

**Department of Education**

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

Fiscal Year 2010 Budget Request

**CONTENTS**

**Page**

Appropriations Language.....	I-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	I-2
Amounts Available for Obligation.....	I-4
Obligations by Object Classification.....	I-4
Authorizing Legislation.....	I-5
Appropriations History.....	I-6
Significant Items in FY 2009 Appropriations Reports .....	I-7
Summary of Request .....	I-8
State grants:.....	I-10
Grants to States .....	I-10
Preschool grants .....	I-27
Grants for infants and families .....	I-40
National activities:.....	I-52
State personnel development .....	I-52
Technical assistance and dissemination .....	I-61
Personnel preparation.....	I-71
Parent Information Centers .....	I-84
Technology and media services .....	I-94
Special Olympics education programs .....	I-103
State Tables.....	I-105

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Appropriations Language

For carrying out the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (“IDEA”) and the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004, \$12,579,677,000, of which \$3,726,354,000 shall become available on July 1, [2009] 2010, and shall remain available through September 30, [2010] 2011, and of which \$8,592,383,000 shall become available on October 1, [2009] 2010, and shall remain available through September 30, [2010] 2011, for academic year [2009-2010] 2010-2011:<sup>1</sup> [Provided, That \$13,250,000 shall be for Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Inc., to support the development, production, and circulation of recorded educational materials:]<sup>2</sup> [Provided further, That \$737,000 shall be for the recipient of funds provided by Public Law 105-78 under section 687(b)(2)(G) of the IDEA (as in effect prior to the enactment of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004) to provide information on diagnosis, intervention, and teaching strategies for children with disabilities:]<sup>3</sup> *Provided further,* That the amount for section 611(b)(2) of the IDEA shall be equal to the lesser of the amount available for that activity during fiscal year [2008] 2009, increased by the amount of inflation as specified in section 619(d)(2)(B) of the IDEA, or the [percentage increase] percent change in the funds appropriated under section 611(i) of the IDEA, but not less than the amount for that activity during fiscal year 2009:<sup>4</sup> *Provided further,* That funds made available for the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004 may be used to support expenses associated with the Special Olympics National and World games [hosted in the United States].<sup>5</sup>

*(Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2009.)*

#### NOTE

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

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes**

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>1</sup>... of which \$3,726,354,000 shall become available on July 1, [2009] <u>2010</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2010] <u>2011</u>, and of which \$8,592,383,000 shall become available on October 1, [2009] <u>2010</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2010] <u>2011</u>, for academic year [2009-2010] <u>2010-2011</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 is available in an advance appropriation that becomes available for obligation on October 1 of the fiscal year following the year of the appropriation.</p>
<p><sup>2</sup> [<i>Provided</i>, That \$13,250,000 shall be for Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Inc., to support the development, production, and circulation of recorded educational materials:]</p>	<p>This language earmarks an amount for Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic. This language is deleted because funding for activities under section 674(a)(1) of the IDEA related to providing recorded and electronic materials will be supported in 2010 under a multi-year grant that will be awarded in 2010.</p>
<p><sup>3</sup> [<i>Provided further</i>, That \$737,000 shall be for the recipient of funds provided by Public Law 105-78 under section 687(b)(2)(G) of the IDEA (as in effect prior to the enactment of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004) to provide information on diagnosis, intervention, and teaching strategies for children with disabilities:]</p>	<p>This language earmarks an amount for the Greater Washington Educational Television Association (GWETA). The language is deleted because funds are not requested for this project in 2010.</p>

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes**

Language Provision	Explanation
<p><sup>4</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That the amount for section 611(b)(2) of the IDEA shall be equal to the lesser of the amount available for that activity during fiscal year [2008] <u>2009</u>, increased by the amount of inflation as specified in section 619(d)(2)(B) of the IDEA, or the [percentage increase] <u>percent change</u> in the funds appropriated under section 611(i) of the IDEA, <u>but not less than the amount for that activity during fiscal year 2009</u>:</p>	<p>This language would limit the amount of funds required to be transferred to the Department of the Interior under the Grants to States program to the lesser of an amount equal to the amount transferred to the Department of the Interior for fiscal year 2009 plus inflation or the percent change in the appropriation for the Grants to States program. This language would also clarify that in the event of a decrease or no change in the appropriation for the Grants to States program, the amount of funds required to be transferred to the Department of the Interior remains level with the amount they received in fiscal year 2009.</p>
<p><sup>5</sup> <i>Provided further</i>, That funds made available for the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004 may be used to support expenses associated with the Special Olympics National and World games [hosted in the United States].</p>	<p>The language authorizes funds made available for the Special Olympics Sports and Empowerment Act of 2004 to be used to support expenses associated with Special Olympics National and World games held in the United States. The reference to “hosted in the United States” is deleted because in 2010 no Special Olympics National or World games will be hosted in the United States.</p>

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

	2008	2009	2010
Discretionary appropriation:			
Appropriation.....	\$12,181,473	\$12,579,677	\$12,579,677
Across-the-board reduction.....	<u>-187,789</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, appropriation.....	11,993,684	12,579,677	12,579,677
Recovery supplemental (P.L. 111-5) .....	<u>0</u>	<u>12,200,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, adjusted discretionary appropriation.....	11,993,684	24,779,677	12,579,677
Advance for succeeding fiscal year .....	-6,856,444	-8,592,383	-8,592,383
Advance from prior year.....	<u>5,424,200</u>	<u>6,856,444</u>	<u>8,592,383</u>
Subtotal, comparable budget authority .....	10,561,440	23,043,738	12,579,677
Unobligated balance, start of year .....	79,343	12,472	0
Unobligated balance, end of year .....	<u>-12,472</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations .....	10,628,311	23,056,210	12,579,677

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

	2008	2009	2010
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services .....	\$500	\$4,091	\$4,091
Peer review .....	<u>4,100</u>	<u>850</u>	<u>850</u>
Subtotal .....	4,600	4,941	4,941
Grants .....	10,623,711	10,851,269	12,574,736
Grants, Recovery .....	<u>0</u>	<u>12,200,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, obligations.....	10,628,311	23,056,210	12,579,677

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

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

Activity	2009 Authorized	2009 Estimate	2010 Authorized	2010 Request
<b>State Grants:</b>				
Grants to States ( <i>IDEA-B-611</i> )	\$21,519,459 <sup>1</sup>	\$11,505,211 <sup>2</sup>	\$23,809,729 <sup>1</sup>	\$11,505,211 <sup>2</sup>
Preschool grants ( <i>IDEA-B-619</i> )	Indefinite	374,099	Indefinite	374,099
Grants for infants and families ( <i>IDEA-C</i> )	Indefinite	439,427	Indefinite	439,427
<b>National activities:</b>				
State personnel development ( <i>IDEA-D-1</i> )	Indefinite	48,000	Indefinite	48,000
Technical assistance and dissemination ( <i>IDEA-D-2-663</i> )	Indefinite	48,549	Indefinite	48,549
Personnel preparation ( <i>IDEA-D-2-662</i> )	Indefinite	90,653	Indefinite	90,653
Parent information centers ( <i>IDEA-D-3-671-673</i> )	Indefinite	27,028	Indefinite	27,028
Technology and media services ( <i>IDEA-D-3-674</i> )	Indefinite	38,615	Indefinite	38,615
Special Olympics education programs ( <i>SOSEA</i> <sup>3</sup> 3(a))	Indefinite	8,095	Indefinite	8,095
Recovery Act ( <i>P.L. 111-5</i> ) ( <i>non-add</i> )	(0)	(12,200,000)	(0)	(0)
<b>Unfunded authorizations:</b>				
Safe learning environments ( <i>IDEA-D-2-665</i> )	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>0</u>
Total definite authorization	21,519,459		23,809,729	
Total appropriation		12,579,677		12,579,677

<sup>1</sup> Funding for technical assistance on State data collection is limited to \$25,000 thousand adjusted upward for inflation. This amount is estimated to be \$28,794 thousand for fiscal year 2009 and \$32,666 thousand for fiscal year 2010.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$15,000 thousand for technical assistance on State data collection in fiscal years 2009 and 2010.

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Appropriations History (\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2001 (2001 Advance for 2002)	\$6,368,841 (3,742,000)	\$6,550,161 (3,742,000)	\$7,353,141 (4,624,000)	\$7,439,948 (5,072,000)
2002 (2002 Advance for 2003)	8,425,595 0	8,860,076 (5,072,000)	8,439,643 (5,072,000)	8,672,804 (5,072,000)
2003 2003 Technical amendment (P.L. 108-83) (2003 Advance for 2004)	9,687,804 (5,072,000)	9,187,804 (5,072,000)	11,191,424 (7,572,000)	10,033,917 -497 (5,672,000)
2004 (2004 Advance for 2005)	10,690,104 (5,072,000)	11,049,790 (5,072,000)	12,227,464 (5,402,000)	11,238,832 (5,413,000)
2005 (2005 Advance for 2006)	12,176,101 (5,413,000)	12,176,101 (5,413,000)	12,328,391 (5,413,000)	11,673,606 (5,413,000)
2006 (2006 Advance for 2007)	12,126,130 (6,204,000)	11,813,783 (5,413,000)	11,775,107 (5,424,200)	11,653,013 (5,424,200)
2007 (2007 Advance for 2008)	11,697,502 (6,215,200)	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A <sup>1</sup>	11,802,867 <sup>1</sup> (5,424,200)
2008 (2008 Advance for 2009)	11,485,147 (6,215,200)	12,362,831 (6,641,982)	12,330,374 (5,924,200)	11,993,684 (6,856,444)
2009 (2009 Advance for 2010) Recovery Act Supplemental (P.L. 111-5)	12,335,943 (7,647,444) 0	12,587,920 <sup>2</sup> (8,592,383) 13,600,000	12,511,631 <sup>2</sup> (7,647,444) 13,500,000	12,579,677 (8,592,383) 12,200,000
2010 (2010 Advance for 2011)	12,579,677 (8,592,383)			

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

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

## **SPECIAL EDUCATION**

### **Significant Items in FY 2009 Appropriations Reports**

#### **Technical Assistance and Dissemination - Support for Evidence-based Instructional Practices**

Senate: The Committee intends that the increase provided above last year's funding level be used to increase technical assistance support for evidence-based practices that will help improve the instructional practices of teachers educating students with disabilities.

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

#### **Parent Information Centers – Training and Information Needs of Parents**

Conference: The Committee indicates that the Department should use the additional funds provided for Parent Information Centers to increase the grant awards of Parent Information Centers that did not receive an increase in their awards from the 2008 appropriation, and to enable all centers to better meet the training and information needs of parents of children with disabilities.

Senate: The Committee intends that the Department use the increase to address the need for transition services for children with disabilities, and encourages the Office of Special Education Programs to collaborate with the Rehabilitation Services Administration in carrying out this effort.

Response: The Department plans to use the increase to enable all centers to better meet the training and information needs of parents of children with disabilities.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2010 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

(in thousands of dollars)						
Office, Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	2008 Appropriation	2009 Appropriation	2010 President's Request	Change from 2009 Appropriation	
					Amount	Percent
<b>Special Education (IDEA)</b>						
1. State grants:						
(a) Grants to States (Part B-611):						
Annual appropriation	D	4,091,067	2,912,828	2,912,828	0	0.0%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	6,856,444	8,592,383	8,592,383	0	0.0%
Subtotal		10,947,511	11,505,211	11,505,211	0	0.0%
(b) Preschool grants (Part B-619)	D	374,099	374,099	374,099	0	0.0%
(c) Grants for infants and families (Part C)	D	435,654	439,427	439,427	0	0.0%
Subtotal, State grants		11,757,264	12,318,737	12,318,737	0	0.0%
2. National activities (Part D):						
(a) State personnel development (Subpart 1)	D	22,598	48,000	48,000	0	0.0%
(b) Technical assistance and dissemination (section 663)	D	48,049	48,549	48,549	0	0.0%
(c) Personnel preparation (section 662)	D	88,153	90,653	90,653	0	0.0%
(d) Parent information centers (sections 671-673)	D	26,528	27,028	27,028	0	0.0%
(e) Technology and media services (section 674)	D	39,301	38,615	38,615	0	0.0%
Subtotal		224,629	252,845	252,845	0	0.0%
3. Special Olympics education programs (Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act)	D	11,790	8,095	8,095	0	0.0%
<b>Total, Appropriation</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>11,993,684</b>	<b>12,579,677</b>	<b>12,579,677</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
Total, Budget authority	D	10,561,440	10,843,738	12,579,677	1,735,939	16.0%
Current		5,137,240 <sup>1</sup>	3,987,294 <sup>2</sup>	3,987,294 <sup>2</sup>	0	0.0%
Prior year's advance		5,424,200	6,856,444	8,592,383	1,735,939	25.3%
Outlays	D	12,280,101	11,490,079	12,336,617	846,538	7.4%
<b>Special Education, Recovery Act</b>						
1. State grants:						
(a) Grants to States (IDEA-B-611)	D	0	11,300,000	0	(11,300,000)	-100.0%
(b) Preschool grants (IDEA-B-619)	D	0	400,000	0	(400,000)	-100.0%
(c) Grants for infants and families (IDEA-C)	D	0	500,000	0	(500,000)	-100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12,200,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(12,200,000)</b>	<b>-100.0%</b>
Outlays	D	0	244,000	4,514,000	4,270,000	1750.0%

<sup>1</sup> Excludes an advance appropriation of \$6,856,444 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year

<sup>2</sup> Excludes an advance appropriation of \$8,592,383 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year

NOTES: Category Codes are as follows: D = discretionary program; M = mandatory program.  
FY 2008 detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

## 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 2010 budget request for Special Education of \$12.6 billion is aimed at making this goal a reality by helping States and school districts improve the results for children with disabilities.

The Administration requests \$11.5 billion for the **Grants to States** program, level with the fiscal year 2009 regular 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 Administration believes that this level is appropriate, taking into consideration the funds available under the Recovery Act. The Recovery Act provided an unprecedented increase to States and LEAs, much of which is likely to be available for use during the same period of availability as the fiscal year 2010 funds requested for this program. The Recovery Act funds are available for obligation through September 30, 2011.

This request would maintain the Federal contribution toward meeting the excess cost of special education and related services at 17 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure, the same level as estimated would be provided under the fiscal year 2008 appropriation. The request would provide an average of \$1,713 for each of the 6.718 million children with disabilities who are estimated to be served for 2010.

The requests of \$374.1 million for **Preschool Grants** and \$439.4 million for **Grants for Infants and Families** are the same as the fiscal year 2009 appropriation levels. The Preschool Grants program provides additional support to States and schools for providing special education services to children ages 3 through 5. The Grants for Infants and Families program provides assistance to States to help them implement statewide systems of early intervention services for children from birth through age 2.

The \$252.8 million request for **National Activities** programs would support a variety of technical assistance, dissemination, training, and other activities to help States, local educational agencies, parents, and others in improving results for children with disabilities.

**State Personnel Development, Technical Assistance and Dissemination, Personnel Preparation, Technology and Media Services, and Parent Information Centers** would be funded at their 2009 levels of \$48.0 million, \$48.5 million, \$90.7 million, \$38.6 million, and \$27.0 million, respectively.

Level funding is requested for **Special Olympics Education Programs**, which was funded at a level of \$8.095 million in 2009.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

**State grants: Grants to States**

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): \$23,809,729 <sup>1</sup>

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$2,912,828 <sup>2</sup>	\$2,912,828 <sup>2</sup>	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	<u>8,592,383</u>	<u>8,592,383</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	11,505,211	11,505,211	0
 Recovery Act appropriation	 11,300,000	 0	 \$11,300,000

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 611(c) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act limits technical assistance activities to \$25.0 million, increased by the amount of inflation from year to year. It is estimated that the maximum amount authorized for fiscal year 2010 would be \$32.6 million.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$15.0 million for technical assistance activities in fiscal years 2009 and 2010.

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

---

<sup>1</sup> The amount that any single State's allocation may increase from one year to the next is capped at the amount the State received in the prior year multiplied by the sum of 1.5 percent and the percentage increase in the total amount appropriated for Part B of IDEA from the prior year. The maximum amount that any State may receive in any

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

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

This is a forward-funded program that includes advance appropriations. In a typical year, a portion of the funds become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year of the appropriation and remain available for 15 months, through September 30 of the following year. The remaining funds – the advance appropriation – become available on October 1 of the fiscal year following the year of the appropriations act and remain available for 12 months, expiring at the same time as the forward-funded portion. For fiscal year 2010, school districts will use both the forward- and advance-funded amounts primarily for the 2010-2011 school year.

Funds remain available for obligation at State and local levels for an additional year. Hence, States and local educational agencies will have until September 30, 2012 to obligate their fiscal year 2010 awards.

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

State Administration – A State may reserve for State administration up to the greater of the maximum amount the State could reserve for State administration from fiscal year 2004 funds, or \$800,000, increased by inflation as reflected by the Consumer Price Index For All Urban Consumers. For fiscal year 2010, this amount is estimated to be \$953,870.

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 of the authorized activities is to support a risk pool, or high cost fund, to assist LEAs in meeting the cost of serving high need 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 consortiums of LEAs to address the needs of specific high cost children.

Starting in 2007, the amount that a State may set aside for other State-level activities is based on a percentage of its total allocation for 2006, increased for inflation. The percentage is based on whether the State opts to use funds for a risk pool and the amount of funds that the State sets aside for administration. If the State opts to use funds for a risk pool and the State sets aside \$850,000 or less for administration, the percentage is 10.5 percent. If the State opts to

---

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

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

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

Similarly, each LEA is required to maintain its expenditures on special education from one year to the next. However, IDEA allows certain LEAs to reduce the level of support otherwise required each year by up to 50 percent of any increase in their allocation under the Grants to States program over the prior year. LEAs taking advantage of this flexibility must use any funds that otherwise would have been used for the education of children with disabilities to support activities that are authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Also, if an SEA determines that an LEA is not meeting all of the requirements of Part B, including meeting targets in the State’s performance plan, the SEA must prohibit that LEA from reducing its level of support.

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

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

---

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

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

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) provided an additional \$11.3 billion for supplemental FY 2009 formula grant awards under the Grants to States program. The Administration awarded half of the Grants to States Recovery Act funds in April 2009. The remaining \$5.65 billion will be awarded once States have submitted additional information addressing how they will meet the recordkeeping and reporting requirements of the Recovery Act.

