

Department of Education

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Fiscal Year 2009 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations Language.....	H-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes.....	H-2
Amounts Available for Obligation.....	H-4
Obligations by Object Classification.....	H-4
Summary of Changes.....	H-5
Authorizing Legislation.....	H-6
Appropriations History.....	H-7
Summary of Request.....	H-8
State grants:	
Grants to States.....	H-10
Preschool grants.....	H-24
Grants for infants and families.....	H-38
National activities:	
State personnel development.....	H-50
Technical assistance and dissemination.....	H-58
Personnel preparation.....	H-65
Parent information centers.....	H-75
Technology and media services.....	H-83
Special Olympics education programs.....	H-90
State Tables.....	H-92

SPECIAL EDUCATION

For carrying out the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act ("IDEA") [and the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004, ¹ \$12,181,473,000], \$12,335,943,000, of which [\$5,084,406,000] \$4,446,820,000 shall become available on July 1, [2008] 2009, and shall remain available through September 30, [2009] 2010, and of which [\$6,856,444,000] \$7,647,444,000 shall become available on October 1, [2008] 2009, and shall remain available through September 30, [2009] 2010, for academic year [2008-2009] 2009-2010.² [Provided, That \$13,000,000 shall be for Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Inc., to support activities under section 674(c)(1)(D) of the IDEA:³ *Provided further*, That \$1,500,000 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:]⁴ *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 [2007] 2008, increased by the amount of inflation as specified in section 619(d)(2)(B) of the IDEA, or the percentage increase in the funds appropriated under section 611(i) of the IDEA ⁵ [: *Provided further*, That nothing in section 674(e) of the IDEA shall be construed to establish a private right of action against the National Instructional Materials Access Center for failure to perform the duties of such center or otherwise authorize a private right of action related to the performance of such center:⁶ *Provided further*, That \$7,500,000 shall be available to support the 2009 Special Olympics World Winter Games].⁷ (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2008.*)

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>¹ For carrying out the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act ("IDEA") [and the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004, ...]</p>	<p>Language providing that funds included in the appropriation include those for the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004 have been deleted because no funds are requested under this authority in 2009.</p>
<p>²... of which [\$5,084,406,000] <u>\$4,446,820,000</u> shall become available on July 1, [2008] <u>2009</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2009] <u>2010</u>, and of which [\$6,856,444,000] <u>\$7,647,444,000</u> shall become available on October 1, [2008] <u>2009</u>, and shall remain available through September 30, [2009] <u>2010</u>, for academic year [2008-2009] <u>2009-2010</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>³ [<i>Provided</i>, That \$13,000,000 shall be for Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Inc., to support activities under section 674(c)(1)(D) of the IDEA: ...]</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 are being supported in 2009 under a multi-year grant awarded in 2007.</p>
<p>⁴ [... <i>Provided further</i>, That \$1,500,000 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>The 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 2009.</p>

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>⁵ ... <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 [2007] <u>2008</u>, increased by the amount of inflation as specified in section 619(d)(2)(B) of the IDEA, or the percentage increase in the funds appropriated under section 611(i) of the IDEA ...</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 2008 plus inflation or the percentage increase in the appropriation for the Grants to States program.</p>
<p>⁶ [<i>Provided further</i>, That nothing in section 674(e) of the IDEA shall be construed to establish a private right of action against the National Instructional Materials Access Center for failure to perform the duties of such center or otherwise authorize a private right of action related to the performance of such center: ...]</p>	<p>This language clarified that the National Instructional Materials Access Center is not liable for nonperformance related to its duties or potential copyright infringement by States using the services of the Center. The language is deleted because it was included in the 2008 appropriations act and does not have to be repeated each year.</p>
<p>⁷ [... <i>Provided further</i>, That \$7,500,000 shall be available to support the 2009 Special Olympics World Winter Games].</p>	<p>The language earmarks an amount for the Special Olympics World Winter Games. The language is deleted because funds are not requested for Special Olympics in 2009.</p>

SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

	2007	2008	2009
Discretionary appropriation:			
Appropriation.....	\$11,802,867	\$12,181,473	\$12,335,943
Across-the-board reduction.....	<u>0</u>	<u>-187,789</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, appropriation.....	11,802,867	11,993,684	12,335,943
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-5,424,200	-6,856,444	-7,647,444
Advance from prior year.....	<u>5,424,200</u>	<u>5,424,200</u>	<u>6,856,444</u>
Subtotal, comparable budget authority	11,802,867	11,561,440	11,544,943
Unobligated balance, start of year	170,813	79,343	0
Unobligated balance, end of year	<u>-79,343</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations	11,894,337	10,640,783	11,544,943

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

	2007	2008	2009
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services	\$4,555	\$4,750	\$4,700
Peer review	<u>1,480</u>	<u>1,455</u>	<u>1,435</u>
Subtotal	6,035	6,205	6,135
Grants	<u>11,888,302</u>	<u>10,634,578</u>	<u>11,538,808</u>
Total, obligations.....	11,894,337	10,640,783	11,544,943

SPECIAL EDUCATION

**Summary of Changes
(\$000s)**

2008	\$11,993,684
2009	<u>12,335,943</u>
Net change.....	+342,259

	<u>2008 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Increases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
State grants – Grants to States – Increase to maintain Federal per child funding at about 2008 level.	\$10,947,511	+\$337,000
National activities – State personnel development – Increase to provide new and continuation funds 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.	22,598	<u>+25,402</u>
Subtotal, increases		+362,402
Decreases:		
<u>Program:</u>		
National activities – Technology and media services – Decrease because of elimination of 2007 appropriation earmarks for designated organizations.	39,301	-8,352
Special Olympics education programs – Decrease because of elimination of funding for earmarks.	11,790	<u>-11,790</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-20,142
Net change		+342,259

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Authorizing Legislation
(\$000s)

Activity	2008 Authorized	2008 Estimate	2009 Authorized	2009 Request
State Grants:				
Grants to States (<i>IDEA-B-611</i>)	\$19,229,188 ¹	\$10,947,511 ²	\$21,519,459 ¹	\$11,284,511 ²
Preschool grants (<i>IDEA-B-619</i>)	Indefinite	374,099	Indefinite	374,099
Grants for infants and families (<i>IDEA-C</i>)	Indefinite	435,654	Indefinite	435,654
National activities:				
State personnel development (<i>IDEA-D-1</i>)	Indefinite	22,598	Indefinite	48,000
Technical assistance and dissemination (<i>IDEA-D-2-663</i>)	Indefinite	48,049	Indefinite	48,049
Personnel preparation (<i>IDEA-D-2-662</i>)	Indefinite	88,153	Indefinite	88,153
Parent information centers (<i>IDEA-D-3-671-673</i>)	Indefinite	26,528	Indefinite	26,528
Technology and media services (<i>IDEA-D-3-674</i>)	Indefinite	39,301	Indefinite	30,949
Special Olympics education programs (<i>SOSEA</i> ³ 3(a))	Indefinite	11,790	Indefinite	0
Unfunded authorizations:				
Safe learning environments (<i>IDEA-D-2-665</i>)	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>0</u>
Total definite authorization	19,229,188		21,519,459	
Total appropriation		11,993,684		12,335,943

¹ Funding for technical assistance on State data collection is limited to \$25,000 thousand adjusted upward for inflation. This amount is estimated to be \$27,362 thousand for fiscal year 2008 and \$28,043 thousand for fiscal year 2009.

² Includes \$15,000 thousand for technical assistance on State data collection in fiscal years 2008 and 2009.

³ Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Appropriations History
(\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2000	\$5,449,896	\$5,833,146	\$6,035,646	\$6,036,646
2000 Rescission (2000 Advance for 2001)	0 (1,925,000)	0 (3,608,000)	0 (2,201,059)	-450 (3,742,000)
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	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 (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 ¹	N/A ¹	1,802,867 ¹ (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)	12,335,943 (7,647,444)			

¹ 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.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2009 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

