPRCs), and 5 continuing Technical Assistance Centers.

Together, the PTIs, CPRCs, and Technical Assistance Centers provide training and information to more than one million parents and professionals each year. Family involvement in children's learning is critical to ensuring the provision of high quality education and related services that promote positive educational and life outcomes. Decades of research show that positive school-family partnerships can effectively involve families in their children's learning and improve student achievement.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

The training and information provided by the PTIs help ensure that parents and families have the knowledge and skills to help their children with disabilities succeed. In addition to helping parents and families 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 and families 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, as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). For parents of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services, this means participating with a multidisciplinary team in the development of individualized family service plans.

Parent centers use a variety of mechanisms to share information with parents and families, and professionals, including websites, one-on-one support, telephone call-in numbers, training workshops, and dissemination of written materials. In recent years, the Department's Office of

---

<sup>1</sup> Henderson, A.T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family and community connections on student learning*. Austin, TX: Southwest Education Development Laboratory (<https://www.sedl.org/connections/resources/evidence.pdf>).

<sup>2</sup> See Lisa Boonk, Hieronymus J.M. Gijsselaers, Henk Ritzen, Saskia Brand-Gruwel (2018). *A review of the relationship between parental involvement indicators and academic achievement*. *Educational Research Review* 24, 10–30 (<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1747938X18301027>); S. Wilder (2014). *Effects of parental involvement on academic achievement: a meta-synthesis*. *Educational Review* 66:3, 377-397 (<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00131911.2013.780009?src=recsys>).

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

Special Education Programs has worked with the Parent Centers to improve their websites and make their resources available in languages other than English, particularly Spanish.<sup>1</sup> According to data collected by the parent centers, families receiving services report a high degree of satisfaction with the services they receive and an increase in their capacity to effectively support their children.

The Department is considering extending by one year the 24 PTIs that are scheduled to be competed in fiscal year 2019 so that all 64 of the PTI awards can be consolidated into a single competition in fiscal year 2020. This consolidation would reduce the Department's administrative burden and allow the Department to align the PTI competition with the Rehabilitation Services Parent Information and Training competition.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
<b>Program Funding:</b>			
Parent Training & Information Centers:			
New	0	\$7,464 <sup>2</sup>	\$13,912 <sup>1</sup>
Continuations	<u>\$21,210<sup>3</sup></u>	<u>13,416</u>	<u>7,464</u>
Subtotal	21,210	20,880	21,376
Community Parent Resource Centers:			
New	0	0	0
Continuations	<u>2,900</u>	<u>2,900</u>	<u>2,900</u>
Subtotal	2,900	2,900	2,900
Technical Assistance Centers:			
New	2,800	0	0
Continuations	<u>0</u>	<u>2,852<sup>4</sup></u>	<u>2,748</u>
Subtotal	2,800	2,852	2,748
Total Program Funding:			
New	2,800	7,464	13,912
Continuations	24,110	19,168	13,112
Other (contracts, supplements):	477	733	327
Peer Review of new award applications	<u>24</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>60</u>

<sup>1</sup> For examples, see <http://parentcenterhub.org/osep-spanish-glossary/> and <http://www.parentcenterhub.org/resourcelibrary/>

<sup>2</sup> The Department is considering extending by one year the 24 PTIs that are scheduled to be competed in fiscal year 2019. If the awards are extended, \$20,880 thousand will be used to fund continuation awards in fiscal year 2019 and \$21,376 thousand will be used to fund new awards in fiscal year 2020.

<sup>3</sup> Includes \$501 thousand in fiscal year 2018 funds used to pay fiscal year 2019 continuation costs.