While LEAs may use Recovery Act funds for any purpose consistent with IDEA statutory and regulatory requirements, the Administration is encouraging LEAs to focus on short-term investments with the potential for long-term benefits.

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

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

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

The Department will update its Recovery Act guidance throughout the year to provide additional information on spending funds wisely.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)	
2005 .....	\$10,589,746	<sup>1</sup>
2006 .....	10,582,961	<sup>2</sup>
2007 .....	10,782,961	<sup>2</sup>
2008 .....	10,947,511	<sup>2</sup>
2009.....	11,505,211	<sup>2</sup>
Recovery Act .....	11,300,000	

---

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$10 million for technical assistance.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$15 million for technical assistance.

### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$11.5 billion for Grants to States to assist in covering the excess costs associated with providing special education and related services to children with disabilities. This request is level with the 2009 regular appropriation.

The Administration believes that this level is appropriate, taking into consideration the funds available under the Recovery Act. The Recovery Act provided an unprecedented increase to LEAs, much of which is likely to be available for use during the same period of availability as the fiscal year 2010 funds requested for this program. The Recovery Act funds are available for obligation through September 30, 2011. This means that the effective request for 2010 is billions of dollars above the 2009 funding level.

This request would provide an average of \$1,713 per child. This compares with \$3,395 per child in 2009 (including funding available under the Recovery Act) and \$1,609 per child in 2008. These averages are based on the assumption that the number of children ages 3 through 21 who will be served will remain constant at the 2009 actual level of 6.718 million. The request would maintain the Federal contribution toward offsetting the cost of special education and related services for children with disabilities at 17 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure (APPE), the same level as estimated for fiscal year 2008.

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

Both the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and the IDEA emphasize improving results for children with disabilities through heightened expectations and increased accountability. The Administration has identified four goals that are central to this challenge. As stated in Section 14005(d)(2) of the Recovery Act, these four goals involve:

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

- Making improvements in teacher effectiveness and ensuring that all schools have highly qualified teachers;
- Making progress toward college and career-ready standards and rigorous assessments that will improve both teaching and learning;
- Improving achievement in low-performing schools, by providing intensive support and effective interventions in schools that need them the most, and;
- Gathering information to improve student learning, teacher performance, and college and career-readiness through enhanced data systems that track progress.

States and LEAs may use funds available under the Grants to States program to support these critical objectives as they relate to students with disabilities.

Almost without exception, since the enactment of IDEA, the growth in the number of children with disabilities served has outpaced the growth in the general population ages 3 through 21. However, in every fiscal year since 2006, the count of children with disabilities reported by States has decreased slightly from the prior fiscal year. We do not know whether the counts reported represent a new trend in the number of children being served. In the absence of better information, we have projected the numbers of children with disabilities expected to be served for fiscal years 2009 and 2010 at 6.718 million children, the same level as reported by States for fiscal year 2008.

### Department of the Interior Set-Aside

As in previous years, we are proposing that the fiscal year 2010 budget include special appropriation language limiting the amount of funding required to be provided to the Department of the Interior. The special language would limit funding for the Department of the Interior to the lesser of the prior year funding level plus inflation or the percentage increase in funding for the Grants to States program. IDEA requires that 1.226 percent of the funds appropriated for Grants to States be provided to the Department of the Interior for serving Indian children with disabilities, regardless of the number of children served by the Department of the Interior. At the request level, the uncapped allocation to the Department of Interior would provide, for each child with a disability it serves, an average of approximately \$20,000, over 11 times the average amount per child that States would receive. At the request level, with the cap, the Department of Interior would receive about 8 times the average amount per child that States would receive, or about 133 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure (APPE). In other words, while State allocations are capped at 40 percent of APPE, at the level of the request the Department of Interior would receive 133 percent of APPE.

### Technical Assistance

The IDEA emphasizes improving results for children with disabilities through the collection and use of performance data. The law requires each State to develop a State Performance Plan that includes measurable and rigorous targets in a number of key monitoring areas. These areas are free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment; disproportionate representation of children in special education based on their race and ethnicity; and State exercise of general supervision authority in areas such as child find, monitoring, mediation, and transition

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

services. Each State is responsible for providing supervision to programs providing special education to children with disabilities within its jurisdiction to ensure that the requirements in IDEA are met. State performance data are collected through Annual Performance Reports from States.

The amendments also provide authority for the Secretary of Education to use a portion of Grants to States funds to provide technical assistance to States to improve their capacity to meet these expanded data collection requirements. The request includes \$15 million for such technical assistance.

### PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<b><u>Program funding (\$000):</u></b>			
Formula grants to States	\$10,803,246	\$11,357,631	\$11,357,631
Formula grants to Outlying Areas	33,919	33,919	33,919
Grants to Freely Associated States	6,579	6,579	6,579
Department of the Interior	88,767	92,012	92,012
Technical assistance	14,930	15,000	15,000
Peer review of new Technical Assistance award applications	70	70	70
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,947,511</b>	<b>11,505,211</b>	<b>11,505,211</b>
Recovery Act appropriation	0	11,300,000	0
 <b>Number of children with disabilities served ages 3 through 21</b>	 6,718,000 <sup>1</sup>	 6,718,000 <sup>1</sup>	 6,718,000 <sup>1</sup>
 <b>Average Federal share per child (\$)</b>	 \$1,609 <sup>1</sup>	 \$3,395 <sup>1,2</sup>	 \$1,713 <sup>1</sup>
 <b>Average per pupil expenditure (APPE) (\$)</b>	 \$9,796 <sup>1</sup>	 \$10,154 <sup>1</sup>	 \$10,309 <sup>1</sup>
 <b>Federal funding as a percentage of APPE</b>	 17% <sup>1</sup>	 35% <sup>1,2</sup>	 17% <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Estimate.

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

#### Basis for leaving special education for youth with disabilities ages 14 and older <sup>1, 2</sup>

	School Year <u>2004-2005</u>		School Year <u>2005-2006</u>		School Year <u>2006-2007</u>	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
<b>Basis:</b>						
Graduating with regular diploma	32.13%	214,986	32.9%	224,553	32.8%	221,460
Graduating through certification	9.0%	60,123	9%	61,676	9.6%	65,133
Transferred to regular education <sup>2</sup>	10.1%	67,707	10.5%	71,473	9.9%	66,926
Dropped out, or moved but not known to have continued in education	16.6%	111,343	15.3%	104,414	14.9%	100,913
Moved, but known to have continued in education <sup>2</sup>	31.1%	207,797	31.0%	211,162	31.6%	213,688
Reaching maximum age for Services and other reasons	<u>1.1%</u>	<u>7,127</u>	<u>1.2%</u>	<u>8,389</u>	<u>1.5%</u>	<u>7,955</u>
<b>Total</b>	100.0%	669,083	100.0%	681,667	100.0%	676,075

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

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

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>History of Children Served and Program Funding</u>			
	Children Served (000s)	Appropriation (\$000)	Federal Share Per Child <sup>1</sup>	Federal Share as a Percentage of APPE
1977	3,485	\$251,770	\$72	5%
1978	3,561	566,030	159	10%
1979	3,700	804,000	217	13%
1980	3,803	874,500	230	12%
1981	3,941	874,500	222	10%
1982	3,990	931,008	233	10%
1983	4,053	1,017,900	251	10%
1984	4,096	1,068,875	261	9%
1985	4,124	1,135,145	275	9%
1986	4,121	1,163,282	282	8%
1987	4,167	1,338,000	321	9%
1988	4,236	1,431,737	338	9%
1989	4,347	1,475,449	339	8%
1990	4,419	1,542,610	349	8%
1991	4,567	1,854,186	406	9%
1992	4,727	1,976,095	418	8%
1993	4,896	2,052,728	419	8%
1994	5,101	2,149,686	421	8%
1995	5,467	2,322,915	425	8%
1996	5,629	2,323,837	413	7%
1997	5,806	3,107,522	535	9%
1998	5,978	3,807,700 <sup>2</sup>	636	11%
1999	6,133	4,310,700 <sup>2</sup>	701	11%
2000	6,274	4,989,685 <sup>2</sup>	793	12%
2001	6,381	6,339,685 <sup>2</sup>	991	14%
2002	6,483	7,528,533 <sup>2</sup>	1,159	15%
2003	6,611	8,874,398 <sup>2</sup>	1,340	17%
2004	6,723	10,068,106 <sup>2</sup>	1,495	18%
2005	6,820	10,589,746 <sup>4</sup>	1,558	18%
2006	6,814	10,582,961 <sup>4</sup>	1,551	18%
2007	6,796	10,782,961 <sup>4</sup>	1,584	17% <sup>3</sup>
2008	6,718 <sup>3</sup>	10,947,511 <sup>4</sup>	1,609 <sup>3</sup>	17% <sup>3</sup>
2009	6,718 <sup>3</sup>	22,805,211 <sup>4, 5</sup>	3,395 <sup>3, 5</sup>	35% <sup>3, 5</sup>
2010	6,718 <sup>3</sup>	11,505,211 <sup>4</sup>	1,713 <sup>3</sup>	17% <sup>3</sup>

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

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$6.7 million in 1998 for studies and evaluations on a comparable basis. Includes \$9.7 million for studies and evaluations in 1999, \$13 million in 2000, and \$16 million in 2001 through 2004.

<sup>3</sup> Estimate.

<sup>4</sup> Includes \$10 million for technical assistance activities in 2005, \$15 million in 2006 through 2010.

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

##### National Assessment of Educational Progress Measures

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of fourth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading.		
Year	Targets	Actual
<b>2002</b>	24	29
<b>2003</b>	25	29
<b>2005</b>	35	33
<b>2007</b> <sup>1/</sup>	35	36
<b>2009</b>	37	
<b>2010</b>	39	

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of eighth-grade students with disabilities scoring at or above Basic on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in mathematics.		
Year	Targets	Actual
<b>2003</b>	23	29
<b>2005</b>	32	31
<b>2007</b> <sup>1/</sup>	33	33
<b>2009</b>	35	
<b>2010</b>	37	

<sup>1/</sup> No comparable NAEP assessments are scheduled for reading or mathematics in 2008.

**Assessment of progress:** National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data for reading and mathematics are encouraging. The performance of children with disabilities has generally improved over baseline years. However, the data also show that the majority of

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

students with disabilities do not meet or exceed even the Basic levels of achievement at any of the grade levels tested. For the 2007 fourth-grade reading assessment, only 36 percent of children with disabilities scored at or above Basic, while 69 percent of other children scored at or above Basic. For the 2007 math assessment, only 33 percent of eighth-graders with disabilities scored at or above Basic, while 74 percent of other children scored at or above Basic.

The National Center for Education Statistics collects data on the percentage of children with disabilities who are excluded from the NAEP assessments because of their disabilities. Exclusion rates are important to keep in mind when considering the performance of children with disabilities because increases in performance accompanied by reductions in children with disabilities tested might simply reflect the exclusion of more lower functioning children. Between 1998 and 2007, the exclusion rate for children with disabilities on fourth-grade reading assessments dropped from 41 percent to 36 percent. Between 2000 and 2007, the exclusion rate on eighth-grade mathematics assessments dropped from 30 percent to 25 percent. It should be noted that these percentages only include children with disabilities who have been included in the NAEP testing sample. Children in schools specifically for children with disabilities are not included in the NAEP sample.

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

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

### Elementary and Secondary Education Measures

The Department has adopted 4 measures for the Special Education Grants to States program to parallel those used for the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program. Data on the measures are being collected annually through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and made available through *EDFacts*. Targets are based on a straight-line trajectory toward the ESEA goal to have all children performing at proficient or advanced levels by 2014. States were not required to test students in all grades 3 through 8 in 2005. However, they were required to test children in all grades 3 through 8 in 2006. The targets for 2007 were based on the incomplete 2005 tests. Targets for 2008 through 2010 have been revised based on the more comprehensive 2006 data. Most of the performance data for 2008 should be available in September 2009.

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

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

Year	Targets	Actual
2005		38.0
2006		38.7
2007	51.8	41.5
2008	54.0	
2009	61.7	
2010	69.4	

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

Year	Targets	Actual
2005		27.8
2006		29.6
2007	21.6	28.7
2008	22.2	
2009	18.5	
2010	14.8	

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

Year	Targets	Actual
2005		38.5
2006		37.8
2007	52.2	41.9
2008	53.3	
2009	61.1	
2010	68.9	

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

<b>Measure:</b> The difference between the percentage of students with disabilities in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State mathematics assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State mathematics assessments.		
Year	Targets	Actual
<b>2005</b>		24.9
<b>2006</b>		27.2
<b>2007</b>	19.4	26.1
<b>2008</b>	20.5	
<b>2009</b>	17.0	
<b>2010</b>	13.6	

**Assessment of progress:** Between 2006 and 2007 States improved their performance on all four of these measures, and are making progress in ensuring that student with disabilities who participate in State reading and math assessments are reasonably well-equipped to perform on these assessments. However, while States are making progress, it should be noted that fewer than half of students with disabilities continue to score at the proficient or advanced levels in reading and math on State assessments (41.5 percent and 41.9 percent, respectively). There are also still significant gaps between the percent of children with disabilities scoring at proficient or advanced levels on State assessments in reading and math and the percent of all students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels (28.7 percent and 26.1 percent, respectively).

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

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma.		
Year	Targets	Actual
<b>2004</b>		54.2
<b>2005</b>	54.0	54.4
<b>2006</b>	56.0	56.5
<b>2007</b>	57.0	56.1
<b>2008</b>	58.0	
<b>2009</b>	59.0	
<b>2010</b>	60.0	

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of students with disabilities who drop out of school.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2004</b>		30.9
<b>2005</b>	34.0	28.3
<b>2006</b>	29.0	26.2
<b>2007</b>	28.0	25.5
<b>2008</b>	27.0	
<b>2009</b>	26.0	
<b>2010</b>	25.0	

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

### Postsecondary Outcomes

One of the purposes of IDEA is to help prepare children with disabilities for further education, employment, and independent living. The Department recently developed an indicator on employment and postsecondary education. Data for this indicator will be collected on an annual basis, directly from the States. We believe that this is a critical indicator for the program, since it is a reflection of the ultimate results of our efforts to provide special education under the Grants to States program. The Department expects to have baseline data by summer, 2011.

### Efficiency Measure

The Department has developed one efficiency measure for the program. That measure is the average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and the Department’s response. For fiscal years 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007 the average times between the completion of the visit and the letter of findings were 123 days, 107 days, 50 days, and 92.2 days, respectively. The targets for 2009 and 2010 are 90 days and 88 days, respectively. We believe the very low average time in 2006 was atypical and not likely to recur. Therefore, we do not believe that it is appropriate to revise our targets based on performance in that year.

### Other Performance Information

**IDEA National Assessment.** Section 664 of IDEA requires the Department to conduct a national assessment of activities carried out with Federal funds under IDEA. To implement this

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

requirement, funds requested for the Special Education Studies and Evaluation program in the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) account are being used to conduct an independent evaluation of the program. As required by IDEA, the National Assessment of IDEA addresses the extent to which States, districts, and schools are implementing the programs and services authorized under IDEA 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 programs and services funded through IDEA in promoting the developmental progress, and academic achievement of children with disabilities. The National Assessment includes the following activities:

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

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

**Impact Evaluation of Response to Intervention Strategies.** Response to Intervention (RTI) is a multi-step approach to providing early and more intensive intervention and monitoring within the general education setting. In principle, RTI begins with research-based instruction and behavioral support provided to students in the general education classroom, followed by screening of all students to identify those who may need systematic progress monitoring,

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

intervention, or support. Students who are not responding to the general education curriculum and instruction are provided with increasingly intense interventions through a "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. IDEA permits some Part B special education funds to be used for "early intervening services" such as RTI and also permits districts to use RTI to inform decisions regarding a child's eligibility for special education.

This evaluation will rely on the random assignment of schools to receive training in different tier 2 RTI strategies for monitoring student progress and providing research-based instruction in first and second grade reading. Approximately 150 elementary schools will be recruited and randomly assigned to training during the 2009-2010 school year. Data will be collected on RTI implementation and on student outcomes including reading achievement, grade promotion, and identification for special education. A final report is scheduled to be completed by the spring of 2013.

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

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

### Program Improvement Efforts

The Department is undertaking the following improvement efforts for this program:

- *Conducting an independent evaluation of the program of sufficient scope to determine if and how the program contributes to the effectiveness of special education programs and their impact on students.* Section 664 of IDEA requires the Department to conduct a national assessment of activities carried out with Federal funds under IDEA. To implement this requirement, funds requested for the Special Education Studies and Evaluation program in the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) account are being used to conduct an independent evaluation of the program.
- *Identifying strategies in key topic areas that have the potential for improving results for children with disabilities.* The Department has identified six key topic areas for its long-term measures and is now working on strategies that focus on these areas to improve results for children with disabilities.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants to States

---

- *Improving collaboration with other Federal programs.* The Department is making a continuing effort to improve collaboration between the Grants to States program and other programs. For example, the Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination program provides partial support for three Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) technical assistance centers focusing on instruction, teacher quality, and high schools. These centers are part of an OESE system of 21 regional and content technical assistance centers, which received initial funding in 2005.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### State grants: Preschool grants

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$374,099	\$374,099	0
Recovery Act appropriation	400,000	0	-\$400,000

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

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

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

The number of children served under this program decreased from 714,384 in fiscal year 2007 to 710,371 in fiscal year 2008. We believe this was primarily due to a change in reporting procedures in one State. From fiscal year 1992 to 2008, the number of children served under the Preschool Grants program grew from 398,355 to 710,371, a 78.3 percent increase. Over the same period, the growth in the number of 3-through-5-year-old children in the general population for the 50 States and the District of Columbia was only 9.6 percent. The increase in general population between fiscal year 2007 and 2008 was only 0.5 percent. The Department predicts that the number of children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 will increase in fiscal years 2009 and 2010, but only by 2 percent each year. The Department expects to receive the data on the number of children served for fiscal year 2009 in October 2009.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) provided an additional \$400 million for supplemental fiscal year 2009 formula grant awards under the Preschool Grants program. The Administration awarded half of the Preschool Grants Recovery Act funds in April

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

2009. The remaining \$200 million will be awarded once States have submitted additional information addressing how they will meet the recordkeeping and reporting requirements of the Recovery Act. (<http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/recovery/factsheet/idea.html>)

While local educational agencies may use Recovery Act funds for any purpose consistent with IDEA statutory and regulatory requirements, the Administration is encouraging LEAs to focus on short-term investments with the potential for long-term benefits.