(in thousands of dollars)			2007 Annual		2009	Change from 2008 Appropriation	
Office, Account, Program and Activity	Category Code	CR Operating Plan	2008 Appropriation	President's Request	Amount	Percent	
Special Education (IDEA)							
1. State grants:							
(a) Grants to States (Part B-611):							
Annual appropriation	D	5,358,761	4,091,067	3,637,067	(454,000)	-11.1%	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	5,424,200	6,856,444	7,647,444	791,000	11.5%	
Subtotal		10,782,961	10,947,511	11,284,511	337,000	3.1%	
(b) Preschool grants (Part B-619)	D	380,751	374,099	374,099	0	0.0%	
(c) Grants for infants and families (Part C)	D	436,400	435,654	435,654	0	0.0%	
Subtotal, State grants		11,600,112	11,757,264	12,094,264	337,000	2.9%	
2. National activities (Part D):							
(a) State personnel development (Subpart 1)	D	0	22,598	48,000	25,402	112.4%	
(b) Technical assistance and dissemination (section 663)	D	48,903	48,049	48,049	0	0.0%	
(c) Personnel preparation (section 662)	D	89,720	88,153	88,153	0	0.0%	
(d) Parent information centers (sections 671-673)	D	25,704	26,528	26,528	0	0.0%	
(e) Technology and media services (section 674)	D	38,428	39,301	30,949	(8,352)	-21.3%	
Subtotal		202,755	224,629	241,679	17,050	7.6%	
3. Special Olympics education programs (Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act)	D	0	11,790	0	(11,790)	-100.0%	
Total, Appropriation	D	11,802,867	11,993,684	12,335,943	342,259	2.9%	
Total, Budget authority	D	11,802,867	10,561,440	11,544,943	983,503	9.3%	
Current		6,378,667 ¹	5,137,240 ²	4,688,499 ³	(448,741)	-8.7%	
Prior year's advance		5,424,200	5,424,200	6,856,444	1,432,244	26.4%	
Outlays	D	11,777,258	11,771,719	11,939,905	168,186	1.4%	

¹ Excludes an advance appropriation of \$5,424,200 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

² Excludes an advance appropriation of \$6,856,444 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

³ Excludes an advance appropriation of \$7,647,444 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 no child is left behind, including students with disabilities. The fiscal year 2009 request for Special Education of \$12.3 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 \$11.3 billion for the **Grants to States** program, an increase of \$337.0 million over the fiscal year 2008 appropriation level, to assist States and schools in covering the excess costs of providing special education and related services to children with disabilities ages 3 through 21. This level would maintain the level of 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 \$1,658 for each of the 6.796 million children with disabilities who are estimated to be served for 2009.

The requests of \$374.1 million for **Preschool Grants** and \$435.7 million for **Grants for Infants and Families** are the same as the fiscal year 2008 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 \$241.7 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.

The Administration requests \$48.0 million for **State Personnel Development**, an increase of \$25.4 million over the fiscal year 2008 appropriation, 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 fiscal year 2008 appropriation does not include sufficient funds to cover the 2008 continuation awards or provide new funding for the 6 States whose projects expire on September 30, 2008. The funds requested would provide for the full cost of continuation awards to 41 States and new awards to 5 States.

Technical Assistance and Dissemination, Personnel Preparation, and Parent Information Centers would be funded at their 2008 levels of \$48.0 million, \$88.2 million, and \$26.5 million, respectively.

The **Technology and Media Services** program would be reduced from \$39.3 million to \$30.9 million, reflecting the elimination of funding for appropriation earmarks included in the fiscal year 2008 appropriation.

No funds are requested for **Special Olympics Education Programs**, which was funded at a level of \$11.8 million in 2008.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): \$21,519,459 ¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$4,091,067 ²	\$3,637,067 ²	-\$454,000
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	<u>6,856,444</u>	<u>7,647,444</u>	<u>+791,000</u>
Total	10,947,511	11,284,511	+337,000

¹ 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 2009 would be \$28.0 million.

² Includes \$15.0 million for technical assistance activities in fiscal years 2008 and 2009.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Grants to States program provides formula grants to assist the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Secretary of the Interior, Outlying Areas, and the Freely Associated States in meeting the excess costs of providing special education and related services to children with disabilities. In order to be eligible for funding, States must serve all children with disabilities 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 amount available for allocation to States 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 in the age range for which the States guarantees 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. If the amount available for allocation to States remains the same from one year to the next, additional funds are awarded to each State so that there is no change in funding from one year to the next. 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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

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. A portion of the funds becomes available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year of the appropriation and remains available for 15 months, through September 30 of the following year. The remaining funds – the advance appropriation – become available 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 2009, school districts will use both the forward- and advance- funded amounts primarily for the 2009-2010 school year.