<sup>4</sup> Includes \$52 thousand in fiscal year 2019 funds used to pay fiscal year 2020 continuation costs.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

Total	27,411	27,411	27,411
-------	--------	--------	--------

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
<b>Number of Projects:</b>			
Parent Training & Information Centers:			
New	0	24 <sup>1</sup>	40 <sup>1</sup>
Continuations	64	40	24
Community Parent Resource Centers:			
New	0	0	0
Continuations	29	29	29
Technical Assistance Centers:			
New	5	0	0
Continuations	0	5	5
Total number of projects:			
New	5	24	40
Continuations	<u>93</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>58</u>
Total	98	98	98

<sup>1</sup> The Department is considering extending by one year the 24 PTIs that are scheduled to be competed in fiscal year 2019. If the awards are extended, there will be 64 continuation awards in fiscal year 2019 and 64 new awards in fiscal year 2020.

### 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 2020 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.*

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

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

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

#### Annual Performance Measures

The three annual measures deal with the quality, relevance, and usefulness of products and services provided by the program. These measures were developed as part of a cross-departmental effort to make measures relating to technical assistance and dissemination activities more consistent Department-wide. However, the measures were adapted to reflect the unique purposes of the Parent Information Centers program. Targets for 2012 through 2020 were established based on performance data from 2007 to 2017. The measures are:

**Measure:** The percentage of materials disseminated by Parent Training and Information Center Program projects deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of experts qualified to review the substantive content of the products or services.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	97%	93%
2016	97	93
2017	93	100
2018	93	86
2019	93	
2020	93	

**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.

**Measure:** The percentage of Parent Training and Information Center Program products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified experts with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products or services.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	97%	90%
2016	97	93
2017	93	100
2018	93	97
2019	93	
2020	93	

**Additional Information:** As with the performance measure above, 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.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

**Measure:** The percentage of all Parent Training and Information Center Program 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
2015	97%	93%
2016	97	93
2017	93	100
2018	93	93
2019	93	
2020	93	

**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.

### Long-Term Performance Measures

Two new long-term measures have been developed for the program. Data are collected every 2 years through an Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)-supported survey of parents who received services from the parent centers. Baseline data were collected in fiscal year 2017.

**Measure:** The percentage of parents receiving Special Education Parent Information Centers services who report having enhanced capacity to work with schools and service providers effectively in meeting the needs of their children.

Year	Target	Actual
2017		90%
2019	TBD	

**Additional Information:** Data for the measure are collected by the parent centers every two years by mail, on-line survey, or telephone interview from 1 percent of the parents served by each center. Baseline data for this measure were collected in 2017. Targets will be established in late 2019.

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

Year	Target	Actual
2017		94%
2019	TBD	

**Additional Information:** Data for the measure are collected by the parent centers every two years by mail, on-line survey, or telephone interview from 1 percent of the parents served by each center. Baseline data for this measure were collected in 2017. Targets will be established in late 2019.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

#### Efficiency Measure

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	1.1	1.6
2016	1.1	0.8
2017	1.1	0.8
2018	1.1	0.5
2019	1.1	
2020	1.1	

**Additional Information:** The efficiency measure for the PTIs program is “the index of federal cost per unit of output.” The calculation of the Federal index of cost per unit of technical assistance is the total Federal cost of PTI grant funding for a given fiscal year divided by the sum of the numbers of parents and professionals receiving technical assistance during that fiscal year. The Department notes that it is difficult to attribute increases or decreases under this measure to the Federal share of funds due to the variability in other sources of funding. The result is expressed as an index of cost rather than a cost in dollars.

For fiscal year 2018, the index of .52 was arrived at by dividing the total funding (\$27,411,000) by the total number of services provided to parents, youth and professionals (52,613,850). Of this count, 98 percent were attributable to website hits (9,382,247), social media hits (31,711,822) and newsletter dissemination (10,609,580). The remaining 2 percent were attributable to direct assistance through letters, telephone calls and email exchanges (573,986); participation in trainings (326,626), and extended assistance through attendance or participation in IEP meetings, mediation sessions, and resolution sessions (9,589).