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

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

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

The Department will update its Recovery Act guidance throughout the year to provide additional information on spending funds wisely.

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2005 .....	\$384,597
2006 .....	380,751
2007 .....	380,751
2008 .....	374,099
2009.....	374,099
Recovery Act .....	400,000

### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$374.1 million for the Preschool Grants program. The request would maintain funding for this program at the fiscal year 2009 level. In addition to the regular appropriation of \$374.1 million in fiscal year 2009, the ARRA included an additional \$400 million for this program. The Administration believes the request will provide an appropriate level of resources to support activities for young children with disabilities, taking into consideration the funds available under the Recovery Act. The Recovery Act provided an unprecedented increase to local education agencies, much of which is likely to be available for use during the same period of availability as the fiscal year 2010 funds requested for this program. The Recovery Act funds are available for obligation through September 30, 2011. This means that the effective request for 2010 is millions of dollars above the 2009 funding level.

In addition to IDEA funds, the Administration has requested funds for two new early childhood programs in fiscal year 2010, the Title I Early Childhood Grants and Early Learning Challenge Fund programs. Title I Early Childhood Grants would provide financial incentives for LEAs participating in the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program to invest Title I funds received under the ARRA in early childhood education. LEAs would use these funds to create new pre-K education programs, expand existing programs, or improve the quality of existing programs. The Early Learning Challenge Fund initiative would provide grants to SEAs for the development of State plans and infrastructure to raise the quality of publicly funded early learning programs through the use of Quality Rating Systems (QRS). These actions would include efforts to incorporate inclusive practices so as to facilitate participation by children with disabilities. Both of these programs would increase opportunities for young children with disabilities.

The Administration also is requesting \$11.5 billion for the Grants to States program for fiscal year 2010. Funding under Preschool Grants supplements funds provided to States under the Grants to States program, which serves children with disabilities aged 3 through 21, including all children served under the Preschool Grants program. Young children with disabilities also benefit from other early childhood programs funded by the Federal Government, such as Head Start.

The President believes early childhood education is critical to the future success of vulnerable children, including children with disabilities, and that improved coordination among Federal early childhood programs would lead to improved services. Funding under the Preschool Grants program supports early childhood programs that provide services needed to prepare young

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

children with disabilities to enter school ready to learn. This program also supports the inclusion of young children with disabilities in State early childhood programs and federally funded programs, such as Head Start and child care programs under the Department of Health and Human Services' Child Care and Development Block Grants (CCDBG) for young children. States frequently use the Preschool Grants program State-level set-aside funds to support initiatives to provide for comprehensive services to young children to ensure that children with disabilities are included in State early childhood programs and programs operated or supported by other Federal programs.

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>2010</u> <sup>1</sup>
Children served <sup>2</sup>	710,371	724,578	739,070
Share per child (whole \$)	\$527	\$1,068 <sup>3</sup>	\$506

---

<sup>1</sup> Estimates.

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

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

<b>History of Children Served and Program Funding</b>			
<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Children Served</u> (000s)	<u>Appropriation</u> (\$000s)	<u>Federal</u> <u>Share Per Child</u>
1977	197	\$12,500	\$64
1978	201	15,000	81
1979	215	17,500	81
1980	232	25,000	108
1981	237	25,000	105
1982	228	24,000	105
1983	242	25,000	103
1984	243	26,330	108
1985	260	29,000	112
1986	261	28,710	110
1987	266	180,000	677 <sup>1</sup>
1988	288	201,054	698
1989	322	247,000	767
1990	352	251,510	715
1991	367	292,766	798
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	725 <sup>2</sup>	774,099 <sup>2, 3</sup>	1,068 <sup>2, 3</sup>
2010	739 <sup>2</sup>	374,099 <sup>2</sup>	506 <sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1986 changed the Preschool Grants program from a grant program that provided an incentive for States to serve children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 to a program that, beginning in fiscal year 1991, required that services be made available to all such children as a condition for receiving funding for children in this age range under the Grants to States program. Funding was increased to support the change in statutory authority.

<sup>2</sup> Estimates.

<sup>3</sup> These figures include funds provided under the ARRA in fiscal year 2009.

## 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 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

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

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

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

It should be noted that there are a number of concerns with this data. There was a great deal of variation in the size of the samples in State entry level data collections; States varied in the definitions they used of “near entry” and “near exit” and criteria used to define “same age

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

peers”; and the results varied by large margins depending on the measurement method used. The data also are limited because they only include children who were in the program at least 6 months, but less than a year. The Department awarded a new grant for the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) in fiscal year 2008 to work with the States to resolve these issues and improve the reliability of the data they submit. In February 2010, States will submit a fourth year of entry data and third year of exiting data that will include children covering a full cohort of children aged 3 through 5. The Department expects to set performance targets based on this data.

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of children with disabilities (aged 3 through 5) who receive special education and related services in a regular early childhood program at least 80 percent of the time.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		41.7
2008	43	44.4
2009	43	
2010	43	

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

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

In July 2007, the Department published a Federal Register notice requesting comment on a proposal to add another reporting category that would cut the data a little finer to show children in programs in which 70 percent or more of the children are not disabled. SEAs and other interested parties submitted extensive comments regarding the proposal and the general validity and reliability of this measure. States reported that they had a great deal of difficulty implementing the new system because they must collect information on where children with disabilities spend their day, not just where they receive special education and related services. The Department has reviewed these comments and is considering further changes to the measure.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

The Department, to assist States in collecting the preschool educational environments data, is using technical assistance providers such as the ECO Center to assist States and is providing additional technical assistance through mechanisms such as presentations at the annual State data managers' conference and other meetings and the provision of "Frequently Asked Questions" documents and a data dictionary.

(<http://www.ideadata.org/docs/bdatadictionary.pdf>)

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

**Assessment of progress:** The Department did not meet its overall target for fiscal year 2007 and four fewer States met their target. However, the total of 34 States is consistent with levels for the several years preceding fiscal year 2006. We anticipate that the fiscal year 2008 data will become available in October 2009.

To assist States in preparing a sufficient number of qualified preschool special education personnel, OSEP funded the National Professional Development Center on Inclusion (NPDCI) in fiscal year 2006. The purpose of the NPDCI is to assist States to create a system of high quality, accessible professional development programs for early childhood personnel and integrated, cross-agency systems of professional development to support inclusion of children with disabilities with their non-disabled peers. In addition, beginning in fiscal year 2007, OSEP funded a National Early Childhood Training Enhancement Center. The focus of this Center is on assisting preservice higher education faculty and professional development programs that train early interventionists, early childhood educators, related services providers, and childcare personnel to improve and expand their programs. The two Centers will help address State-identified needs for highly qualified personnel and help ensure that those personnel have the skills and knowledge needed to serve children with disabilities ages birth through 5.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

#### Efficiency Measure

<b>Measure:</b> The average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) response to the State.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2004</b>		123
<b>2005</b>		107
<b>2006</b>	113	50
<b>2007</b>	100	92.2
<b>2008</b>	95	
<b>2009</b>	90	
<b>2010</b>	88	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department has developed one efficiency measure for this program. That measure is the average number of workdays between the completion of site visits in a particular fiscal year and the Department's responses to the States. Targets were set for fiscal years 2006, 2007, and 2008 based on the actual performance for fiscal years 2004 and 2005. The very low average time in fiscal year 2006, while extremely positive, appears to be an aberration.

#### Other Performance Information

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

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

In January, 2009, the latest report from this study was released, "Early School Transitions and Social Behavior of Children with Disabilities: Selected Findings from the Pre-Elementary Education Longitudinal Study." Transitions are a time when changes in eligibility for services can occur. For example, the study found that 20 percent of children who transitioned from preschool to kindergarten were declassified (i.e., children who were receiving special education services in preschool but were determined not to have an eligible disability or to require special education services when they were reevaluated) between 2003-04 and 2004-05, and 21 percent were declassified between 2004-05 and 2005-06. In contrast, of children who did not undergo a transition, only 5 percent of children were declassified between 2003-04 and 2004-05 and between 2004-05 and 2005-06, 9 percent were declassified.

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

For all three years of data collection, parents were asked a number of questions about their children's social skills and behavior. Parent reports regarding their children's social skills and behaviors changed significantly during the time their children were receiving preschool services, generally in the direction of improved social skills and fewer behavior problems. The percentage of parents who reported that their children were not at all aggressive increased significantly, from 43 percent in 2003-04 to 52 percent in 2005-06, and the percentage of parents who reported that their children's behavior was age appropriate increased from 58 percent in 2003-04 to 61 percent in 2005-06. The study also found that transfers out of special education were closely associated with children's social skills and the extent that they no longer exhibited problem behaviors.

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

The Office of Special Education Programs, and subsequently the National Center on Special Education Research, have sponsored a special education questionnaire for teachers in the

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

ECLS-K Study and the collection of more extensive data on children with disabilities and their programs, including the identification of, receipt of services for, and use of special equipment for a number of disabling conditions that may interfere with a sampled child's ability to learn. The children in the ECLS-K cohort were 5 years of age in school year 2006-07, when the first kindergarten data collection was performed. During this collection, the majority of the children in the cohort were age-eligible for kindergarten, although all sample children will be evaluated regardless of kindergarten enrollment status. Since about a quarter of the cohort were not age-eligible for kindergarten until fall 2007, a second kindergarten data collection was fielded in 2007 to measure the kindergarten experiences of these children. The ECLS-K is scheduled to follow children through the cohort's eighth grade year in school year 2008-09.

### Program Improvement Efforts

Research indicates that services at the preschool level are effective in preparing children with disabilities to enter school ready to learn. However, there is no information to indicate that the Preschool Grants program is effective in providing these services or in producing positive outcomes for these children. The Department has implemented a multifaceted approach to help address this lack of information. This includes activities to promote the development of State systems for collecting outcomes data for young children receiving services under the IDEA that will allow the Department to obtain meaningful performance data on IDEA programs. Following is a summary of activities to date and results expected in the future.

- *Collect national point of entry data for children entering programs funded by the Preschool Grants program.* In February 2009, the Department collected a third round of data on the percentage of children who entered on level with same-aged peers and the percentage of children who entered at a level below same-aged peers for each of the three outcome areas: (1) social-emotional skills (including social relationships); (2) acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); (3) and use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. The Department will collect a fourth round of data in February 2010.
- *Collect national progress data on children exiting programs funded by the Preschool Grants program.* The Department established five categories for reporting child progress in the three outcome areas: (1) the percentage of children who do not improve functioning; (2) the percentage of children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers; (3) the percentage of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers, but did not reach it; (4) the percentage of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers; and (5) the percentage of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers. The Department has collected two rounds of data on child progress for children exiting programs funded by the Preschool Grants program and will report a third year in February 2010.
- *Disseminate outcome data and provide targeted technical assistance to States on issues related to data quality.* In September 2004, the Department made 18 General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) awards that had a focus or partial focus on early childhood outcomes. The Department ran a competition in fiscal year 2006 and made 9 new awards focusing on early childhood. A new set of 8 grants was awarded in fiscal year 2008 that

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Preschool grants

---

included a focus area on early childhood outcomes. The average duration of a GSEG grant is approximately 18 months. The Department also plans to sponsor a series of early childhood outcomes technical assistance meetings to provide opportunities for States to discuss issues and potential solutions in fiscal year 2009.

The Department awarded a grant to establish the National Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) in September 2003 and a second grant for this purpose in September 2008. The ECO center will provide technical assistance regarding methodology and measurement options, and will develop a series of resource documents for use by States. ECO developed a tool for States to use in aggregating outcome data on children aged birth through 5 called the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF). The Annual Performance Reports (APRs) that States submitted in February 2008 indicated that 34 States were using the COSF, 13 were using one statewide tool, 3 were using multiple publisher's online systems, and 9 were using other approaches. The Department will continue to compile information about the assessment data States are collecting, problems States are encountering, and the most viable measurement options for States to pursue. ECO also will work intensively with a number of the States that received GSEG awards, additional States that want help to develop their systems, and a group of States interested in staff training regarding how to conduct reliable and valid assessments, and will provide a wide range of technical assistance to the other States. ECO posts key information regarding assessment data and measurement options as it becomes available on the following website: (<http://www.the-eco-center.org>).

- *Collect final baseline data and establish targets for the child outcome measure.* In February 2010, States will report a fourth year of entry data and third year of data on child progress. These data will include children who entered in reporting periods July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006; July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007; July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008; and July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009 and who exited in the 2008-2009 reporting period. This will be the first report of exiting data that includes children aged birth through 2. These data will be used as the baseline for establishing targets for the performance measure on child progress.

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

---

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$439,427	\$439,427	0
Recovery Act appropriation	500,000	0	-\$500,000

---

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

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

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) also requires the Secretary to set aside funds for a State Incentive Grants program in years in which the appropriation exceeds \$460 million. 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.

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

Funds allocated under this program can be used to: (1) maintain and implement the statewide system described above; (2) fund direct early intervention services for infants and toddlers with

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

disabilities and their families that are not otherwise provided by other public or private sources; (3) expand and improve services that are otherwise available; (4) provide a free appropriate public education, in accordance with Part B of the IDEA, to children with disabilities from their third birthday to the beginning of the following school year; (5) with the written consent of the parents, continue to provide early intervention services to children with disabilities aged three and older, and (5) initiate, expand, or improve collaborative efforts related to identifying, evaluating, referring, and following up on at-risk infants and toddlers in States that do not provide direct services for these children.

If a State pursues the option to extend eligibility for Part C services to older children, only children with disabilities who are eligible for services under the IDEA, section 619, Preschool Grants program, and who previously received services under Part C, are eligible to receive these services and only until they are eligible to enter kindergarten or elementary school, as appropriate. The Act further stipulates that any Part C programs serving children aged 3 or older must provide an educational component that promotes school readiness and incorporates preliteracy, language, and numeracy skills and written notification to parents of their rights regarding the continuation of services under Part C and eligibility for services under section 619. As of fiscal year 2008, no State had chosen to pursue this option.

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

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

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) provided an additional \$500 million for supplemental FY 2009 formula grant awards under the Grants for Infants and Families program. The Administration awarded approximately \$214 million of the Grants for Infants and Families Recovery Act funds in April 2009. An additional \$214 million will be awarded once States have submitted additional information addressing how they will meet the recordkeeping and reporting requirements of the Recovery Act.  
(<http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/recovery/factsheet/idea-c.html>)

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

The increase provided through the ARRA triggered the IDEA provisions relating to reservation of funds for the Part C State Incentive Grants program. The Department has reserved approximately \$72 million of the IDEA, Part C recovery ARRA for State Incentive Grants to provide funds to State lead agencies that elect to carry out the Flexibility to Serve Children Three Years of Age until Entrance into Elementary School provisions of the IDEA. A State that wishes to receive a State Incentive Grant must submit with its FY 2009 application the policies and other information showing it has met the requirements related to the State Incentive Grants provisions of the IDEA. All ARRA funds reserved by the Department, but not allocated to States eligible for Incentive Grants, will be reallocated proportionately to all States on July 1, 2009.

IDEA Part C ARRA funds must be used consistently with the current IDEA, Part C statutory and regulatory requirements, including the payor of last resort requirements. Part C ARRA funds may be used for any allowable purpose under Part C of the IDEA, including the direct provision of early intervention services to infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families, and implementing a statewide, comprehensive, coordinated, multidisciplinary, interagency system to provide early intervention services. However, the Administration is encouraging State lead agencies to focus on short-term investments with the potential for long-term benefits. The Administration's overall guidance for use of Recovery Act funds includes four key principles: (1) spend funds quickly to save and create jobs; (2) improve student achievement through school improvement and reform; (3) ensure transparency, reporting, and accountability; and (4) invest one-time Recovery Act funds wisely using evidence-based practices, and thoughtfully so as to minimize any problems that may occur when they are no longer available.

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

- Providing in-service training on evidence-based practices to early intervention program staff and early intervention service providers to ensure that all infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families receive high quality services in a timely manner.
- Work with community-based programs to expand options for providing services for infants and toddlers with disabilities in natural environments.
- Expand child-find activities to ensure that all States meet their performance targets related to serving infants under age one and infants and toddlers birth through age two.
- Develop intensive programs and initiatives to train and support families, including families whose primary language is not English, in working with their infants and toddlers with disabilities and effectively communicating their children's needs.
- Support development or expansion of high quality State and local data systems to collect valid and reliable data for use in improving the timely delivery of early intervention services, the transition of children receiving services under Part C to the Part B preschool program, the tracking of early childhood outcome data as children exit the program and enter preschool and school, and in meeting data reporting requirements on the State's and early intervention services programs' performance on early childhood priority areas.
- Obtain state-of-the art assistive technology devices and provide training to qualified personnel on the use of such devices to support the functional development of infants and toddlers with disabilities.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

- Implement innovative program strategies for improving the statewide services program, such as web-based systems for developing Individualized Family Service Plans and transition plans for toddlers with disabilities as they exit the Part C program.
- Purchase equipment for use by qualified personnel such as occupational and speech therapists to increase their ability to provide effective services.
- Develop and implement a joint State policy to provide early intervention services with other early childhood and related programs in the State.

The Department will update its Recovery Act guidance throughout the year to provide additional information on spending funds wisely.

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

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

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$440,808
2006.....	436,400
2007.....	436,400
2008 .....	435,654
2009.....	439,427
Recovery Act .....	500,000

### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$439.4 million for the Grants for Infants and Families program for fiscal year 2010, the same as the fiscal year 2009 level. In addition to the regular appropriation of \$439.4 million in fiscal year 2009, the ARRA included an additional \$500 million for this program. The Administration believes that the request level is appropriate, taking into consideration the funds available under the Recovery Act. The Recovery Act provided an unprecedented increase to State lead agencies, much of which is likely to be available for use during the same period of availability as the fiscal year 2010 funds requested for this program. The Recovery Act funds are available for obligation through September 30, 2011. This means that the effective request for 2010 is millions of dollars above the 2009 funding level.