Funds will remain available for obligation at State and local levels for an additional year. Hence, States and local educational agencies will have until September 30, 2011 to obligate their fiscal year 2009 awards.

Most 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. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 made significant changes regarding the State set-aside. As under the prior law, 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 2009, this amount is estimated to be \$926,000.

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 to assist LEAs cover 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 local educational agencies or consortiums of local educational agencies to address the needs of specific high cost children.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

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 a State that provided, in the 2003-2004 school year or any subsequent year, 100 percent of the non-Federal costs of special education services 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, as amended, allows an LEA to reduce its level of support each year by up to 50 percent of the increase in its allocation under the Grants to States program over the prior year, less any funds it uses for early intervening services. A State educational agency may prohibit an LEA from reducing its support if it determines that the LEA is not meeting the requirements of Part B of IDEA.

An LEA may also use up to 15 percent of its allocation, less any amount it uses to reduce its maintenance of effort level, for early intervening services to address the needs of students who require additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed, but who are not identified as needing special education.

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.

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.

Support for studies and evaluations of IDEA programs, which was formerly provided under this activity, is now provided through the Institute of Education Sciences account.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2004	\$10,068,106 ¹
2005	10,589,746 ²
2006	10,582,961 ³
2007	10,782,961 ³
2008.....	10,947,511 ³

¹ Includes \$16 million for studies and evaluations.

² Includes \$10 million for technical assistance.

³ Includes \$15 million for technical assistance.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$11.3 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 is \$337 million more than the 2008 appropriation.

The request would provide an average of \$1,658 per child. This compares with \$1,609 per child in 2008 and \$1,584 per child in 2007. 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 2007 actual level of 6.796 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 (APPR), 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. Over the last 33 years, IDEA has been successful in ensuring that all children with disabilities have access to a free appropriate public education. The primary challenge of the program now is to improve the quality of that education so that children with disabilities can, to the maximum extent possible, meet challenging standards that have been established for all children, and be prepared to lead productive, independent adult lives.

Both the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 have placed greater emphasis on improving results for children with disabilities through heightened expectations and increased accountability. The upcoming reauthorization of No Child Left Behind is one of the President's top priorities. In working toward that reauthorization, the Administration will strive to preserve and enhance the basic No Child Left Behind principles of measuring the progress of all children, including those with disabilities, and holding schools accountable for helping them improve.

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, the count of children with disabilities reported by States to the Department for fiscal year 2006 was a small reduction from the fiscal year 2005 count. The fiscal year 2007 count, in turn, was smaller than the fiscal year 2006 count. 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 2008 and 2009 at 6.796 million children, the same level as reported by States for fiscal year 2007.

Department of the Interior Set-Aside

As in previous years, we are proposing that the fiscal year 2009 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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

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 about \$20,000, over 12 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 135 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure (APPE).

Technical Assistance

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 placed increased emphasis on improving results for children with disabilities through the collection of data on performance. The amendments require 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 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 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. One of the indicators included in State Performance Plans is the participation and performance of children with disabilities on State assessments. Many States need support in developing, enhancing, or redesigning their assessment systems to ensure that they meet the requirements of No Child Left Behind and the IDEA with regard to the assessment of children with disabilities. The request includes \$15 million to assist States in collecting data, the same level of assistance that would be provided for 2008. Most of these funds would be used to assist States in the area of assessing and reporting on assessments for children with disabilities. Funds would be used to support technical assistance contracts and General Supervision Enhancement Grants to State agencies, which would enhance State data collection capacity.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<u>Program funding (\$000):</u>			
Formula grants to States	\$10,640,540	\$10,803,246	\$11,136,991
Formula grants to Outlying Areas	33,409	33,919	34,963
Grants to Freely Associated States	6,579	6,579	6,579
Department of the Interior	87,433	88,767	90,978
Technical assistance	14,927	14,930	14,930
Peer review of new Technical Assistance award applications	<u>73</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>70</u>
 Total	 10,782,961	 10,947,511	 11,284,511
 Number of children with disabilities served ages 3 through 21	 6,796,000 ¹	 6,796,000 ¹	 6,796,000 ¹
 Average Federal share per child (\$)	 \$1,584 ¹	 \$1,609 ¹	 \$1,658 ¹
 Average per pupil expenditure (APPE) (\$)	 \$9,249 ¹	 \$9,370 ¹	 \$9,701 ¹
 Federal funding as a percentage of APPE	 17% ¹	 17% ¹	 17% ¹