Due to the overwhelming proportion of outputs attributable to website hits, social media hits, and newsletter dissemination compared to the number of parents and professionals otherwise served by grantees, the Department is considering revising this measure or including an additional measure to provide a more descriptive representation of the cost per output.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### National activities: Educational technology, media, and materials

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2020 Authorization: To be determined<sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority:

	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$28,047	\$28,047	0

---

<sup>1</sup> The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2011; continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2020 through appropriations language.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Educational Technology, Media, and Materials program is the primary source of support for accessible technology and media-related activities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The program supports two broad categories of activities – *accessible technology* and *educational media and materials*.

Technology activities are generally designed to promote the development, demonstration, and use of accessible technology. The technology component of the program also supports research on using technology to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, and technical assistance and dissemination activities to enhance the use of technology by students, parents, and teachers. Media and materials activities focus on closed captioning, video description, timely provision of books and other educational materials in accessible formats, and other activities to improve access to education for students with disabilities.

The 21st Century Communications and Video Accessibility Act of 2010 expanded the range of media that must be closed captioned and updated accessibility standards to include emerging Internet and mobile technologies. However, significant gaps in captioning coverage remain. The Educational Technology, Media, and Materials program helps ensure educational media that are not otherwise required to be made accessible are available to students with disabilities. For example, mandatory captioning only applies to broadcast television, not to video broadcast solely over the Internet or video produced for classroom viewing. Funding for this program helps to fill these critical gaps in the accessibility of learning content and materials by supporting the captioning and nationwide distribution of thousands of titles of educational media each year.

Video description is used to make video and other media with visual content accessible for people who are blind or visually impaired. Audio-narrated descriptions of key visual elements in a video or television program are inserted into natural pauses in the spoken dialogue, supplementing the regular audio track of the program by providing additional context. Federal law requires television broadcast stations affiliated with the top four commercial broadcasting corporations (ABC, CBS, FOX and NBC) and licensed to the top 60 Designated Market Areas (i.e., unique, county-based geographic areas designated by The Nielsen Company, a television audience measurement service based on television viewership) and the five most watched non-broadcast networks to provide 50 hours of video description per calendar quarter. The video

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### **National activities: Educational Technology, media, and materials**

---

description must be of prime time or children's television programming. All other video programming, including educational materials intended for use in the classroom and increasingly popular Internet media, are not subject to description requirements. The funds available through this program play a critical role in filling these gaps. The IDEA requires that description and captioning funds be used only for programs that are suitable for use in classroom settings, and program funds may not be used to describe or caption news programs, even when they are suitable for use in classrooms.

Educational materials activities include the preparation of electronic files suitable for efficient conversion into specialized accessible formats. The educational materials provided by this program are intended to support 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. Due to recent advances in digital technologies, these activities can be accomplished more efficiently than ever before.

The Department makes competitive awards for projects throughout the fiscal year. The duration of awards typically varies from 3 to 5 years.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2015.....	28,047
2016.....	30,047
2017.....	28,047
2018.....	28,047
2019.....	28,047

### **FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2020, the Administration requests \$28.0 million for the Educational Technology, Media, and Materials program, the same as the fiscal year 2019 appropriation. This request would provide approximately \$4.8 million for 9 new awards and approximately \$22.7 million for 20 continuation projects. The remaining funding would support program evaluation and peer review activities.

Projects funded under the 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 students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education, consistent with the requirements of the IDEA. The program also funds innovations in accessible technologies and broadens the understanding of how technology can be used effectively to increase academic achievement. The Department believes increased access and participation results in higher expectations and improved outcomes for children with disabilities.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Educational Technology, media, and materials

---

#### Educational Technology

The request includes \$12.0 million for Technology activities, which promote the development, demonstration, and use of accessible technology. In fiscal year 2020, at least \$1.6 million will support three new Stepping Up Technology Implementation awards, and \$7.1 million will support nine continuing Stepping Up projects. These model demonstration grants validate and scale up promising technology-based products or interventions, such as curriculum materials, accessible products, and instructional methodologies. The remaining \$3.1 million would be used for continuation awards in the areas of technical assistance and dissemination and projects for individuals with deafness.