In addition to IDEA funds, the Administration has requested funds for two new early childhood programs in fiscal year 2010, the Title I Early Childhood Grants and Early Learning Challenge Fund programs. Title I Early Childhood Grants would provide financial incentives for LEAs participating in the Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program to invest Title I funds received under the ARRA in early childhood education. LEAs would use these funds to create new pre-K education programs, expand existing programs, or improve the quality of existing programs. The Early Learning Challenge Fund initiative would provide grants to SEAs for the development of State plans and infrastructure to raise the quality of publicly funded early learning programs through the use of Quality Rating Systems

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

(QRS). These actions would include efforts to incorporate inclusive practices so as to facilitate participation by children with disabilities. Both of these programs would increase opportunities for young children with disabilities.

Research indicates that providing early intervention services as early as possible to infants and toddlers with developmental delays and disabilities develops the foundational skills needed for them to realize their full potential. The Department completed the National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study in January 2007 ([www.sri.com/neils](http://www.sri.com/neils)). This study described the experiences of infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families with regard to early intervention services and early elementary school. The findings from this study suggest that early intervention can prevent some developmental problems from occurring, provide remediation so that children are functioning at grade level, and provide compensatory skills and lessen the impact of disability on development. The Grants for Infants and Families program is the primary mechanism by which the Federal Government ensures that infants and toddlers with disabilities receive appropriate early intervention services. In fiscal year 2008, this program helped States to serve 321,894 children, a 5.7 percent increase over the number served in fiscal year 2007 and a 130.7 percent increase over the 15-year period since States were first required to provide services to all eligible infants and toddlers with disabilities.

Funds requested for the Part C program would be used to support the efforts of States to provide services designed to lessen the needs of infants and toddlers with disabilities for future or more extensive services and to ensure that very young children with disabilities receive the supports and services they need to prepare them to participate in a meaningful manner when they are ready to enter formal education. The Administration believes that early childhood services are critical to improving the educational outcomes of children with disabilities.

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u> <sup>1, 2</sup>	<u>2010</u> <sup>1</sup>
Range in size of awards to States:			
Smallest State award <sup>3, 4</sup>	\$2,135	\$4,293	\$2,153
Average State award <sup>3</sup>	8,121	16,511	8,188
Largest State award <sup>3</sup>	53,121	106,793	53,560
Children served	321,894	338,000	354,900

<sup>1</sup> Estimates.

<sup>2</sup> The fiscal year 2009 estimates include funds provided under the ARRA. However, these amounts exclude funds reserved for the State Incentive Grants program.

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

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

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

**Assessment of progress:** Baseline data and targets are not yet available for this measure. However, the Department has been implementing a plan to collect data from all States through their Annual Performance Reports (APRs) that can be used to assess child outcomes. As part of this plan, all States reported data on entering students in the Annual Performance Reports (APRs) submitted in February 2007, 2008, and 2009. The data covered the July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006, July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007, and July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 reporting periods, respectively, and included the status of children at entry into the program.

In FY 2009, the States reported their third year of entry data. This data indicated that approximately 55 percent of the children entered Part C below age expectations in the area of social-emotional development, 71 percent were below expectations in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and 64 percent were below expectations in use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. In FY 2009, the States reported their second year of exiting data, which indicated that approximately 24 percent of the children exiting the program made progress sufficient to reach a level comparable to their same age peers in the area of social-emotional development, 28.2 percent in the area of use of knowledge and skills, and 32.2 percent in the area of use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. It should be noted that there are a number of concerns with this initial data. We do not yet have a full cohort of children aged birth through 2 who have entered and exited the system, so the entry and exiting data are not directly comparable. In addition, there was a great deal of variation in the size of the samples in State data collections and measurement approaches used to collect data; States varied in the definitions they used of “near entry” and “near exit” and criteria used to define “same age peers;” and the results varied by large margins depending on the measurement method used. The Department will continue to work with the States in fiscal years 2009 and 2010 to resolve these issues and improve the reliability of the data they submit.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

In February 2010, the Department will have a full cohort of entry and exiting data for children aged birth through 2. These data will provide the baseline for establishing targets for the performance measure on child progress. Under the section on “Program Improvement Efforts,” we discuss the steps the Department is taking to obtain data for this measure and our strategy for promoting the development of State data systems on child outcomes for infants and toddlers receiving services under Part C. This measure has been identified as a long-term performance measure for this program.

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

**Assessment of progress:** The first data for this measure were submitted by the States in their Annual Performance Reports in February 2008. These are the most recent data available for this measure. Of the 54 States that provided data, 25 used the family survey tool developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) to collect data for this measure, 18 used the Early Childhood Center (ECO) family survey, 10 used State developed surveys, and one added questions from the NCSEAM and ECO surveys to its State survey. The data indicate that 79 percent of the families participating in Part C programs reported that they know their rights, 78 percent believed that they could effectively communicate their children’s needs, and 85 percent reported that they had the skills necessary to help their children develop and learn.

There are a number of issues relating to the quality and consistency of the data collected. States are working on strategies to improve survey response rates, develop local improvement plans to improve ratings, and provide training for providers and service coordinators on family rights and procedural safeguards. The Department plans to provide technical assistance to the States through the NSCEAM, ECO, National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center, and Regional Resource Centers. This measure has been identified as a long-term performance measure for this program.

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

<b>Measure:</b> The number of States that serve at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under age one through Part C.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	27	24
2006	27	25
2007	27	24
2008	27	25
2009	27	
2010	27	

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

**Assessment of progress:** For a number of years, only 24 or 25 States have served at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under the age of one, and the program has not met its target in any year. The 1 percent threshold for this measure is based on the prevalence rate data for 5 conditions: 0.4 percent - severe mental retardation; 0.2 percent - hearing impairment; 0.1 percent - visual impairment; 0.2 percent - physical conditions (spina bifida, cerebral palsy, etc.); and 0.1 percent - autism. Data on numbers of infants and toddlers with disabilities being served under the Grants for Infants and Families program are reported annually by State lead agencies responsible for the implementation of these programs. The Department provides assistance to the States on improving their child find programs through programs such as the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) and the Regional Resource Centers (RRCs). The U.S. Census Bureau provides the population data used for this measure. The Department expects to receive data for fiscal year 2009 (December 1, 2008 child count) in October 2009.

**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
2005	31	30
2006	31	30
2007	31	29
2008	31	31
2009	31	
2010	31	

**Assessment of progress:** Fiscal year 2008 is the first year that the target has been met for this measure. However, it is too soon to tell if this level of performance will be maintained. Data on numbers of infants and toddlers with disabilities being served under the Grants for Infants and Families program are reported annually by State lead agencies responsible for the implementation of these programs. The Department provides assistance to the States on improving their child find programs through programs such as the NECTAC and the RRCs. The 2 percent threshold for this measure is based on prevalence rate data related to the percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities in the general population. The U.S. Census Bureau provides the population data used for this measure. The Department expects to receive data for fiscal year 2009 in October 2009.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of children receiving age-appropriate early intervention services in the home or in programs designed for typically developing peers.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	83	88
2006	85	91
2007	86	91
2008	86	
2009	87	
2010	88	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department has met or exceeded its targets for this measure every year since fiscal year 2000, and its performance continues to improve. Data on settings in which children receive services are reported by State lead agencies on an annual basis. To assist States to continue to improve their performance in this area, the Department provides technical assistance and disseminates information on effective home visiting and other practices related to providing services in natural settings. The Department expects that fiscal year 2008 data will become available in October 2009.

### Efficiency Measures

<b>Measure:</b> The average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) response to the State.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		60
2007		59.5
2008	Set baseline	
2009	Maintain baseline	
2010	Maintain baseline	

**Assessment of progress:** The Department has developed one efficiency measure for this program. That measure is the average number of workdays between the completion of site visits in a particular fiscal year and the Department's response to the State. This is a new measure for the Part C program. Data from fiscal year 2007 indicate that the Office of Special Education programs conducted 10 site visits that year, with an average of 59.5 days from the site visit to the response to the State. Data for fiscal year 2008 is not yet available. However, we anticipate receiving it by no later than October 2009. The Department does not plan to set targets for this measure until we have at least one more year of actual performance data for this measure.

### Other Performance Information

The National Center for Education Statistics is sponsoring the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study - Birth Cohort (ECLS-B) (<http://nces.ed.gov/ecls/Birth.asp>). This is a nationally

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

representative, longitudinal study following an initial sample of 14,000 children born in 2001 through kindergarten entry. The data describe the early development, preparation for school, and key transitions experienced by these children during the early childhood years. The study assesses a broad range of developmental domains, including physical, cognitive, social, and emotional. In addition, each data collection solicits detailed information about the children's health and development.

The study has provided demographic information regarding infants and toddlers with disabilities. For example, the ECLS-B data collection over-sampled moderately low and very low birth-weight children because low birth weight is associated with developmental issues, including a variety of disabilities. This relationship was confirmed by the study. The percentage of children born in 2001 in families that reported receiving early intervention services, by birth weight, was 5.3 percent for children with moderately low birth weight and 23.4 percent for children with very low birth weight. Over 25 percent of children born in families reporting various child disabilities were of moderately or very low birth weight. In a variety of developmental domains, the study indicated that moderately or very low birth weight children showed delayed progress as compared to children, in general. Only 27.9 percent of very low birth weight children purposely explored objects at 9 months of age as compared to 35.1 percent of moderately low birth weight and 41.9 percent of all children. In addition, only 28.4 percent of very low birth weight children were sitting at 9 months as compared to 48.4 percent of moderately low birth weight children and 56.3 percent of children in general.

The Department anticipates that this study will provide additional information about children's health and development that is relevant to children with disabilities, such as:

- How are children's early health care and health status, including disabilities and injuries, related to their preparation for formal school?
- How do early childhood and family medical histories and health care practices differentially affect children's development and school readiness? What is the effect of health insurance coverage and access to health care on children's health and well-being?
- What groups of children have more developmental difficulties and how do family involvement in early intervention, early childhood education programs, and health promotion and prevention programs enhance the rates of growth and development of these vulnerable children?

### Program Improvement Efforts

Annual data show that this program has met its process goals, such as the number of children served, but there are no data on the key measure of program performance – the educational and developmental outcomes of infants and toddlers served through the program. The Department has implemented a multifaceted approach to addressing this issue. This includes implementing new data collection requirements in fiscal year 2005 to obtain information on outcomes associated with infants and toddlers with disabilities and activities to promote the development of State systems for collecting outcomes data for young children receiving services under the IDEA. We believe that these activities will allow the Department to obtain meaningful performance data

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

on the Part C program. Following is a summary of activities to date and results expected in the future.

- *Collect national point of entry data for children entering the Part C service system.* Three years of data are necessary to cover a full cohort of the children served through this program. In February 2007, the States submitted initial data on the percentage of children who entered on level with same-aged peers and the percentage of children who entered at a level below same-aged peers for each of the three outcome areas: (1) social-emotional skills (including social relationships); (2) acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); (3) and use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs). The Department received the second round of data in February 2008 and a third round of data in February 2009.
- *Collect national progress data on children exiting the Part C service system.* The Department established five categories for reporting child progress in the three outcome areas: (1) the percentage of children who do not improve functioning; (2) the percentage of children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparably to same-aged peers; (3) the percentage of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers, but did not reach it; (4) the percentage of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers; and (5) the percentage of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers. The Department received initial data on child progress for children exiting the Part C system in February 2008 and a second round of data in February 2009.
- *Disseminate outcome data and provide targeted technical assistance to States on issues related to data quality.* The Department has run a number of competitions under the General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) program that had a focus or partial focus on early childhood outcomes. In addition, the Department has conducted a series of conference calls related to measuring outcomes in which a variety of State presenters, including GSEG project coordinators, shared information and experiences related to measuring Grants for Infants and Families program outcomes and how to respond to the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report requirements. This was in addition to a number of sessions on the performance measures in the annual national leadership and early childhood conferences sponsored by the Department. The Department plans to continue to conduct these conference calls and presentations in fiscal years 2009 and 2010.

The Department is encouraging States using the same assessment tools to share resources and training approaches, and to incorporate use of the outcome data for State and local purposes beyond the Federal reporting requirements. A number of States have reported that they have been able to use the data collection on the local level as a tool for evaluation, setting functional goals, and determining training needs. The Department is sponsoring a series of early childhood outcomes technical assistance meetings in fiscal year 2009 to provide opportunities for States to discuss issues and potential solutions. The Department also has developed "Frequently Asked Questions" documents specifically related to early childhood outcomes. These documents will be updated, as necessary, in fiscal year 2009 and additional materials will be developed to respond to issues that have emerged as States develop and implement their outcomes systems.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### State grants: Grants for infants and families

---

The Department established the National Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) in September 2003 and awarded a second grant for this center in fiscal year 2008. The Center has evaluated State practices, recommended methodology and measurement options, and developed resource documents. ECO also developed a framework for analyzing current and future State-submitted outcome data on children aged birth through 5 called the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF). This form will assist the Department to aggregate data compiled by States using various tools and multiple data sources. The COSF provides a common “metric” to which data from different assessments can be converted. The Annual Performance Reports (APRs) that States submitted in February 2009 indicated that 39 States were using the COSF, 8 States stipulate a single statewide tool, 2 use on-line systems developed by publishers, and 5 use a variety of other tools and approaches. The Department will continue to compile information about what kind of assessment data States are collecting, problems States are encountering, and the most viable measurement options for States to pursue in fiscal year 2009. ECO also will continue to work intensively with States in fiscal year 2009 to help them develop their systems, help States to address staff training issues regarding how to conduct reliable and valid assessments, and provide a wide range of technical assistance. ECO posts key information as it becomes available on the following website: (<http://www.the-eco-center.org>).

- *Collect final baseline data and establish targets for the child outcome measure.* In February 2010, States will report a fourth year of entry data and third year of data on child progress. These data will include children who entered in reporting periods July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006; July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007; July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008; or July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009 and who exited in the 2008-2009 reporting period and had been in the program at least 6 months. This will be the first report of exiting data that includes children aged birth through 2. These data will be used as the baseline for establishing targets for the performance measure on child progress.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

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

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$48,000	\$48,000	0

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

Grants are made on a competitive basis for any fiscal year in which the amount appropriated is less than \$100 million. However, if the amount appropriated is \$100 million or greater, funds would be distributed as formula grants, with allotments based on the relative portion of the funds the State received under Part B. Competitive awards are made for periods of 1 to 5 years with minimum awards to States of not less than \$500,000 and not less than \$80,000 for Outlying Areas. The maximum award to States is \$4 million per fiscal year. The factors used to determine the ultimate amount of each competitive award are: the amount of funds available; the relative population of the State or Outlying Area; and the types of activities proposed, alignment of proposed activities with the State's personnel standards, alignment of proposed activities with the State's plan and application under sections 1111 and 2112 of the ESEA, and the use, as appropriate, of scientifically-based research.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$50,653
2006.....	50,146
2007.....	0 <sup>1</sup>
2008.....	22,598
2009.....	48,000

---

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

### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$48 million for the State personnel development grants program to assist State educational agencies to improve results for children through the delivery of high quality instruction and the recruitment and retention of highly qualified personnel. The request, which maintains funding at the 2009 level, would be used to support 38 continuation awards and 8 new awards. In addition, funds provided through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) for State grant programs under Parts B and C of IDEA, much of which is likely to be available for use during the same period of availability as the fiscal year 2010 funds requested for this program, may be used to support professional development activities for special education personnel.

Personnel shortages and inadequately trained teachers in special education are among the most pressing and chronic problems facing the field. SPD projects assist in addressing critical State and local needs for personnel preparation and professional development identified in the State's Personnel Development Plan. Projects provide personnel with the knowledge and skills to meet the needs of, and improve the performance and achievement of infants, toddlers, preschoolers, and children with disabilities, and to meet the State's performance goals established in accordance with section 612(a)(15) of IDEA. Support for special education personnel preparation activities is also provided through the Personnel Preparation program, under which the Secretary makes competitive awards, primarily to IHEs, to help States meet their responsibility to train and employ adequate numbers of fully certified personnel to serve children with disabilities. In addition, a variety of other programs administered by the Department make competitive awards that support training and professional development activities that are designed to enhance teacher classroom effectiveness, including special education personnel. These programs include the Teacher Incentive Fund, carried out under Title V, Part D of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Teacher Quality Partnership program, authorized under Title II of the Higher Education Act.

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

assistance under the SPD program must also develop a plan for coordinating professional development activities funded under the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Program (see this program in the School Improvement Programs account) and professional development activities funded through other Federal, State, and local programs.

Teacher quality is one of the most important factors in improving student achievement and eliminating achievement gaps between our neediest students and their more advantaged peers. Research shows that effective teaching is integral to improving the academic achievement of students who are at greatest risk of not meeting high academic standards. It is critical that children with disabilities from low-income and minority backgrounds have the same access to highly qualified special education teachers as do children with disabilities attending schools in low poverty districts.

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

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

- North Carolina has used its SPD funds to increase the quantity and improve the quality of professional personnel providing leadership and instruction for the statewide educational program for students with disabilities. One of the main goals of the project is to improve the basic skills performance of students with disabilities. In the second year of the project, the percentage of students with disabilities statewide at or above grade level increased 5.8 percentage points. In the third year of the project, this number increased another 2 percent to 65 percent of all students with disabilities.
- Illinois has used its SPD funds to establish and implement a coordinated, regionalized system of professional development that will increase the capacity of school systems to provide early intervening services, aligned with the general education curriculum, to at-risk

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

students and students with disabilities. The project's professional development system focuses on training in scientific, research-based reading instruction; progress monitoring; response to intervention; and standards-aligned instruction and assessment. A total of 63 schools across 39 districts are served by this project. All of the sites that have collected data for 2 years have demonstrated implementation of knowledge and skills gained through their training, an improvement from 85 percent the previous year. After a year of participation in the project, 40 percent of the sites demonstrated an increase in the percentage of grade 3 students who met or exceeded State standards in reading, as measured by the 2006 and 2007 Illinois Standards Achievement Test.

- Georgia has used its SPD funds to decrease dropout rates for students with disabilities. Using research based practices such as math strategies for students who struggle, student mentoring programs, positive behavior supports, and parent and student activities focusing on attendance and involvement, 7 of 15 school districts (46.6 percent) reported a decrease in the drop-out rate for students with disabilities in the first year (2007-2008 school year) of the project.