¹ Estimate.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

Basis for leaving school for youth with disabilities ages 14 and older:¹

	School Year <u>2003-2004</u>	School Year <u>2004-2005</u>	School Year <u>2005-2006</u>
Graduating with a regular diploma	54.5%	54.4%	56.5%
Graduating through certification	13.0%	15.5%	15.3%
Dropping out, or moved but not known to have continued in education	31.1%	28.3%	26.2%
Reaching maximum age for services and other reasons	<u>1.4%</u>	<u>1.8%</u>	<u>1.9%</u>
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

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

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

History of Children Served and Program Funding

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	Children Served (000s)	Appropriation (\$000)	Federal Share Per Child ¹	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 ²	425	8%
1996	5,629	2,323,837	413	7%
1997	5,806	3,107,522	535	9%
1998	5,978	3,807,700 ³	636	11%
1999	6,133	4,310,700 ³	701	11%
2000	6,274	4,989,685 ³	793	12%
2001	6,381	6,339,685 ³	991	14%
2002	6,483	7,528,533 ³	1,159	15%
2003	6,611	8,874,398 ³	1,340	17%
2004	6,723	10,068,106 ³	1,495	18%
2005	6,820	10,589,746 ⁵	1,558	18%
2006	6,814	10,582,961 ⁵	1,551	18%
2007	6,796	10,782,961 ⁵	1,584	17% ⁴
2008	6,796 ⁴	10,947,511 ⁵	1,609 ⁴	17% ⁴
2009	6,796 ⁴	11,284,511 ⁵	1,658 ⁴	17% ⁴

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

² Includes \$82.878 million to offset elimination of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Chapter 1 Handicapped program.

³ 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.

⁴ Estimate.

⁵ Includes \$10 million for technical assistance activities in 2005 and \$15 million in 2006 through 2009.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including 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 2009 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

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

National Assessment of Educational Progress Measures

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

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

^{1/} 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 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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

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.

No Child Left Behind 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 NCLB goal to have all children performing at proficient or advanced levels by 2014. States were not required to test students in all grades 3 through 8 in 2005. However, they were required to test children in all grades 3 through 8 in 2006. The target for 2007 was based on the incomplete 2005 tests. Targets for 2008 and 2009 have been revised based on the more comprehensive 2006 data. Performance data for 2007 should be available in September 2008.

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	
2008	54.0	
2009	61.7	

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	
2008	22.2	
2009	18.5	

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	
2008	53.3	
2009	61.1	

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

Year	Targets	Actual
2005		24.9
2006		27.2
2007	19.4	
2008	20.5	
2009	17.0	

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

Assessment of progress: While performance on only one of these measures, performance on State reading assessments, improved between 2005 and 2006, it should be kept in mind that the data for 2005 was incomplete. A comparison between data for 2006 and 2007 should provide a much better idea of how States are progressing.

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

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

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

Source: Annual data collection from States by OSERS and through EDEN/EDFacts.

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. Previous 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.”

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

Postsecondary Outcomes

One of the purposes of IDEA is to help prepare children with disabilities for further education, employment, and independent living. The Department has developed an indicator on employment and postsecondary education. Data for this indicator are collected through longitudinal studies and, therefore, they are available only intermittently. However, 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. Baseline data have been extracted from the National Longitudinal Transition Study 1 (NLTS1). Data from that study indicate that, for 1987, 52 percent of students were either competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within 2 years of leaving high school. Data from the National Longitudinal Transition Study 2 (NLTS2) indicate that this percentage grew to 59 percent for 2004 and to 75 percent for 2005.