#### Educational Media and Materials

Media and materials investments include a variety of activities designed to provide educational content, such as textbooks, in accessible formats for individuals with disabilities, particularly deaf or hard-of-hearing individuals and blind or other visually impaired individuals. In fiscal year 2020, \$15.6 million would be allocated to these activities.

The request for educational media and materials includes approximately \$2 million to support new awards for projects to provide access—through video description and captioning—to television programs appropriate for use in classroom settings and not otherwise required to be captioned by the Federal Communications Commission. These projects fill in the gaps for an increasingly large amount of content that is not currently covered under Federal accessibility policies, and help ensure that as much educational programming as possible is accessible to students with visual or hearing impairments. An additional \$1.2 million would be used to support a center dedicated to conducting a comprehensive review of industry accessibility standards, ensuring that new and emerging technologies are fully accessible to students with disabilities.

Additionally, the IDEA requires the Administration to support the National Instructional Materials Access Center (NIMAC), which is awarded noncompetitively to the American Printing House for the Blind. The NIMAC<sup>1</sup> is a national electronic file repository that makes electronic files that comply with the National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard (NIMAS) available for the production of print instructional materials in specialized formats. NIMAC receives source files from textbook publishers and provides these files to State and local educational agencies for use in producing materials in accessible media, such as braille, audio, and digital text. The request includes \$650,000 for a continuation award for this project in fiscal year 2020.

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://www.nimac.us/>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Educational Technology, media, and materials

---

#### **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**

(dollars in thousands)

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
<b>Program Funding:</b>			
<u>Technology:</u>			
Research:			
New	\$1,499	\$1,800	\$1,617
Continuations	<u>6,949</u>	<u>7,554</u>	<u>7,191</u>
Subtotal	8,448	9,354	8,808
Technical assistance and dissemination:			
New	2,149	0	0
Continuations	<u>0</u>	<u>2,149</u>	<u>2,149</u>
Subtotal	2,149	2,149	2,149
Projects to address the postsecondary, vocational, technical, and adult education needs of individuals with deafness:			
New	0	0	0
Continuations	<u>1,000</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>1,000</u>
Subtotal	1,000	1,000	1,000
Subtotal, Technology:			
New	3,648	1,800	1,617
Continuations	<u>7,949</u>	<u>10,703</u>	<u>10,340</u>
Subtotal	11,297	12,503	11,957
<u>Media and Materials:</u>			
Captioned and described accessible media:			
New	0	0	2,000
Continuations	<u>4,500</u>	<u>3,494</u>	<u>1,998</u>
Subtotal	4,500	3,494	3,998
Books and other instructional materials in accessible formats:			
New	0	1,200	1,200
Continuations	<u>10,795</u>	<u>9,700</u>	<u>9,700</u>
Subtotal	10,795	10,900	10,900
National Instructional Materials Access Center (NIMAC) – Statutory earmark:			
New	0	0	0
Continuations	<u>650</u>	<u>650</u>	<u>650</u>
Subtotal	650	650	650

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Educational Technology, media, and materials

---

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Subtotal, Media and Materials:			
New	0	\$1,200	\$3,200
Continuations	<u>\$15,946</u>	<u>13,844</u>	<u>12,350</u>
Subtotal	15,946	15,044	15,550
<b>Other</b> (e.g. program evaluation contracts):			
New	0	221	0
Continuations	<u>448</u>	<u>230</u>	<u>448</u>
Subtotal, Other	448	451	448
<b>Peer review of new award applications:</b>	56	50	92
<b>Total Program Funding:</b>			
New	3,648	3,221	4,817
Continuations	24,343	24,777	23,138
Peer review	<u>56</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>92</u>
Total	28,047	28,047	28,047

## 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 2020 and future years, as well as the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

### Annual Performance Measures

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

For each of the three annual performance measures that follow, a contractor collects and analyzes data based on input from two panels of subject matter experts. Panels review a sample of products and services developed by grantees against a listing of evidence-based practices in key target areas the Department has identified as critical. The sample of grantees included in this measure for each year consists of projects from across all areas of this program. Products and services are divided into the categories of policy and practice.