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

- Florida has used its SPD funds to work with the existing system of the regional Personnel Development Partnerships to provide local school districts with a single access point for all professional development planning and implementation for education and related services personnel. Existing programs are being scaled up, including Para-to-Teacher Tuition Support, Induction and Mentoring, Virtual ESE Distance Learning, and Weekends with the Experts programs. A new program aimed at assisting special education teachers to become highly qualified is also being developed and implemented. In addition, endorsement courses that are needed to meet requirements for specific common competencies and training in Pre-Kindergarten Disabilities, Autism Spectrum Disorders, and Severe/Profound Disabilities are being implemented as well, leading to an increase in the number of personnel serving students with these disabilities. Statewide, from the 2005-2006 school year to the 2006-2007 school year, there was a 1.37 percent increase in full time special educators. In addition, the number of non-traditional and underrepresented personnel participating in pre-service, alternative, and/or continuing education programs rose more than 15 percent.
- Alabama has used its SPD funds to implement a mentoring program, Gaining Expertise through Mentoring and Support (GEMS) to increase the retention of fully qualified teachers. The goals of the program are to: (1) build collegial relationships between mentor teachers and beginning teachers to promote instructional excellence; (2) develop self-efficacy for beginning teachers as well as their mentors, to improve teaching satisfaction and job

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

retention of special education teachers and related service personnel; and (3) identify the needs of beginning teachers and generate and implement strategies to support beginning teachers within the context and culture of special education. These goals were implemented by utilizing 11 Regional In-service Centers to provide ongoing training and technical assistance to school systems in their regions on the GEMS. Alabama's retention efforts have led to a 23 percent decrease in the need to hire new teachers.

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Project funding:			
SPD awards			
New	0	\$4,980	\$7,565
Continuations	\$22,598 <sup>1</sup>	43,005	40,400
Peer review of new award applications	<u>0</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>25</u>
Total funding	22,598	48,000	48,000
 Average award	 \$600 <sup>1</sup>	 \$1,043	 \$1,043
 Number of awards:			
New awards	0	5	8
Continuation awards	<u>41</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>38</u>
Total awards	<u>41</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>46</u>

<sup>1</sup> The fiscal year 2008 appropriation did not include sufficient funds to pay the full cost of continuation awards, which was \$41,175,667, causing the average award to be significantly lower.

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program. The program has two long-term measures, four annual measures, and an efficiency measure.

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

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

#### Annual Measures

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of personnel receiving professional development through the State Personnel Development Grants program on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		30.5
2008	40	
2009	60	
2010	65	

**Assessment of progress:** This measure assesses the program's performance in providing personnel with professional development on instructional or behavioral practices that are scientific- or evidence-based. An expert panel reviews information submitted with a SPD project's Annual Performance Report (APR) to determine whether or not the training activities provided by a SPD project meet the standard for a scientific- or evidence-based instructional practice, based on pre-determined criteria. The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) staff use the results of the panel review and data in the APR to identify the number of personnel that received professional development on instructional practices that were judged to be scientific- or evidence-based. The measure is calculated by dividing the number of personnel who received professional development based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices by the total number of personnel who received professional development provided by SPD projects that are in at least their second budget period. In FY 2007, an expert panel reviewed the APRs of the 8 projects that were in at least their second budget period and found that 30.5 percent of the personnel received professional development based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices. In FY 2008, there were a total of 17 SPD projects that were in at least their second budget period. In fiscal years 2009 and 2010, the pool of projects available for review will increase to 41.

As part of the Department's Data Quality Initiative, the Department is reviewing the data collection and review process for the SPD measures and has postponed panel reviews until after the review is completed.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of State Personnel Development projects that implement personnel development/training activities that are aligned with improvement strategies in their State Performance Plans.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		37.5
2007	38	87.5
2008	88	
2009	92	
2010	92	

**Assessment of progress:** For all SPD projects that are in at least their second budget period, this measure is the percentage of projects conducting professional development activities that are explicitly identified as an improvement strategy in their State Performance Plan (SPP). In FY 2006, only 8 of the 49 SPD projects funded under this program were conducting projects under the new State Personnel Development Grants authority. The other grantees were conducting their projects under the prior State Improvement Grant authority. In FY 2006, OSEP staff reviewed the SPPs and project APRs of the 8 SPD projects for the FY 2005/2006 performance period and found that only 37.5 percent of the projects conducted activities that were explicitly identified in the State's SPP. In FY 2007, the percentage increased to 87.5 percent based on a review of the same 8 projects. The Department has emphasized to States that SPD funds should be used as a resource to support the improvement strategies specified in their SPP. In addition, OSEP staff discussed project performance on the program's measures during monthly teleconferences with project staff, including project evaluators, and at the Annual Project Directors Meeting.

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

#### Annual Measure

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

**Assessment of progress:** This measure assesses the program's performance in providing training on scientific- or evidence-based instructional or behavioral practices. Grantees must include a description of each professional development activity provided by the project in their

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: State personnel development

---

APR. In FY 2007, an expert panel reviewed the information submitted with the APR from the 8 SPD projects who were in at least their second budget period to determine whether or not each of the professional development training activities provided by the project was focused on a scientific- or evidence-based instructional practice. Based on this information, the reviewers determined that professional development/training activities on scientific- or evidence-based instructional/behavioral practices accounted for 61 percent of the total professional development/training activities conducted by SPD projects. The Department expects significant improvement on this measure in FY 2009 as 80 percent of the pool of projects available for review were funded under a grant priority that focused on the preparation of personnel to deliver scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

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

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

### **Efficiency Measure**

The efficiency measure for this program is the percentage of projects whose cost per individual receiving professional development on scientific- or evidence-based practices is within a specified range. The cost per individual will be calculated by dividing total Federal grant funds by the number of individuals who receive professional development on scientific- or evidence-based practices. The Department plans to establish performance targets based on FY 2008 performance data before the end of the current fiscal year.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

**National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination**

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$48,549	\$48,549	0

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

Technical Assistance and Dissemination activities are coordinated to address the needs of a variety of audiences. While these audiences vary, in general, they include teachers, related services personnel, early intervention personnel, administrators, parents, and individuals with disabilities.

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

Technical Assistance and Dissemination activities are based on the best information available. One source of the scientifically-based research findings that are used in technical assistance and dissemination activities is the What Works Clearinghouse in the Institute of Education Sciences. The duration of awards varies with the award's purpose. Most individual awards are made for a period of 5 years.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$52,396
2006.....	48,903
2007.....	48,903
2008.....	48,049
2009.....	48,549

### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2010, the Administration is requesting \$48.5 million for the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program, the same as the 2009 level. The request includes about \$4.3 million for new technical assistance, dissemination, and model projects, and \$44.1 million for continuation projects.

Funds available for new awards would be used to support an assessment center, a center related to secondary transition, and a new model demonstration projects. The Department is also considering how these funds might be used to help ensure that IDEA funds provided to State educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) are used prudently and effectively to improve education outcomes for children with disabilities. In particular, technical assistance centers supported through this program may be able to assist LEAs in such areas as: providing intensive district-wide professional development for special education and regular education teachers that focuses on scaling-up, through replication, proven and innovative evidence-based school-wide strategies in reading, math, writing and science, and positive behavioral supports to improve outcomes for students with disabilities; developing or expanding the capacity to collect and use data to improve teaching and learning, and; expanding the availability and range of inclusive placement options for preschoolers with disabilities by developing the capacity of public and private preschool programs to serve these children. The Department is currently exploring how it can tap into the centers' substantial expertise in order to improve the quality and effectiveness of activities support by SEAs and LEAs with funds available under the ARRA.

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

Projects focusing on particular topical areas:

- Partial support for three Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) technical assistance centers focusing on instruction, teacher quality, and high schools – These centers are part of an OESE system of 21 regional and content technical assistance centers, which received initial funding in 2005.
- National Center on Educational Outcomes – This center is providing technical assistance on increasing the participation of children with disabilities in assessment and accountability systems. (University of Minnesota) (<http://cehd.umn.edu/nceo>)

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

Projects focusing on children with disabilities by age or grade:

- Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center – This Center provides technical assistance and information to assist States and local jurisdictions in providing quality early intervention and special education services to children with disabilities, birth through 5, and their families. (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill) (<http://www.nectac.org/>)

Projects focusing on children with particular disabilities:

- Deaf-Blindness Projects – The Department supports 50 State and multi-State technical assistance projects providing technical assistance on children who are both deaf and blind, as well as one project to provide technical assistance to these State and multi-State projects. (The project providing technical assistance to State and multi-State projects is at the Teaching Research Institute at Western Oregon University.) (<http://www.tr.wou.edu/ntac/>)

Projects focusing on particular audiences:

- State and Federal Policy Forum for Program Improvement – This cooperative agreement facilitates communication between the Office of Special Education Programs and State and local administrators, and synthesizes national program information to improve the administration of special education programs. (National Association of State Directors of Special Education) (<http://www.nasdse.org/forum.htm>)

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<u>Program funding:</u>			
Specialized technical assistance and dissemination:			
New	\$7,050	0	\$1,500
Continuations	<u>5,277</u>	<u>\$12,480</u>	<u>\$11,028</u>
Subtotal	12,327	12,480	12,528
Model Demonstration Centers:			
New	0	1,200	1,200
Continuations	<u>2,398</u>	<u>2,399</u>	<u>2,400</u>
Subtotal	2,398	3,599	3,600
Regional/Federal Resource Centers:			
New	0	7,800	0
Continuations	<u>7,798</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7,800</u>
Subtotal	7,798	7,800	7,800

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination**

---

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Early childhood technical assistance:			
New	\$800	\$767	0
Continuations	<u>4,941</u>	<u>4,610</u>	<u>\$5,300</u>
Subtotal	5,741	5,377	5,300
Secondary, transition and postsecondary technical assistance:			
New	0	700	800
Continuations	<u>3,349</u>	<u>2,399</u>	<u>2,000</u>
Subtotal	3,349	3,099	2,800
Technical assistance for children who are both deaf and blind:			
New	9,345	160	0
Continuations	<u>1,915</u>	<u>11,125</u>	<u>11,350</u>
Subtotal	11,260	11,285	11,350
Transfers to Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Continuations	3,000	3,000	3,000
Federal technical assistance, technical assistance in data analysis, State and Federal information exchange, other:			
New	281	607	557
Continuations	<u>1,533</u>	<u>1,243</u>	<u>1,314</u>
Subtotal	1,814	1,850	1,871
Peer review of new award applications	272	59	60
Total:			
New	17,566	11,234	4,297
Continuations	30,211	37,256	44,192
Peer review of new award applications	<u>272</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>60</u>
Total	48,049	48,549	48,549

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

##### **Performance Measures**

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

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

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

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

Annual Measures: The three annual measures deal with the quality, relevance, and usefulness of products and services provided by the program. These measures were developed as part of a cross-departmental effort to make measures relating to technical assistance and dissemination activities more consistent departmentwide. However, the measures have been adapted to reflect the unique purposes of the TA & D program. Baseline data for 2005 were incomplete and not of high quality, so they have not been included here. Actual data for 2006 reflect more accurate measurements of program activities and a change in the rating standards used to judge performance for the measures. Targets for 2008 have been revised for measures dealing with quality and relevance and 2009 and 2010 targets have been established based on these more accurate data. The measures are:

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Technical Assistance and Dissemination products and services deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2006		56
2007		74
2008	76	80
2009	77	
2010	78	

**Assessment of progress:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using expert panels of reviewers who assess grant implementation by reviewing a sample of products and services developed by grantees against a listing of scientifically- or evidence-based practices in key target areas that have been identified by the Department as critical. The sample of grantees included in this measure for each year consists of approximately 26 TA & D centers and 10 State Deaf-Blind programs. Each TA & D center included in the sample is asked to submit its best product or service, and the Department's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) randomly selects a typical product or service from a database containing all products and services. Each State Deaf-Blind grantee included in the sample is asked to submit a "best" product or service, and a "typical" product or service. Products and services are divided into the categories of policy and practice. Items that are considered to be in the area of practice are reviewed by the science panel, and policy items are reviewed by the State representative stakeholder panel. Items are reviewed using an OSEP-developed scoring instrument that is designed to provide ratings on two dimensions of quality, in the areas of substance and communication. Total scores for each item reviewed range from 0 to 9, with 6 or better considered to be "of high quality."

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of TA&D center products and services that received an average quality rating of 6 or better (35) by the total number of products and services reviewed (42), and then multiplying by the proportion of program funds expended on TA & D projects (.955). The same calculation is completed for the State Deaf-Blind grantees (e.g., 2 products and services received scores of 6 or better, divided by 12 products or services reviewed, multiplied by .045). The results of these calculations are added together to provide a single rating for the program.

Based on just a few years of data it appears that program grantees have made progress in ensuring that products and services are of reasonably high quality. The Department is planning to monitor individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Technical Assistance and Dissemination products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified members of the target audiences of the technical assistance and dissemination.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2006		63
2007		94
2008	94	89
2009	94	
2010	94	

**Assessment of progress:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using expert panels of reviewers who assess grant implementation by reviewing a sample of products and services developed by grantees against a listing of scientifically- or evidence-based practices in key target areas that have been identified by the Department as critical. The sample of grantees included in this measure for each year consists of approximately 26 TA & D centers and 10 State Deaf-Blind programs. Each TA & D center included in the sample is asked to submit its best product or service, and OSEP randomly selects a typical product or service from a database containing all products and services. Each State Deaf-Blind grantee included in the sample is asked to submit a “best” product or service, and a “typical” product or service. Products and services are divided into the categories of policy and practice. Items that are considered to be in the area of practice are reviewed by the science panel, and policy items are reviewed by the State representative stakeholder panel. Items are reviewed using an OSEP-developed scoring instrument that is designed to provide ratings on a three dimensions of relevance, in the areas of need, pertinence, and reach. Total scores for each item reviewed range from 0 to 9, with 6 or better considered to be “of high quality.”

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of TA&D center products and services that received an average quality rating of 6 or better (40) by the total number of products and services reviewed (41), and then multiplying by the proportion of program funds expended on TA & D projects (.955). The same calculation is completed for the State Deaf-Blind grantees (e.g., 5 products and services received scores of 6 or better, divided by 12 products or services reviewed, multiplied by .045). The results of these calculations are added together to provide a single rating for the program.

Based on just a few years of data it appears that program grantees have made progress in ensuring that products and services are of high relevance. The Department is planning to monitor individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of all Technical Assistance and Dissemination products and services deemed by experts to be useful by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2006		46
2007	48	80
2008	50	78
2009	52	
2010	80	

**Assessment of progress:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using expert panels of reviewers who assess grant implementation by reviewing a sample of products and services developed by grantees against a listing of scientifically- or evidence-based practices in key target areas that have been identified by the Department as critical. The sample of grantees included in this measure for each year consists of approximately 26 TA & D centers and 10 State Deaf-Blind programs. Each TA & D center included in the sample is asked to submit its best product or service, and OSEP randomly selects a typical product or service from a database containing all products and services. Each State Deaf-Blind grantee included in the sample is asked to submit a “best” product or service, and a “typical” product or service. Products and services are divided into the categories of policy and practice. Items that are considered to be in the area of practice are reviewed by the science panel, and policy items are reviewed by the State representative stakeholder panel. Items are reviewed using an OSEP-developed scoring instrument that is designed to provide ratings on a three dimensions of usefulness, in the areas of ease, replicability, and sustainability. Total scores for each item reviewed range from 0 to 9, with 6 or better considered to be “of high quality.”

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of TA&D center products and services that received an average quality rating of 6 or better (32) by the total number of products and services reviewed (42), and then multiplying by the proportion of program funds expended on TA & D projects (.955). The same calculation is completed for the State Deaf-Blind grantees (e.g., 7 products and services received scores of 6 or better, divided by 12 products or services reviewed, multiplied by .045). The results of these calculations are added together to provide a single rating for the program.

The Department is still working to revise the targets for this measure to ensure that the new targets are ambitious and attainable.

Based on just a few years of data it appears that program grantees have made progress in ensuring that products and services are useful. The Department is planning to monitor individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

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

- The percentage of school districts and service agencies receiving Technical Assistance and Dissemination services regarding scientific- or evidence-based practices for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities that implement those practices. (Targets will be established in FY 2010 on the basis of 2010 baseline data.)
- Of the Technical Assistance and Dissemination projects responsible for developing models, the percentage of projects that identify, implement and evaluate effective models. (Targets will be established in FY 2010 on the basis of 2010 baseline data.)

### Efficiency Measures

The Department has developed a common efficiency measure for technical assistance and dissemination programs, including the Special Education Technical Assistance and Dissemination program. It is “the cost per unit of technical assistance, by category, weighted by the expert panel quality rating.” The Department is working to determine what units of technical assistance and categories are appropriate for the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program, and how these factors should be weighted. Baseline data should be available in October 2009.

### Other Performance Information

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

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

---

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

---

#### Program Improvement Efforts

The Department is undertaking the following improvement efforts for this program:

- *Developing baselines and targets for the program's two long-term measures.* The Department is in the process of collecting data for the program's two long-term measures. Baseline data should be available in 2010.
- *Using performance and other program information to actively manage the overall Technical Assistance and Dissemination program portfolio by adjusting issue coverage and reallocating resources when needs and priorities shift.* The Department is in the process of gathering information to be used to adjust issue coverage and reallocate resources.
- *Developing a baseline and targets for the program's efficiency measure.* The Department is in the process of analyzing data for the program's efficiency measure. Baseline data and targets should be available by October 2009.
- *Developing a strategy for evaluating the impact and effectiveness of program activities.* OSEP is working with the Institute of Education Sciences to develop a plan for evaluating this and other National Activities programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

### National activities: Personnel preparation

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$90,653	\$90,653	0

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

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

The revised law also requires the Secretary to provide enhanced support for beginning special educators. Specifically, the Secretary is required to make at least one award to: (a) enhance and restructure existing teacher education programs or develop teacher education programs that prepare special education teachers by incorporating an extended (e.g., an additional 5<sup>th</sup>

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

year) clinical learning opportunity, field experience, or supervised practicum, or (b) create and support teacher-faculty partnerships between LEAs and IHEs (e.g., professional development schools) that provide high-quality mentoring and induction opportunities with ongoing support for beginning special educators or in-service support and professional development opportunities.

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

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

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

While individuals and students are not eligible for awards under the Personnel Preparation program, many grantees are required to use at least 65 percent of their award(s) to support scholarships. In recent years, approximately half of the program’s total appropriations have been used to support student scholarships. A large majority of the grants awarded through this program (approximately 96 percent) go to IHEs. Awards are made throughout the fiscal year. Duration of awards varies from 3 to 5 years, depending on the type of project.