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, and 2006 the average times between the completion of the visit and the letter of findings were 123 days, 107 days, and 50 days, respectively. The targets for 2008 and 2009 are 95 days and 90 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.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

PART assessments of the Grants to States program were conducted in 2002 and 2005. In 2002 the program was rated "Results Not Demonstrated." The Department has addressed most of the concerns raised in the 2002 PART analysis. The rating resulting from the 2005 assessment was "Adequate." The improvement in rating was due largely to the establishment of meaningful long-term goals and the demonstration of satisfactory progress in reaching those goals.

The PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department's actions to address them.

- *Conduct 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.* Funds requested for the Special Education Studies and Evaluation program in the Institute of Education Sciences account are being used to conduct an independent evaluation of the program. The Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services has been meeting with the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) on the development of the evaluation for the program. Section 664 of IDEA requires IES to conduct a national assessment of activities carried out with Federal funds under IDEA. As part of this assessment, IES is conducting an evaluation of the Grants to States program, which will address effectiveness and impact of the program. IES expects to gather much of

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants to States

the data for this evaluation from extant sources including longitudinal studies and data collected from States under section 618 of IDEA. The evaluation is expected to be completed by September 2008.

- *Identify 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.
- *Improve 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.
- *Develop and implement a new measure to replace the current measure on postsecondary outcomes for children with disabilities.* The current measure relies on performance data collected through longitudinal studies that are not planned to be continued. The Department will soon be collecting data directly from the States on postsecondary outcomes. A new measure on postsecondary outcomes needs to be developed based on this new data collection.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$374,099	\$374,099	0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

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 this section 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.

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$387,699
2005.....	384,597
2006.....	380,751
2007.....	380,751
2008.....	374,099

FY 2009 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 2008 level. The Administration believes the

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

request will provide an appropriate level of resources to support activities for young children with disabilities. 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. The Administration is requesting \$11.3 billion for the Grants to States program for fiscal year 2009, an increase of over \$337 million above the fiscal year 2008 level. In addition, young children with disabilities benefit from other early childhood programs funded by the Federal Government, such as Head Start. We believe that the combination of the proposed funding under the Preschool Grants and Grants to States programs and other sources will provide sufficient funds to support State efforts to provide appropriate special education and related services to preschool aged children with disabilities.

“Unprecedented attention to schooling from preschool through 3rd grade offers greater promise for improving outcomes than almost any other step that educators might take.”¹ The importance of preschool services for children with disabilities continues to increase as expectations for children aged 3 through 5 are raised. According to a survey of the 50 States and the District of Columbia conducted for *Quality Counts*², 41 States and the District of Columbia currently have early-learning standards aligned with State academic standards for the elementary grades. Thirteen States have defined what young children need to know and be able to do to be ready for school. In addition, 16 States require districts to assess the school readiness of entering students, and 18 States provide programs to help young children who do not meet school-readiness expectations. “The basic principles of neuroscience and the technology of human skill formation indicate that later remediation for highly vulnerable children will produce less favorable outcomes and cost more than appropriate intervention at a younger age.”³ Funding under the Preschool Grants program supports early childhood programs that provide services needed to prepare young children with disabilities to enter school ready to learn.

Preschool Grant funds are used to support the inclusion of young children with disabilities in the expanding array of State early childhood programs and federally funded programs. For example, States are developing and initiating 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.

Numbers Served

From fiscal year 1992 to 2007, the number of children served under the Preschool Grants program increased from 398,355 to 714,384, a 79.7 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

¹ Building Blocks: Making Children Successful in the Early Years of School, Gene I. Maeroff, Palgrave Macmillan Press, 2006.

² “Quality Counts 2007, From Cradle to Career: Connecting American Education from Birth to Adulthood,” Education Week, January 4, 2007.

³ The Science of Early Childhood Development: Closing the Gap Between What We Know and What We Do, A publication of the National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, Center on the Developing Child, Harvard University, 2007.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

and the District of Columbia was only 9.1 percent. After increasing an average of 8.2 percent per year from 1992 to 1996, the rate of growth in the number of children served under this program slowed dramatically. The fiscal year 2005 increase was 3.3 percent, but the 2006 increase was only 0.3 percent and the 2007 increase 1.5 percent. The Department predicts that the number of children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 will continue to increase in fiscal years 2007 through 2009, but only by 2 percent each year. The Department expects to receive the data on the number of children served for fiscal year 2008 in October 2008.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u> ¹	<u>2009</u> ¹
Children served ²	714,384	728,700	743,300
Share per child (whole \$)	\$533	\$513	\$503

¹ Estimates.