Panels of experts review and score all products and services 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.

In assessing the performance under each measure, panels of six to eight experts reviewed a sample of products and services from the program's projects.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Educational Technology, media, and materials

---

**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 relevance to improving outcomes of infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	94%	91%
2016	94	100
2017	94	100
2018	94	
2019	90	
2020	90	

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

Year	Target	Actual
2015	94%	86%
2016	94	100
2017	94	79
2018	94	
2019	90	
2020	90	

**Additional Information:** The percentage of products judged to be of high quality decreased significantly in fiscal year 2017. Of the 14 products reviewed in the sample, only 11 were reported to be of high quality. The Department is currently reviewing performance under this measure to determine potential causes for the poor results and is working directly with grantees whose products were deemed not to be of high quality.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Educational Technology, media, and materials

---

**Measure:** The percentage of Special Education Educational Technology, Media, and Materials projects and services judged by an independent review panel of qualified experts to be useful in improving results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	94%	96%
2016	94	100
2017	94	93
2018	94	
2019	90	
2020	90	

**Additional information:** In fiscal year 2017, 13 of 14 products and services reviewed were found to be highly useful.

### Long-Term Performance 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. Data are reported every two years for these measures because evidence about outcomes of the target population may take more than 1 year to collect, report, and analyze.

**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.*

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

Year	Target	Actual
2012	70%	70%
2014	72	100
2016	72	75
2018	75	
2020	75	

**Additional information:** 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. Three of the four projects that were rated in the 2016 data collection submitted acceptable evidence of validity.

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Educational Technology, media, and materials

---

**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
2013	95%	50%
2015	95	100
2017	95	
2019	95	

**Additional information:** Due to the small number of projects (4 in 2013 and 3 in 2015) that are subject to this measure, minor changes in the number of projects that submit acceptable evidence can cause large drops in the reported percentages; consequently, the Administration plans to reconsider this measure or develop more appropriate targets for 2019 reporting.

### Efficiency Measures

The Administration established two efficiency measures for the Educational Technology, Media, and Materials program. The two measures provide data on accessible book distribution and on video captioning and description projects, respectively. The Administration 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
2015	\$5.0	\$4.1
2016	5.0	5.4
2017	5.0	4.9
2018	4.0	
2019	4.0	

**Additional Information:** In fiscal year 2017, there were 1,696,251 accessible materials product downloads while the total funding for the grantee (Bookshare, Inc.) was \$8,394,862, for an average of \$4.95 per download.

## 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
2015	\$1,669	\$2,335
2016	1,669	2,151
2017	2,000	2,306
2018	2,000	
2019	2,000	
2020	2,000	

**Additional information:** The cost of an hour of media description increased in fiscal year 2017, but is still below the average cost in fiscal year 2015 and prior years.

## Special Olympics education programs

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

(dollars in thousands)

FY 2020 Authorization: Indefinite

Budget Authority:

	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$17,583	0	-\$17,583

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004 authorizes the Department of Education to make discretionary grant awards to the Special Olympics to support activities in a number of areas related to the Special Olympics. The Department of Education is authorized to make awards 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.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

Fiscal Year	(dollars in thousands)
2015.....	7,583
2016.....	10,083
2017.....	12,583
2018.....	15,083
2019.....	17,583

### FY 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

Consistent with the fiscal year 2018 and 2019 budget requests, the fiscal year 2020 request does not include funds for the Special Olympics education programs because they are more appropriately supported with State, local, or private funds. The elimination of funding for this program will also allow the Department to provide strong support for State formula grant programs—including Special Education Grants to States—while maintaining the fiscal discipline required to meet the President’s deficit reduction goals.