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

Additional support for personnel preparation activities is provided through the State Personnel Development Grants (formerly State Improvement Grants) program, under which the Secretary makes competitive awards to help SEAs reform and improve in-service training and professional

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

development activities for teachers, including the recruitment and retention of highly qualified special education teachers. A variety of other programs administered by the Department also make competitive awards that support training and professional development activities that are designed to enhance teacher classroom effectiveness, including special education personnel. These program include the Teacher Incentive Fund, carried out under Title V, Part D of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and the Teacher Quality Partnership program, authorized under Title II of the Higher Education Act.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$90,626
2006.....	89,720
2007.....	89,720
2008.....	88,153
2009.....	90,653

### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2010, the Administration requests \$90.7 million for the Personnel Preparation program, the same level as the 2009 appropriation. Of this amount, at least \$21.6 million would be used for new projects (including peer review costs of approximately \$5.5 million) and \$69.1 million would support the continuation of grants made in prior years.

Improving teacher quality is central to the Department’s goal to improve educational outcomes for all children. The Personnel Preparation program plays a crucial role in improving the quality of preparation for special educators, helping to ensure that all special educators are highly qualified, and providing additional support for training, particularly in areas where the small number(s) of personnel needed can make it difficult to obtain local or State support (e.g. personnel to serve children with low incidence disabilities).

Since the recent economic downturn, the limited funds available through this program play an even more important role in supporting scholarships and training grants for future special educators. As university endowments have declined in value and credit has stopped flowing, student loans and scholarships available through private and public non-Federal loan and scholarship programs have also become difficult to obtain.

Funds available under this program may also be used to support the goals of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act). Section 14005(d)(2) of that legislation requires each State, as a condition of receiving State Fiscal Stabilization funds, to commit to taking “actions to improve teacher effectiveness and comply with section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the ESEA. . . in order to address inequities in the distribution of highly qualified teachers between high- and low-poverty schools, and to ensure that low-income and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers.” Funds available through the Personnel Preparation program may be used to support a wide variety of activities related to this critical objective.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

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

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

Over the last few years, the Department has targeted resources to support a handful of strategies that have been shown to reduce teacher turnover, and that can help place highly qualified teachers in districts with the greatest needs, such as fostering partnerships between IHEs and high-need LEAs, and supporting mentoring programs. In 2006 and 2007, according to the Title II HEA State-reported data, nearly all States reported using financial incentives to recruit and retain teachers, and many of these States target State-level training and loan forgiveness resources to students who agree to work for a specified period of time after graduation in high-poverty schools. For FY 2010, the Department is considering ways to leverage additional program resources to support the critical goal of promoting equity in the distribution of highly qualified, experienced special education teachers between high- and low-poverty schools, as this goal is articulated in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

Beyond the challenges associated with hiring and retaining special educators, an ongoing challenge for States under the revised IDEA has been to ensure that all special educators are highly qualified.<sup>1</sup> Data from the report, *Teacher Quality Under No Child Left Behind: Final*

---

<sup>1</sup> Starting in the 2005–2006 academic year, all veteran special education teachers were required to be highly qualified.

Under the reauthorized IDEA, “highly qualified” means that a teacher:

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

*Report* (published in January, 2009) illustrate the challenge. According to this study, despite large gains in the overall percentages of special educators nationwide who reported being highly qualified, special education teachers were still five times more likely to report that they were not highly qualified (10 percent) than general education teachers (2 percent). Of all special education teachers, 72 percent reported they were highly qualified in the 2006-07 academic year, compared to 84 percent of general education teachers. The percentage of special education teachers who reported they were highly qualified varied significantly by school level: the percentage was lower for high school teachers (56 percent) than for elementary and middle school teachers (71 percent and 83 percent, respectively). (See: <http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/teaching/nclb-final/index.html>).

As States work to address this problem, program funds are being used to provide critical support for promising practices. For example, since fiscal year 2007, the Department has supported Special Education Pre-Service Training Improvement grants, which provided approximately 56 grants to IHEs in fiscal years 2007, 2008, and 2009, to restructure or redesign existing training programs for special educators, to ensure that curricula are aligned with evidence-based practices, and that all graduates receiving stipends meet the highly qualified teacher requirements upon program completion. Beginning in FY 2009, the Department also funded the Paraprofessional Pre-service Training Improvement Grants, which provide grants to IHEs to ensure that coursework and curricula, internships, and mentoring components of training programs are evidence-based, and meet the standards for paraprofessionals contained in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as well as State certification and licensure requirements.

In addition to the support for special education personnel development provided under this program, the teacher loan forgiveness provisions of the Taxpayer-Teacher Protection Act of 2004 increase forgiveness benefits from \$5,000 to \$17,500 for certain mathematics, science, and special education teachers at qualified low-income schools who meet the definition of “highly qualified” included in the ESEA.

- 
- Has obtained full State certification as a teacher or passed the State teacher licensing examination and holds a license to teach in the State, and does not have certification or licensure requirements waived on an emergency, temporary, or provisional basis,
    - Holds a minimum of a bachelor’s degree,
    - Has demonstrated subject matter competency in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches, in a manner determined by the State and in compliance with Section 9101(23) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and
    - Is fully certified as a special education teacher, or has passed a teacher licensing exam and holds a license as a special education teacher.

IDEA further provides that teachers who teach exclusively to alternate achievement standards may demonstrate subject matter competency at the level of instruction being provided. At a minimum, however, such teachers must demonstrate subject matter competency at the elementary school level.

New special education teachers who teach core academic content must be highly qualified when they are hired. If new special educators are already highly qualified in at least mathematics, language arts, or science, such teachers who teach 2 or more core academic subjects exclusively to students with disabilities have 2 additional years from the date they are hired to demonstrate subject matter competency in the additional subjects they teach.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<u>Expired Program funding:</u>			
Low incidence disabilities continuation grants:	\$5,573	---	---
National significance continuation grants:	<u>1,310</u>	---	---
Expired program totals:	6,883	---	---
<u>New Program funding:</u>			
Low incidence disabilities grants:			
New	\$4,584 <sup>1</sup>	\$6,080	\$5,080
Continuations	<u>9,506</u>	<u>10,112</u>	<u>7,956</u>
Subtotal	14,090	16,192	13,036
Leadership training grants:			
New	5,646	5,400	4,400
Continuations	<u>11,490</u>	<u>12,287</u>	<u>13,740</u>
Subtotal	17,136	17,687	18,140
Minority institution grants: <sup>2</sup>			
New	1,973	3,000	3,000
Continuations	<u>7,478</u>	<u>7,846</u>	<u>10,000</u>
Subtotal	9,451	10,846	13,000
Training improvement grants:			
New	2,448	1,406	2,500
Continuations	<u>1,179</u>	<u>4,058</u>	<u>5,464</u>
Subtotal	3,627	5,464	7,964

---

<sup>1</sup> The FY 2008 new awards total includes approximately \$1.28 million in FY 2009 continuation costs.

<sup>2</sup> This category includes awards to institutions with minority enrollments of not less than 25 percent. Under IDEA, Part D, Sec. 681(c)(2), the Secretary is required to reserve not less than 2 percent of the total amount of funds appropriated under Part D, subparts 2 and 3 for outreach and technical assistance activities for historically Black colleges and universities and IHEs with minority enrollments of not less than 25 percent, which translates into \$4.041 million in fiscal year 2008, and is estimated to be \$5.057 million in fiscal years 2009 and 2010.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Other personnel development grants: <sup>3</sup>			
New	\$6,757	\$8,500	\$4,500
Continuations	<u>18,980</u> <sup>4</sup>	<u>16,754</u>	<u>17,726</u>
Subtotal	25,737	24,754	21,726
 National Activities: <sup>5</sup>			
New	2,165	4,980	2,161
Continuations	<u>9,012</u>	<u>9,741</u>	<u>13,637</u>
Subtotal	11,177	14,721	15,798
 Peer review of new award applications	52	489	489
 New program totals:			
New	23,573	29,366	21,641
Continuations	57,645	60,798	68,523
Peer review of new award applications	<u>52</u>	<u>489</u>	<u>489</u>
Total	81,270	90,653	90,653
 Program total	89,720	90,653	90,653

#### PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

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

#### Performance Measures

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

---

<sup>3</sup> This category includes a wide range of training and development activities currently supported through the program, such as awards to train: personnel to serve infants, toddlers and pre-school age children with disabilities; personnel to provide related services, speech/language services, and adapted physical education to children with disabilities; and personnel to serve school-age children with high incidence disabilities.

<sup>4</sup> The FY 2008 continuation awards total includes approximately \$1.57 million in FY 2009 continuation costs.

<sup>5</sup> This category includes investments in national centers in a variety of different critical need areas, including the National Center to Enhance the Professional Development of School Personnel Who Share Responsibility for Improving Results for Children with Disabilities, the Professional Development Center for Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders, the Center on High Quality Personnel in Inclusive Preschool Settings, the Principal Leadership Professional Development Center to Support School Improvement to Ensure Access to, and Participation and Progress in the General Education Curriculum in the Least Restrictive Environment, and the National Center to Enhance the Training of Personnel Who Share Responsibility for Young Children with Disabilities.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

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

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

The program has two long-term measures that are designed to provide information on the quality of the program by looking at the skills of scholars supported using program funds. The first long-term measure, for which the Department does not yet have data, is: the percentage of low incidence positions that are filled by personnel who are fully qualified under IDEA. The Department is currently working with an OSEP-supported Center to identify States that disaggregate teacher qualification data by disability category. Although States are not currently required to disaggregate data in this way, a handful of States do so. The Department expects to obtain these data by fall, 2009.

The second long-term measure is:

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

**Assessment of progress:** Grantees submit data annually through the Department Personnel Preparation Data Report (PPD) web-based data collection (see: <http://www.osepppd.org/>). This measure presents information on the percentage of scholars completing programs who passed an independent exam that is designed to assess the knowledge and skills of special educators, such as the Praxis II. This measure is calculated by dividing the total number of scholars who pass an exam demonstrating knowledge and skills in evidence-based practices for children with disabilities (1,147 students) by the total number of students who completed training programs – including students who passed a test, students who did not pass a test, and students for whom test data are not available (2,639 students).

The Department does not currently require IHEs receiving program funds to use an independent assessment, such as the Praxis II. The Department's performance on this measure is

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

dramatically affected by that fact that a substantial number of scholars (that are included in the denominator) attend programs at IHEs located in States that also do not currently require graduates to pass an independent assessment to measure the knowledge and skills of graduates (766 out of approximately 2,639 scholars did not take a test). Such IHEs either measure knowledge and skills through a “comprehensive examination” process, or through some other mechanism. The Department plans to monitor grantees more closely to determine how they are assessing graduates knowledge and skills in evidence-based practices for children with disabilities, and how these alternate approaches compare with the use of an independent assessment.

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

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

<b>Measure:</b> Percentage of projects that incorporate scientifically- or evidence-based practices in the curriculum.		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>2007</b>	n/a	42
<b>2008</b>	50	56
<b>2009</b>	60	
<b>2010</b>	70	

**Assessment of progress:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using an expert panel of reviewers who assess grant implementation by reviewing a sample of grantee course syllabi against a listing of scientifically- or evidence-based practices in key target areas that have been identified by the Department as critical areas that all projects should address. This measure is calculated by multiplying the total individual scores assigned to each program by the number of syllabi scored for each program, then dividing this sum by the overall number of syllabi included. So, for example, in FY 2008, 36 syllabi were included from the following types of programs: early childhood programs (12 syllabi scored), low incidence programs (7 syllabi scored), minority programs (9 syllabi scored), and leadership programs (8 syllabi scored). The average panel scores assigned in each of these areas were: 33.3 percent, 71.4 percent, 44.4 percent, and 87.5 percent, respectively. These individual ratings are multiplied by the number of syllabi included in each area, and the sum is divided by the total number of syllabi included (36), yielding a total of 55.5 percent.

Based on just a few years of data it appears that program grantees could improve substantially in the task of ensuring that program curricula do, in fact, incorporate evidence-based practices. The Department is planning to monitor grantees more aggressively to ensure the grantees take steps to improve their performance in these key areas over time.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

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

**Assessment of progress:** Grantees submit data annually through the Department Personnel Preparation Data Report (PPD) web-based data collection (see: <http://www.osepppd.org/>). No calculation is necessary. The data are taken directly from the PPD data collection. Data suggest that grantees are currently doing a good job of ensuring that scholars maintain reasonable levels of academic performance.

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

**Assessment of progress:** Grantees submit data annually through the PPD web-based data collection. This measure is calculated by dividing the total number of students who received degrees and were working in the area(s) for which they received training at the completion of the program (1,782 for FY 2008) by all degree recipients who were employed, not employed, and for whom the employment status was not known (2,434 for FY 2008). Scholars who received only an endorsement are excluded from all calculations.

On average, over time approximately three-quarters of degree/certification recipients funded through this program end up working in the area for which they were trained upon program completion. The program already has a service obligation requirement that requires scholars to work for several years in the area for which they received training for each year they received Federal support, or pay back the full amount received. The Department is currently considering additional steps that may be taken to ensure that grantees more effectively recruit and train students who will ultimately end up working in the area for which they received training, and to improve training courses and curricula to ensure that graduates will be competitive in the market.

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

**Assessment of progress:** Grantees submit data annually through the PPD web-based data collection. This measure is calculated by dividing the total number of non-leadership degree recipients who received degrees, were working in the area(s) for which they received training at the completion of the program, and who are highly qualified (1,573 for FY 2008) by all degree recipients who were employed, not employed, and recipients for whom the employment status was not known (2,280 for FY 2008). Scholars who received only an endorsement, as well as students who received leadership training, are excluded from all calculations because highly qualified status does not apply to these individuals.

On average, over time approximately three-quarters of degree/certification recipients funded through this program end up working in the area for which they were trained, and are highly qualified, upon program completion. The program already has a service obligation requirement that requires scholars to work for several years in the area for which they received training for each year they received Federal support, or pay back the full amount received. The Department is currently considering additional steps that may be taken to ensure that grantees more effectively recruit and train students who will ultimately end up working in the area for which they received training, and to improve training courses and curricula to ensure that graduates will be competitive in the market.

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

**Assessment of progress:** The Department currently collects data for this measure using a temporary collection methodology that involves surveying a small sample (n=9) of the largest IHEs that receive program funds to support student training. This measure is currently calculated by dividing the total number degree recipients from the 9 largest grantees who, according to those institutions, maintained employment for 3 years in the area(s) for which they were trained and who are highly qualified by the total number of degree recipients from those programs. It is unclear to what extent these data are representative of the whole program. Because these data are currently collected from only 9 grantees, they are not comparable with data presented in the other program performance measures.

In the next year or so, the Department expects to obtain data for this measure through the National Center for Service Obligation, the OSEP-supported contractor that follows students post-graduation to determine whether or not individuals are complying with the program's service obligation requirement.

### Efficiency Measures

The Department recently developed several new efficiency measures for the Personnel Preparation program. These measures are: 1) the Federal cost per degree/certification program

## **SPECIAL EDUCATION**

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

---

recipient working in the area(s) in which they were trained upon program completion; 2) the Federal cost per degree/certification program recipient working in the area(s) in which they were trained upon program completion and fully qualified under IDEA; and 3) the Federal cost per degree/certification program recipient fully qualified under IDEA and maintaining employment for at least 3 years in the area(s) for which they were trained.

All three of the proposed measures link directly to the program's annual performance measures. These measures would also enable comparisons across grantees or sub-sets of similar grantees. Grantee-level data analyses would be used to identify high performing institutions that other grantees may look to as examples for improving program performance. Grantee-level data would also be used to compare the relative efficiency of program grantees, both in relation to one another as well as in relation to other Federal programs that provide graduate level scholarships.

The data used to calculate these measures would come from the Department's PPD web-based data collection. In each case, the cost per degree/certification program recipient would be calculated by dividing the total Federal grant funds in one year by the subset of individuals identified in the measure. For example, the first measure would be calculated by dividing total Federal grant funds by the number of degree recipients working in the area(s) in which they were trained upon program completion.

The Department is still considering the overall utility of these measures, and may ultimately decide not to implement all three of the proposed efficiency measures. Baseline data will be established in FY 2010.

### **Other Performance Information**

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) awarded a \$2.8 million, 4-year evaluation contract for the Personnel Preparation program at the end of fiscal year 2007. The evaluation includes two separate components. The first is a study of institutions of higher education (IHEs) that have applied for funds to train personnel under the program. This portion of the study is designed to: (1) collect descriptive data from all the funded and non-funded applicants to the FY 2006 and FY 2007 competitions (185 funded and 265 non-funded), and (2) document changes to the applicants' courses of study.

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Personnel preparation

---

representing each change and rate the contributions made to the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the specific personnel preparation course of study.

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

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

Final results are expected by fall 2011.

### Program Improvement Efforts

The Department is undertaking the following improvement efforts for this program:

- *Taking meaningful steps to ensure that program data from the program's Personnel Preparation Database are made available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner.* The Department already publishes much of the data collected through the on-line Personnel Prep Data collection, available at <http://www.osepppd.org>; however, the data are not yet disaggregated at the grantee level. The Department is currently working to address this issue. The Department has also started utilizing data from the PPD data collection to improve program management.
- *Collecting reliable, accurate data for the program's new annual, long-term, and efficiency measures.* At least one year of data have already been collected for 7 of the 8 measures established for this program, but the Department is still working to improve the overall quality, validity, and reliability of these data.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

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

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$27,028	\$27,028	0

---

### 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 the 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 the IDEA, in order to develop the skills necessary to cooperatively and effectively participate in planning and decision making relating to early intervention, educational, and transitional services; and
- Parents receive coordinated and accessible technical assistance and information to assist them in improving early intervention, educational, and transitional services and results for their children and families.

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

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

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

Technical assistance is authorized to assist parent training and information centers, including community centers, in areas such as coordinating parent training efforts, disseminating scientifically based research and information, and promoting the use of technology.

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

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

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

(\$000s)

2005.....	\$25,964
2006.....	25,704
2007.....	25,704
2008.....	26,528
2009.....	27,028

### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's request for the Parent Information Centers program is \$27.0 million, the same level as the fiscal year 2009 appropriation. Family involvement in children's learning is critical to achieving high-quality education. Decades of research show that positive school-family partnerships can be built to inform and involve families in their children's learning. Studies show that all families can take concrete steps that significantly help their children succeed in school, regardless of their income, education, or knowledge of the English language.