² 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.

History of Children Served and Program Funding

<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 ¹
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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Children Served</u> (000s)	<u>Appropriation</u> (\$000s)	<u>Federal</u> <u>Share Per Child</u>
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	729 ²	374,099	513 ²
2009	743 ²	374,099 ²	503 ²

¹ The Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1986 changed the Preschool Grants program from a grant program that provided an incentive for States to serve children with disabilities aged 3 through 5 to a 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.

² Estimates.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2009 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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

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 baseline data on entering students in the Annual Performance Reports (APRs) submitted in February 2007. Data covered the July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006 reporting period 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. It should be noted that there are a number of concerns with this initial 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 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 will continue to work with the States in fiscal years 2008 and 2009 to resolve these issues and improve the reliability of the data they submit. In February 2008, States will submit a second year of data that will include children who have been in the program for more than one year.

States also have collected the first year of data on child progress for preschool children with disabilities who entered in reporting periods July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006 and July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007 and who exited the program during the period covering July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007 and had been in the program at least 6 months. States will report the data to the Department by February 2008.

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

Assessment of progress: This measure replaces 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. The Department believes this new measure will provide a more reliable indicator of placement data for preschool-aged children and a more meaningful measure of the extent to which children with disabilities are spending time 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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

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). The Department proposed the addition of another 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. A Federal Register notice was published in July 2007 soliciting comments on this change. The comment period closed in September 2007. The Department is currently reviewing comments regarding the data collection and the extent to which changes are indicated. This change would not be implemented until school year 2008-09.

States began using the revised data collection (OMB No. 1820-0517) 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 is due to the Department in February 2008. The new data collection is very different from the prior collection, and 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. For some States, this involved new reporting procedures and data collections. The Department, to assist States in collecting the preschool educational environments data, is using technical assistance providers such as the Early Childhood Outcome 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.

Measure: 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.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	36	34
2005	37	33
2006	37	38
2007	38	
2008	39	
2009	40	

Assessment of progress: The Department met its target for fiscal year 2006. This is the first time the target has been met since we began collecting data for this measure in 1999. We anticipate that the fiscal year 2006 data will become available in November 2008.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

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.

Efficiency Measure

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

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, may not recur. As such, the Department does not believe it should revise the targets for this measure based on a single year's performance.

Other Performance Information

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

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

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

The first data collection, conducted in 2003 and 2004, had a superior response rate: 96 percent of families completed a parent interview and 100 percent of State educational agencies, 90 percent of local school districts, and 76 percent of teachers or service providers completed a questionnaire. Children participating in PEELS were evaluated in the following areas: literacy (letter and word identification and vocabulary), pre-math (applied math problems), and social skills and behavior. Of the child participants, 84 percent received one-on-one assessments. When direct assessment of a child was not possible, the child's teacher or service provider was asked to report the child's level of functioning by completing an established indirect assessment instrument. Twelve percent of the children participating received an indirect assessment. Information also was collected on services received and demographic data. In addition, 75 percent of the children received teacher-rating scores related to social skills and behavior.

Following are the disability classifications for the children participating in the PEELS:

Disability Classifications for the PEELS Study

Speech or Language Impairment	49.2%
Developmental Delay	26.8%
Autism	7.0%
Low Incidence	5.7%
Mental Retardation	3.7%
Learning Disability	2.4%
Other Health Impairment	2.4%
Orthopedic Impairment	1.8%
Emotional Disturbance	1.0%

The PEELS released "Preschoolers with Disabilities: A Look at School Readiness Skills" was released in 2006. This report provides a profile of standardized assessments scores for preschoolers with disabilities. These children participated in the following series of assessments to determine school readiness:

- **Literacy: Letter and Word Identification**—These skills were assessed using the Woodcock-Johnson III, Letter-Word Identification subtest (Woodcock, McGrew, and Mather 2001);
- **Literacy: Vocabulary**—Receptive vocabulary was assessed using an adapted version of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary test (PPVT) (Dunn and Dunn 1997); and
- **Math: Applied Problems**—The ability to analyze and solve practical math problems was assessed using the Applied Problems subtest (Woodcock, McGrew, and Mather, 2001).