Special Olympics is a well-established nonprofit organization with a broad network of program volunteers and supporters. The organization provides worthwhile activities such as the Special Olympics National Youth Activation Demonstration (Unified Champion Schools, previously referred to as Project UNIFY), a national youth sports demonstration and education program. While the Administration strongly supports the mission of Special Olympics, it does not believe

Federal funding is necessary for the successful operation of these programs, particularly since the organization reported approximately \$113.4 million in revenue from its individual and corporate donors in fiscal year 2017.

## **PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES**

<u>Output Measures</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>
Unified Champion Schools			
Number of funded State programs	49	49	0
Number of schools participating	6,493	7,000	0

## **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. Targets for 2020 are not included because funding for this program is proposed for elimination.

**Goal:** To increase the inclusion and awareness of students with intellectual disabilities.

**Objective:** *The Special Olympics will improve awareness about students with intellectual disabilities.*

**Measure:** The percent of school liaisons who report that Unified Champion Schools helps raise awareness about students with intellectual disabilities.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2015</b>	67%	68%
<b>2016</b>	67	71
<b>2017</b>	67	72
<b>2018</b>	70	76
<b>2019</b>	70	

**Additional information:** Data are collected by external evaluators who survey school liaisons at the end of each program year. School liaisons are volunteers, typically teachers, who administer Special Olympics programming at the school level. Special Olympics includes those survey responses that indicate the program “made a big difference” (scores of 4 or 5 on the survey’s Likert scale) in the numerator used to calculate the actual performance.

**Measure:** The percent of school liaisons who report that Unified Champion Schools increases opportunities for students with intellectual disabilities to be involved in school activities.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	61%	65%
2016	61	65
2017	61	67
2018	61	76
2019	61	

**Additional information:** Data are collected by external evaluators who survey school liaisons at the end of each program year. School liaisons are volunteers, typically teachers, who administer Special Olympics programming at the school level. Special Olympics includes those survey responses that indicate the program “made a big difference” (scores of 4 or 5 on the survey’s Likert scale) in the numerator used to calculate actual performance data.

**Objective:** *The Special Olympics will increase opportunities for K-12 students with intellectual disabilities to participate in inclusive school activities.*

**Measure:** The number of schools participating in Unified Champion Schools.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	2,500	3,686
2016	4,000	4,451
2017	4,500	5,453
2018	5,000	6,493
2019	6,800	

**Measure:** The number of schools participating in a Unified Champion Schools High Activation Program.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	1,150	1,685
2016	1,725	3,005
2017	1,765	3,748
2018	3,500	4,998
2019	4,500	

**Additional information:** Increased funding has allowed Special Olympics to rapidly increase the number of participating schools in recent years. 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 generally include schools that are new to the program.

## Efficiency Measures

**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
2015	\$3,033	\$2,057
2016	3,033	1,703
2017	3,033	1,849
2018	2,500	1,938
2019	2,500	

**Measure:** The percent of Federal funds spent on administration.

Year	Target	Actual
2015	20%	22%
2016	20	20
2017	20	19
2018	20	
2019	20	

**Additional information:** These two measures provide basic information on the efficiency of the program. The program exceeded the targets for Federal cost per school in 2015-2018, and exceeded the target for the percent of Federal funds spent on administration in 2017, showing an increase in program efficiency. Data for the percent of Federal funds spent on administration in 2018 will be available in March 2019.

## Other Performance Information

In 2014, external evaluators from the University of Massachusetts conducted a formative evaluation of Project UNIFY (now referred to as Unified Champion Schools). Data from surveys of school liaisons in 1,509 schools indicate that Project UNIFY did not demonstrate causal 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 have positive attitudes and behaviors. It is difficult to avoid this self-selection effect because participation in Special Olympics activities is voluntary and non-random. The project's impact on academic outcomes was not measured, because improving academic achievement is not the primary goal of this program.

The formative evaluation also found that the majority of school staff involved with the project believe 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.