The training and information provided by the parent centers help ensure that parents have the knowledge and skills to help their children with disabilities succeed. In addition to helping parents better understand the nature of their children's disabilities and their educational and developmental needs, the centers provide training and information on how parents can work with professionals serving their children. For school-aged children, this includes participating

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

with administrators and teachers in the development of their child's individualized education programs (IEPs). For infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services, it means participating with a multidisciplinary team in the development of individualized family service plans (IFSPs).

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

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

In particular, parents need a reliable source of information on the evolving ESEA requirements for participation of their children in assessments. Under IDEA and ESEA, all children with disabilities are required to be included in assessments. However, regulations published on December 9, 2003 provide that children with the most significant cognitive disabilities can be assessed using alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards. The regulations also provide that the number of proficient and advanced scores for these children that are counted toward meeting adequate yearly progress is limited to 1 percent of the number of children in the grades assessed. (See <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/finrule/2003-4/120903a.pdf>). On March 29, 2004, the Department announced new policies for calculating participation rates for children in assessments that provide for a 3-year averaging of rates to meet the 95 percent participation requirement and allow the exclusion of children with significant medical emergencies in the calculation of these rates. (See <http://www.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2004/03/03292004.html>). Most recently, on April 9, 2007, the Department published final regulations to implement a policy allowing alternate assessments for some children with disabilities that are based on modified achievement standards. The regulations provide that the number of proficient and advanced scores for these children that are counted toward meeting adequate yearly progress is limited to 2 percent of the number of children in the grades assessed. (See <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/finrule/2007-2/040907a.pdf>)

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

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

The 2010 request includes \$21.4 million for new and continuing parent training and information centers and \$4.0 million for new and continuing community parent resource centers. In addition, \$2.4 million would fund 7 continuation awards to provide technical assistance to centers.

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<u>Program funding:</u>			
Parent training and information centers:			
New	0	\$5,026	\$3,241
Continuations	<u>\$20,872</u>	<u>16,443</u>	<u>18,158</u>
Subtotal	20,872	21,469	21,399
Community parent resource centers:			
New	1,000	1,000	1,000
Continuations	<u>1,899</u>	<u>1,999</u>	<u>2,000</u>
Subtotal	2,899	2,999	3,000
Technical assistance:			
New	2,480	0	0
Continuations	<u>0</u>	<u>2,320</u>	<u>2,400</u>
Subtotal	2,480	2,320	2,400
Other (contracts):			
New	57	114	0
Continuations	<u>114</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>176</u>
Subtotal	171	177	176
Peer review of new award applications	106	63	53
Total:			
New	3,537	6,140	4,241
Continuations	22,885	20,825	22,734
Peer review of new award applications	<u>106</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>53</u>
Total	26,528	27,028	27,028

### Number of projects:

Parent training and information centers:			
New	0	17	12
Continuations	<u>67</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>58</u>
Subtotal	67	70	70
Community parent information centers:			
New	10	10	10
Continuations	<u>19</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>
Subtotal	29	30	30

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Technical assistance:			
New	7	0	0
Continuations	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>
Subtotal	7	7	7
Other:			
New	1	2	0
Continuations	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
Subtotal	4	3	3
Total:			
New	18	29	22
Continuations	<u>89</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>88</u>
Total	107	110	110

#### 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 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

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

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

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

Annual Measures: The three annual measures deal with the quality, relevance, and usefulness of products and services provided by the program. These measures were developed as part of a cross-departmental effort to make measures relating to technical assistance and dissemination activities more consistent departmentwide. However, the measures have been adapted to reflect the unique purposes of the Parent Information Centers program. Baseline

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

data for 2006 were incomplete and not of high quality, and are consequently not included here. Actual data for 2007 reflect more accurate measurements of program activities and a change in the rating standards used to judge performance for the measures. Targets for 2008 have been revised and 2009 and 2010 targets have been established based on these more accurate data. The measures are:

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of materials used by Parent Information Centers projects that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2007	42	69.6
2008	72	57.9
2009	73	
2010	73	

**Assessment of progress:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using expert panels of reviewers who assess grant implementation by reviewing a sample of products and services developed and submitted by each of the six (6) Regional PTI Technical Assistance Centers.

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

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of individual products and services that received an average quality rating of 6 or better (11) by the total number of products and services reviewed (19), multiplied by 100 percent. ( $11/19 = .57895 \times 100\% = 57.9\%$ )

Based on just a few years of data it appears that program grantees could improve substantially in the task of ensuring that program services and products are of high quality. The Department is currently exploring the feasibility of monitoring individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of Parent Information Centers products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified members of the Parent Information Centers target audience.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2007	49	95.8
2008	96	95.2
2009	96	
2010	96	

**Assessment of progress:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using expert panels of reviewers who assess grant implementation by reviewing a sample of products and services developed and submitted by each of the six (6) Regional PTI Technical Assistance Centers. A panel of six (6) parent stakeholders (who have or are currently raising children with disabilities) review a randomly selected sample of materials (n=21) that have been developed by each of the six (6) Regional PTI Technical Assistance Centers, and that are currently available on-line.

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

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of individual products and services that received an average relevance rating of 6 or better (20) by the total number of products and services reviewed (21), multiplied by 100 percent.  $(20/21 = .95238 \times 100\% = 95.2\%)$

Based on just a few years of data it appears that program grantees do a reasonably good job of ensuring that products and services are of high relevance to education and early intervention policy or practice. The Department is currently exploring the feasibility of monitoring individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

<b>Measure:</b> The percentage of all Parent Information Centers products and services deemed to be useful by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2007	29	95.8
2008	96	95.2
2009	96	
2010	96	

**Assessment of progress:** Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using expert panels of reviewers who assess grant implementation by reviewing a sample of products and services developed and submitted by each of the six (6) Regional PTI Technical Assistance Centers. A panel of six (6) parent stakeholders (who have or are currently raising children with disabilities) review a randomly selected sample of materials (n=21) that have been developed by each of the six (6) Regional PTI Technical Assistance Centers, and that are currently available on-line.

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

This measure is calculated by dividing the number of individual products and services that received an average relevance rating of 6 or better (20) by the total number of products and services reviewed (21), multiplied by 100 percent. ( $20/21 = .95238 \times 100\% = 95.2\%$ )

Based on just a few years of data it appears that program grantees do a reasonably good job of ensuring that products and services are useful to target audiences. The Department is currently exploring the feasibility of monitoring individual grantees receiving relatively low scores more aggressively to ensure these grantees take steps to improve over time.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

Long-term Measures: Two long-term measures have been developed for the program for which data will be collected every 2 years. The data for these measures will be collected using an OSEP-supported survey of parents. They are:

- The percentage of parents receiving Parent Information Centers services who promote scientifically- or evidence-based practices for their infants, toddlers, children, and youth. (Baseline 2007, 73 percent. Target 2009, 71 percent. Target 2011, 73 percent. Target 2013, 75 percent.)
- The percentage of parents receiving Parent Information Centers services who report enhanced knowledge of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act rights and responsibilities. (Baseline 2007, 83 percent. Target 2009, 85 percent. Target 2011, 87 percent. Target 2013, 89 percent.)

### Efficiency Measures

The Department has developed a common efficiency measure for technical assistance and dissemination programs, including the Parent Information Centers program. As adapted for the Parent Information Centers program, this measure is “the cost per output, by category, weighted by the expert panel quality rating.” The measure is based on the amount of funding provided for the Parent Information Centers program divided by the number of parents reported to be served under the program, weighted by an index reflecting the quality, relevance, and usefulness (QRU ratio) of the materials provided through the program. The Department has now collected baseline data for the measure. In FY 2008, the cost per unit of technical assistance for the program was \$1.49. However, a comparison between the FY 2008 data and similar data from preliminary calculations conducted in previous years suggest that there are still a number of methodological problems that need to be addressed in this measure. For example, while the QRU ratings (used in the denominator) are slightly lower in FY 2008 than in previous fiscal years (the QRU dropped from 6.9 out of 9 in 2007 to 6.6 out of 9 in 2008), the final cost per unit of technical assistance produced by this measure improved dramatically over the same time period. The cost per unit of technical assistance in FY 2007 was \$2.24, while the same cost in FY 2008 is just \$1.49.

This dramatic change in cost per unit of technical assistance between 2007 and 2008 appears to be largely attributable to the fact that the “total units of technical assistance” included in the denominator increased by approximately 8.6 million (from 12.2 million to 20.8 million). The current definition of “unit of technical assistance” includes outputs such as hits on Web site materials and newsletters mailed. The Department is currently exploring alternative definitions of “unit of technical assistance” to better ensure that the results of this analysis are more directly associated with core program outcomes.

### Program Improvement Efforts

The Department is undertaking the following improvement efforts for this program:

- *Developing and implementing long-term measures of the programs performance.* The Department has developed and implemented two long-term measures to reflect the

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Parent information centers

---

program's performance. Baseline data are available and targets have been established through 2012.

- *Developing a strategy for evaluating the impact and effectiveness of program activities.* The Office of Special Education Programs, which administers the Parent Information Centers program, is working with the Institute of Education Sciences to develop a plan for evaluating this and other National Activities programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.
- *Developing and implementing an efficiency measure for the program.* The Department has developed an efficiency measure and has a baseline for that measure. However, more analysis is needed before targets can be set.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

---

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

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$38,615	\$38,615	0

---

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

Video description is the audio description of visual images. It provides individuals with visual impairments access to television and other media that includes visual images. Neither Federal law nor regulations require video description for television programming.

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

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$38,816
2006.....	38,428
2007.....	38,428
2008.....	39,301
2009.....	38,615

### FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration’s request for the Technology and Media Services program is \$38.6 million, the same as the fiscal year 2009 appropriation level. The request includes \$7.9 million for a new competition to provide accessible materials for students who are blind or have other print disabilities. In addition, the request would provide approximately \$10.7 million for new competitive grants in other areas, as described below, and approximately \$20 million for continuation projects. The request does not include funds for fiscal year 2009 appropriation earmarks: \$737,000 for the Greater Washington Educational Television Association (GWETA) and \$13.3 million for Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Inc. (RFB&D).

Projects funded under the Technology and Media Services program promote the development, demonstration, and use of technology and the provision of educational materials in specialized formats for children with disabilities in early intervention, preschool, elementary, middle school, and high school programs. These activities help improve access to and participation in: the general education curriculum, developmentally appropriate activities for preschool children, and statewide assessments. These activities ultimately improve the performance of children with disabilities.

#### **Technology**

The request includes \$17.9 million for Technology activities, which promote the development, demonstration, and use of technology, primarily through research, for which \$12 million is proposed. Most new technology research awards would be made under the Steppingstones of Technology Innovation for Students with Disabilities priority. These projects are awarded in two phases: development of technology-based interventions and research on effectiveness. Projects focus on curriculum materials and instructional methodologies that use innovative and emerging technology to improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities. Of the funds proposed for research activities, approximately \$5.8 million would support new and continuation awards for the Steppingstones program.

The request also would provide funding for new research projects on electronic text, including the application of universal design principles to the use of electronic text, characteristics of supported electronic text that facilitate or impede access to and learning of academic content, and barriers to the use of electronic text for mathematics and science courses. Another competition would focus on the use of existing and emerging technologies and use of commercially available software and equipment to increase options for State and local educational agencies. A third priority would make awards for projects promoting understanding

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

and use of technology through improvements in professional development, coaching, and in-service training programs.

In addition to research, the request for Technology activities includes \$4.8 million for technical assistance projects. Of this amount, \$2.8 million would support continuations, including a center to assist SEAs and LEAs in implementing and evaluating practices that integrate technology into teaching, a center on promoting the distribution and use of technology-related products and approaches, and a center to promote the use of assistive technology approaches for working with infants and toddlers.

The amount requested for technical assistance includes \$1 million for a competition for State System Improvement Grants. In fiscal year 2007, the Department conducted a competition for State System Improvement Grants to support the development or improvement of State systems for providing educational materials in accessible formats, including for students with disabilities who are not eligible for materials produced from National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard (NIMAS) files obtained through the National Instructional Materials Access Center (NIMAC). A majority of the States and territories applied for funding under this program. Three-year grants were made to a consortium of 15 States and a consortium comprised of the Outlying Areas. The grants were very successful. Many more States wanted to participate, but could not be accommodated. Therefore, the request provides funding for a competition to support additional State System Improvement Grants in fiscal year 2010.

The request also includes \$1 million for a technology technical assistance center on implementing technology in education. This project would provide support to State and local education agencies to promote integrated instructional technology for all students, including students with disabilities, and demonstrate how this technology helps students achieve to high educational standards. The center would identify evidence-based practices, innovative online technical assistance tools, and professional development needs, and establish communities of practice. Research on promising and emerging practices, technology resources, and targeted tools would be showcased and cataloged by topic area in a searchable database.

Examples of previous technology projects include the "TeachTown: Skill Builder," a computer-assisted instruction program for teaching school-age children with autism spectrum disorders and developing self-management skills. Another project, *WiiCane*, is creating a new diagnostic and training tool for use by orientation and mobility specialists and their visually impaired clients ages 2 through 22. The tool will include a lightweight wireless sensor capable of tracking movement of a long cane during mobility training. As a trainee walks along a route, the sensor will deliver a continuous stream of data to a stationary computer. An application running on the computer will compare the trainee's cane technique against a set of pre-established criteria generated from parameters specific to that person's physical characteristics, and then provide real-time feedback to the trainee in the form of audible or vibratory stimulus.

IDEA section 682(d)(1)(B) requires that the Secretary use at least \$4.0 million of the funds provided for programs authorized under subparts 2 and 3 of Part D of IDEA "to address the postsecondary, vocational, technical, continuing, and adult education needs of individuals with deafness." Starting in fiscal year 2006, the Department has addressed this requirement through a combination of funding from the Technical Assistance and Dissemination, Personnel

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

Preparation, and Technology and Media Services programs. Continuation funding for these awards in the amount of \$1 million from the Technology and Media Services appropriation will be provided in 2010. Funds from the Technology and Media Services program are being used to address the technology needs of postsecondary institutions related to recruiting, enrolling, retaining, and instructing students who are deaf, and addressing the varying communication needs of and methods used by individuals who are deaf, such as sign language transliteration and interpreting services, oral transliteration services, cued language transliteration services, and transcription services.

#### **Media Services**

Media Services includes a variety of activities targeted toward providing educational materials for individuals with disabilities, particularly deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals and blind and other visually impaired individuals. The majority of the funding for Technology and Media services, over \$20 million, is allocated to these activities in FY 2010.

Educational Materials in Accessible Formats - The request includes almost \$15 million for activities related to providing instructional materials in accessible formats. This includes a competition for \$7.9 million to support the development, production, and distribution of educational materials in accessible formats to students with visual impairments and other print disabilities. The Department strongly believes awarding funds through competition is the best way to ensure that the needs of students with visual impairments and other print disabilities will be met efficiently and effectively. In fiscal year 2007, the Department funded a new competitively-selected grantee, Bookshare for Education, that has transformed the provision of educational materials in accessible formats by providing free educational materials, including textbooks, much less expensively and more quickly than was previously possible. Bookshare.org is using technology in a variety of creative ways to not only increase the volume of available materials and speed at which materials are made available, but also to make it easier to access materials (<http://www.bookshare.org/web/Welcome.html>). The Department would continue to fund this grantee at \$6.5 million in fiscal year 2010.

The IDEA requires the Department to support the NIMAC, which is noncompetitively awarded to the American Printing House for the Blind. (<http://www.nimac.us/>) The NIMAC is a national electronic file repository that makes electronic files that comply with the NIMAS available for the production of print instructional materials in specialized formats. NIMAC receives source files in NIMAS format from textbook publishers and provides these files to State and local educational agencies for use in producing materials in accessible media such as braille, audio, and digital text. The request includes \$550,000 to continue this project in fiscal year 2010.

Video Description and Closed Captioning - The request includes \$2.5 million for new projects and \$1.1 million for continuation projects that provide support for video description and closed-captioning of educational television programming that would otherwise not be required to be described or captioned. The support for video description of educational programming is particularly important for individuals with visual impairments since, unlike closed captioning, there are no Federal requirements for providing video descriptions. In addition, the Department would provide \$1.5 million in continuation support for captioning and the distribution of educational videos for use in classroom settings. The distribution system for these videos

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

currently includes local and regional depositories. These local and regional depositories are in the process of being phased out in favor of more efficient distribution methods that use new and emerging technologies. The awardee is the National Association of the Deaf. (<http://www.dcmp.org/>)

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<u>Program funding:</u>			
<b>Technology:</b>			
Research:			
New	\$4,710	\$6,271	\$5,450
Continuations	<u>4,358</u>	<u>1,631</u>	<u>6,571</u>
Subtotal	9,068	7,902	12,021
Technical assistance and dissemination:			
New	600	1,000	2,000
Continuations	<u>1,485</u>	<u>1,835</u>	<u>2,835</u>
Subtotal	2,085	2,835	4,835
Projects to address the postsecondary, vocational, technical, continuing, and adult education needs of individuals with deafness:			
Continuations	1,000	1,000	1,000
Appropriation earmark for Greater Washington Educational Television Association (GWETA):	1,474	737	0
<b>Subtotal, Technology:</b>			
New	5,310	7,271	7,450
Continuations	7,843	4,466	11,406
Earmarks	<u>1,474</u>	<u>737</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	14,627	12,474	17,856
<b>Media services:</b>			
Accessible television and technology media demonstrations:			
New	0	0	2,500
Continuations	<u>3,627</u>	<u>3,630</u>	<u>1,130</u>
Subtotal	3,627	3,630	3,630
Educational video captioning, description, and distribution:			
Continuation	1,499	1,500	1,500
National Instructional Materials Access Center (NIMAC) – Statutory earmark			
Continuations	546	576	550

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Free educational materials competitive award:			
New	0	0	\$7,900
Continuations	<u>\$6,515</u>	<u>\$6,515</u>	<u>6,515</u>
Subtotal	6,515	6,515	14,415
Appropriation earmark for Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Inc.	12,773	13,250	0
<b>Subtotal, Media services:</b>			
New	0	0	10,400
Continuations	11,187	12,221	9,695
Earmarks	<u>12,773</u>	<u>13,250</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	23,960	25,471	20,095
<b>Other</b> (e.g. program evaluation, project meeting costs):			
New	0	103	360
Continuations	<u>407</u>	<u>360</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	407	463	360
<b>Peer review of new award applications</b>	306	207	304
<b>Total:</b>			
New	5,616	7,581	18,514
Continuations	19,437	17,047	20,101
Appropriation earmarks	<u>14,247</u>	<u>13,987</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	39,301	38,615	38,615

#### 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 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

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

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

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

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

**Assessment of progress:** The Department has set targets based on the first 2 years of data under this program. While the results reported for these 2 years are relatively consistent, it is too early to know whether this level of performance can be sustained. We will reevaluate the targets for the outyears after we receive fiscal year 2009 data, expected in October 2009.

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

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

**Assessment of progress:** Baseline data for the measure dealing with the relevance of program products first became available in fiscal year 2006. However, both the quality and completeness of the data used for the baseline were not high. The Department believes that

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Technology and media services

---

the data for fiscal year 2007 reflect more accurate measurements of program activities. The targets were set based on this data. While the program obtained a score of 100 percent in fiscal year 2008, it is unclear if such high performance can be sustained; therefore, only a small increase is reflected in the 2010 target. Data for fiscal year 2009 are expected in October 2009.

The scores appearing in the actual data column are derived from a panel of five to seven technology and media stakeholders, who reviewed a sample of products from eleven Technology and Media Services projects. All of the products were assessed on whether the product content was responsive to priority issues and challenges confronting the target groups and judged on three dimensions of relevance: (1) Need – Does the content of the material attempt to solve an important problem or critical issue; (2) Pertinence – Does the content of the material match the problem or issue facing the target group or groups; and (3) Reach – To what extent is the content of the material applicable to diverse populations within the target group?

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

**Assessment of progress:** Performance in fiscal year 2008 was the same as for fiscal year 2007. Data for fiscal year 2009 are expected in October 2009.

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

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

- The percentage of Technology and Media Services projects that develop and validate technologies that incorporate evidence-based materials and services. This measure will

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

---

focus on six target areas: assessment, literacy, behavior, instructional strategies, early intervention, and inclusive practices.

- The percentage of Technology and Media Services projects that make technologies that incorporate evidence-based practices available for widespread use.

Data for these measures are not yet available. The Department collected some data in fiscal year 2006, but was determined that it was flawed. A new set of data is being collected in FY 2009. Data for fiscal year 2009 are expected in October 2009.

### **Efficiency Measures**

The Department has developed an efficiency measure for the Technology and Media Services program. This measure is “the Federal cost per unit of technology and media services, by category, weighted by the expert panel quality rating.” The Department has collected data on Technology and Media Services outputs such as hours of media captioned and described and for numbers of technology products produced. The Media Services measure is calculated as the amount of funding provided for Media Services activities divided by the numbers of hours of accessible media provided, weighted by an index of the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the materials. The number of technology products weighted by the total number of technology projects and a similar quality factor. The adjusted cost of a unit of media varied widely between fiscal years 2007 and 2008, and only one year of data is available for technology products. The Department has concerns regarding the validity of the data and plans to review the data and methodology in fiscal year 2009. We anticipate that data for this measure will be reconciled and reported for fiscal year 2009.

### **Program Improvement Efforts**

The Department is working on a number of program improvement activities, including the following:

- *Develop baselines and targets for the program's two long-term performance measures.* Baselines and targets are expected in October 2009.
- *Develop baseline and targets for the program's efficiency measure.* A baseline for Media Services activities, but not Technology activities, was established. The Department is reviewing the data and methodology related to this measure and expects that baseline data and targets for Technology activities will be set in fiscal year 2009.
- *Develop a strategy for evaluating the impact and effectiveness of program activities.* The Office of Special Education Programs, which administers the Technology and Media Services program, has been working with the Institute of Education Sciences to develop a plan for evaluating this and other National Activities programs under the IDEA. An evaluation strategy is expected to be completed in fiscal year 2009.

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**

---

**Special Olympics education programs**

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

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$8,095	\$8,095	0

---

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

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

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	0
2006.....	0
2007.....	0
2008.....	\$11,790
2009 .....	8,095

**FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST**

The Administration requests \$8.095 million for Special Olympics education programs, the same as the amount appropriated for fiscal year 2009. The Administration’s request would support activities and programs of the Special Olympics, such as the Special Olympics National Youth Activation Demonstration Project (Project UNIFY) and the 2011 Special Olympics World Summer Games to be held in Athens, Greece. Project UNIFY is an education program designed to bring youth together through sports to develop teamwork skills and increase awareness and social acceptance of individuals with intellectual disabilities. Project UNIFY

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### National activities: Special Olympics education programs

---

began operation in fiscal year 2008. As of December, 2008, there were 40 projects involving 1,000 schools.

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

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<b>Project UNIFY</b>			
Total award	\$4,400	\$4,400	\$4,400
Number of projects	40	40	40
Number of project participants	150,000	150,000	150,000

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Grants to States

State or Other Area	2008. Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change From 2009 Estimate
Alabama	172,827,241	181,864,783	180,751,150	180,751,150	0
Alaska	34,370,062	32,956,419	36,229,060	36,229,060	0
Arizona	172,908,742	178,476,064	184,310,869	184,310,869	0
Arkansas	106,603,388	112,177,929	111,491,018	111,491,018	0
California	1,165,972,611	1,226,944,052	1,219,430,973	1,219,430,973	0
Colorado	144,091,119	148,730,571	153,592,924	153,592,924	0
Connecticut	126,363,618	132,971,468	132,157,229	132,157,229	0
Delaware	31,680,482	32,700,531	33,769,589	33,769,589	0
District of Columbia	15,929,040	16,441,924	16,979,449	16,979,449	0
Florida	598,437,209	627,262,665	628,343,023	628,343,023	0
Georgia	303,971,064	313,758,336	324,015,838	324,015,838	0
Hawaii	37,941,233	39,925,269	39,680,790	39,680,790	0
Idaho	51,586,394	53,247,375	54,988,157	54,988,157	0
Illinois	481,310,879	506,479,753	503,378,371	503,378,371	0
Indiana	243,042,361	253,534,865	256,402,295	256,402,295	0
Iowa	116,027,770	122,095,134	121,347,496	121,347,496	0
Kansas	101,560,911	106,871,769	106,217,350	106,217,350	0
Kentucky	150,012,542	157,569,975	157,177,501	157,177,501	0
Louisiana	179,911,586	188,749,525	188,160,303	188,160,303	0
Maine	52,004,668	53,163,974	54,389,016	54,389,016	0
Maryland	190,291,037	200,241,802	199,015,639	199,015,639	0
Massachusetts	269,786,890	280,551,559	282,156,276	282,156,276	0
Michigan	380,700,133	400,607,836	398,154,750	398,154,750	0
Minnesota	180,405,407	189,839,228	188,676,766	188,676,766	0
Mississippi	113,100,724	117,836,482	119,464,792	119,464,792	0
Missouri	215,886,084	227,175,274	225,784,186	225,784,186	0
Montana	35,120,309	36,708,056	36,979,307	36,979,307	0
Nebraska	70,965,998	74,676,976	74,219,699	74,219,699	0
Nevada	65,025,696	67,119,396	69,313,688	69,313,688	0
New Hampshire	45,102,737	47,461,265	47,170,640	47,170,640	0
New Jersey	343,527,756	360,691,433	359,278,067	359,278,067	0
New Mexico	86,618,033	91,147,493	90,589,360	90,589,360	0
New York	721,466,166	759,193,324	754,544,472	754,544,472	0
North Carolina	304,602,437	314,410,039	324,688,845	324,688,845	0
North Dakota	25,724,171	26,552,439	27,420,501	27,420,501	0
Ohio	415,983,310	437,736,052	435,055,616	435,055,616	0
Oklahoma	140,573,963	147,924,906	147,019,100	147,019,100	0
Oregon	122,569,965	128,979,436	128,189,642	128,189,642	0
Pennsylvania	405,950,138	427,178,222	424,562,436	424,562,436	0
Rhode Island	41,560,894	43,734,211	43,466,408	43,466,408	0
South Carolina	166,466,317	173,239,745	176,030,072	176,030,072	0
South Dakota	30,644,180	31,630,863	32,664,950	32,664,950	0
Tennessee	221,641,759	229,613,418	235,422,260	235,422,260	0
Texas	916,138,464	945,636,328	976,551,412	976,551,412	0
Utah	102,248,650	105,540,856	108,991,236	108,991,236	0
Vermont	24,803,013	25,601,621	26,438,599	26,438,599	0
Virginia	267,684,103	281,415,033	280,223,978	280,223,978	0
Washington	210,357,380	221,357,461	220,001,998	220,001,998	0
West Virginia	72,177,653	75,951,991	75,486,907	75,486,907	0
Wisconsin	197,853,865	208,200,108	206,925,213	206,925,213	0
Wyoming	26,020,818	25,786,496	27,736,710	27,736,710	0
American Samoa	6,297,058	230,169	6,297,058	6,297,058	0
Guam	13,962,402	510,352	13,962,402	13,962,402	0
Northern Mariana Islands	4,785,135	174,906	4,785,135	4,785,135	0
Puerto Rico	105,695,291	109,098,472	112,665,159	112,665,159	0
Virgin Islands	8,874,264	324,371	8,874,264	8,874,264	0
Freely Associated States	6,579,306	0	6,579,306	6,579,306	0
Indian set-aside	88,767,145	0	92,011,750	92,011,750	0
Other (non-State allocations)	15,000,000	0	15,000,000	15,000,000	0
	10,947,511,57				
Total	1	11,300,000,000	11,505,211,000	11,505,211,000	0

## SPECIAL EDUCATION

### Preschool Grants

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	5,506,029	5,969,828	5,506,026	5,506,026	0
Alaska	1,241,975	1,332,736	1,241,974	1,241,974	0
Arizona	5,259,801	5,702,860	5,259,797	5,259,797	0
Arkansas	5,279,323	5,565,646	5,279,320	5,279,320	0
California	37,840,710	41,028,219	37,840,680	37,840,680	0
Colorado	4,871,136	5,281,455	4,871,133	4,871,133	0
Connecticut	4,827,210	5,089,013	4,827,207	4,827,207	0
Delaware	1,235,499	1,332,738	1,235,498	1,235,498	0
District of Columbia	240,249	260,486	240,249	240,249	0
Florida	18,170,242	19,700,808	18,170,231	18,170,231	0
Georgia	9,637,532	10,449,347	9,637,526	9,637,526	0
Hawaii	978,634	1,061,069	978,633	978,633	0
Idaho	2,152,049	2,268,765	2,152,048	2,152,048	0
Illinois	17,369,463	18,311,491	17,369,453	17,369,453	0
Indiana	8,757,566	9,232,530	8,757,561	8,757,561	0
Iowa	3,928,346	4,141,398	3,928,344	3,928,344	0
Kansas	4,265,253	4,496,577	4,265,251	4,265,251	0
Kentucky	10,051,610	10,596,756	10,051,604	10,051,604	0
Louisiana	6,372,736	6,909,542	6,372,732	6,372,732	0
Maine	2,473,552	2,607,704	2,473,551	2,473,551	0
Maryland	6,566,015	6,922,121	6,566,011	6,566,011	0
Massachusetts	9,735,466	10,263,466	9,735,461	9,735,461	0
Michigan	12,355,632	13,396,405	12,355,625	12,355,625	0
Minnesota	7,310,811	7,707,311	7,310,807	7,310,807	0
Mississippi	4,160,483	4,510,940	4,160,481	4,160,481	0
Missouri	5,900,044	6,397,033	5,900,040	5,900,040	0
Montana	1,162,983	1,260,947	1,162,982	1,162,982	0
Nebraska	2,220,152	2,340,561	2,220,151	2,220,151	0
Nevada	2,205,315	2,391,080	2,205,313	2,205,313	0
New Hampshire	1,533,160	1,616,311	1,533,159	1,533,159	0
New Jersey	11,197,629	11,804,929	11,197,623	11,197,623	0
New Mexico	3,137,318	3,401,589	3,137,316	3,137,316	0
New York	33,216,002	35,017,461	33,215,984	33,215,984	0
North Carolina	11,133,329	12,071,141	11,133,323	11,133,323	0
North Dakota	794,614	861,549	794,613	794,613	0
Ohio	12,321,462	13,359,358	12,321,454	12,321,454	0
Oklahoma	3,580,349	3,881,940	3,580,346	3,580,346	0
Oregon	3,794,137	3,999,911	3,794,135	3,794,135	0
Pennsylvania	13,749,342	14,495,034	13,749,334	13,749,334	0
South Carolina	7,027,486	7,572,406	7,027,485	7,027,485	0
Rhode Island	1,645,016	1,734,233	1,645,015	1,645,015	0
South Dakota	1,442,067	1,520,277	1,442,066	1,442,066	0
Tennessee	6,775,233	7,345,943	6,775,229	6,775,229	0
Texas	22,438,331	24,328,422	22,438,313	22,438,313	0
Utah	3,504,241	3,694,292	3,504,239	3,504,239	0
Vermont	845,111	916,299	845,110	845,110	0
Virginia	8,983,286	9,470,492	8,983,281	8,983,281	0
Washington	8,039,547	8,475,569	8,039,543	8,039,543	0
West Virginia	3,428,679	3,614,632	3,428,677	3,428,677	0
Wisconsin	9,322,204	9,827,791	9,322,199	9,322,199	0
Wyoming	1,038,035	1,125,474	1,038,034	1,038,034	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	3,076,886	3,336,115	3,076,836	3,076,836	0
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0	0
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>374,099,280</b>	<b>400,000,000</b>	<b>374,099,000</b>	<b>374,099,000</b>	<b>0</b>

**SPECIAL EDUCATION**  
**Grants for Infants and Families**

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	6,077,971	6,090,859	6,128,186	6,128,186	0
Alaska	2,135,315	2,139,843	2,152,956	2,152,956	0
Arizona	9,966,824	9,987,957	10,049,168	10,049,168	0
Arkansas	3,957,948	3,966,341	3,990,648	3,990,648	0
California	53,120,669	53,233,307	53,559,544	53,559,544	0
Colorado	6,935,430	6,950,136	6,992,730	6,992,730	0
Connecticut	4,081,315	4,089,969	4,115,034	4,115,034	0
Delaware	2,135,315	2,139,843	2,152,956	2,152,956	0
District of Columbia	2,135,315	2,139,843	2,152,956	2,152,956	0
Florida	23,028,291	23,077,120	23,218,548	23,218,548	0
Georgia	14,614,553	14,645,542	14,735,296	14,735,296	0
Hawaii	2,135,315	2,139,843	2,152,956	2,152,956	0
Idaho	2,354,608	2,359,601	2,374,062	2,374,062	0
Illinois	17,507,363	17,544,486	17,652,007	17,652,007	0
Indiana	8,549,840	8,567,969	8,620,477	8,620,477	0
Iowa	3,862,827	3,871,018	3,894,742	3,894,742	0
Kansas	3,863,905	3,872,098	3,895,828	3,895,828	0
Kentucky	5,444,061	5,455,604	5,489,039	5,489,039	0
Louisiana	5,789,506	5,801,783	5,837,338	5,837,338	0
Maine	2,135,315	2,139,843	2,152,956	2,152,956	0
Maryland	7,489,632	7,505,513	7,551,511	7,551,511	0
Massachusetts	7,346,249	7,361,826	7,406,943	7,406,943	0
Michigan	12,320,224	12,346,348	12,422,012	12,422,012	0
Minnesota	6,998,387	7,013,227	7,056,206	7,056,206	0
Mississippi	4,371,673	4,380,944	4,407,791	4,407,791	0
Missouri	7,774,440	7,790,925	7,838,671	7,838,671	0
Montana	2,135,315	2,139,843	2,152,956	2,152,956	0
Nebraska	2,558,173	2,563,597	2,579,308	2,579,308	0
Nevada	3,892,934	3,901,189	3,925,097	3,925,097	0
New Hampshire	2,135,315	2,139,843	2,152,956	2,152,956	0
New Jersey	10,776,837	10,799,688	10,865,873	10,865,873	0
New Mexico	2,896,598	2,902,740	2,920,529	2,920,529	0
New York	23,636,568	23,686,688	23,831,850	23,831,850	0
North Carolina	12,703,744	12,730,682	12,808,700	12,808,700	0
North Dakota	2,135,315	2,139,843	2,152,956	2,152,956	0
Ohio	14,379,119	14,409,609	14,497,916	14,497,916	0
Oklahoma	5,261,101	5,272,256	5,304,567	5,304,567	0
Oregon	4,695,600	4,705,556	4,734,395	4,734,395	0
Pennsylvania	14,235,768	14,265,953	14,353,382	14,353,382	0
Rhode Island	2,135,315	2,139,843	2,152,956	2,152,956	0
South Carolina	5,879,403	5,891,870	5,927,977	5,927,977	0
South Dakota	2,135,315	2,139,843	2,152,956	2,152,956	0
Tennessee	8,083,117	8,100,257	8,149,899	8,149,899	0
Texas	39,335,134	39,418,541	39,660,114	39,660,114	0
Utah	5,077,129	5,087,894	5,119,075	5,119,075	0
Vermont	2,135,315	2,139,843	2,152,956	2,152,956	0
Virginia	10,243,859	10,265,580	10,328,493	10,328,493	0
Washington	8,430,457	8,448,333	8,500,108	8,500,108	0
West Virginia	2,135,315	2,139,843	2,152,956	2,152,956	0
Wisconsin	6,984,803	6,999,614	7,042,510	7,042,510	0
Wyoming	2,135,315	2,139,843	2,152,956	2,152,956	0
American Samoa	582,117	21,277	582,117	582,117	0
Guam	1,424,395	52,064	1,424,395	1,424,395	0
Northern Mariana Islands	446,581	16,323	446,581	446,581	0
Puerto Rico	4,777,823	4,787,954	4,817,296	4,817,296	0
Virgin Islands	759,289	27,753	759,289	759,289	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	5,378,442	0	5,623,320	5,623,320	0
Undistributed (State Incentive Grants)	0	71,914,050	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>435,653,802</b>	<b>500,000,000</b>	<b>439,427,000</b>	<b>439,427,000</b>	<b>0</b>