In addition, teachers rated 75 percent of the children in the sample on social skills and problem behaviors using the Preschool and Kindergarten Behavior Scales (Merrell 2002).

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

In general, preschoolers with disabilities scored within the normal range in each area, though below the population mean, on each standardized assessment of readiness. For example, these children scored 90.1 percent on vocabulary, 90.3 percent on applied math problems, 92.8 percent on social skills, and 98.2 percent for both letter-word recognition and problem behaviors. This is compared to a population mean of 100. However, there was variation among population groups. In the area of emerging literacy, children with autism, speech or language impairments, or other health impairments had scores near or above the population mean in letter and word identification skills. All of the children, except those in the mental retardation category, also scored close to the mean on vocabulary. On the other hand, in the social skills area, teacher ratings indicated that children in the low incidence, autism, and mental retardation disability groups were significantly below the general population. In addition, children with autism, emotional disturbance, and mental retardation rated higher on scales of problem behavior.

The second wave of data collection began in January 2005. The attrition rate of the original sample was less than the expected 5 percent. In addition, 15 additional school districts agreed to participate, resulting in a sample of over 3,000 preschool-age children. Preschool, kindergarten, and elementary school teachers and special service providers; elementary school principals; preschool program directors; and parents continued to provide information through mail questionnaires or structured telephone interviews to describe special services, programs, classrooms, and home environments. Direct and indirect child assessments were administered with a final response rate of 94 percent.

The third wave of data collection began in January 2006. The collection of data was the same as in Wave 2. Response rates continued to be high. The final response rate was 93 percent for the direct and indirect child assessments. Direct and indirect assessments will continue to be administered annually as children progress through preschool and kindergarten, with a profile assessment in the mid-to-late elementary school years, when the children are ages 8-10.

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 fifth grade. The ECLS-K provides descriptive information on children's status at entry to school and their transition into school, and is providing information on 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 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 ECLS-K base year (kindergarten), first grade, third grade, and fifth grade data files and the ECLS-B base year (9-month) data files are currently available. The ECLS-K files include data from the special

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

education teacher/service provider questionnaires on the ECLS-K cohort with disabilities (<http://nces.ed.gov/ecls>). The ECLS-K collected data from the cohort, their parents, schools, and classroom teachers, including the special education teachers and service providers, one last time during the 2006-2007 school year, at which time most of the cohort was in the eighth grade. In May 2006, NCES published a data brief, "The Early Reading and Mathematics Achievement of Children Who Repeated Kindergarten or Who Began School a Year Late." This analysis found that children who repeated kindergarten, compared to children who went to first grade on time, were more likely to have been diagnosed with developmental difficulties by the end of first grade (22 versus 9 percent). Developmental difficulties were determined through parent questions about the child's ability to pay attention and learn; overall activity level; ability to communicate; hearing ability and understanding of speech; eyesight – if problems exist that are not correctable with eyeglasses; and receipt of therapy services.

In March 2007, NCES published an issue brief based on the ECLS-K study entitled, "Timing and Duration of Student Participation in Special Education in the Primary Grades." This paper reported on the timing of entry into special education and the number of grades in which students receive special education across the primary grades. According to the paper, about 12 percent of all students receive special education in at least one of the grades examined: kindergarten, first, and third grades, including 16 percent of boys, 8 percent of girls, 18 percent of poor children, and 10 percent of non-poor children. One in three students who receive special education in early grades first received special education in kindergarten. Approximately half of the students in the study who began special education in kindergarten no longer received special education by third grade.

In the primary grades, the most common entry point into special education occurred after first grade, i.e., students received services in third grade, but not in kindergarten or first grade. Among students who received special education in at least one grade, 43 percent received special education in third grade, but not in kindergarten or first grade, 34 percent began receiving services in kindergarten, and 23 percent began in first grade. Students who received special education services in kindergarten did not necessarily continue with special education in later grades. Thirty-three percent of the children who received special education in kindergarten did not receive special education in first or third grades and another 16 percent received special education in first, but not in third grade. This means that about half (49 percent) of students who received special education in kindergarten had stopped receiving special education by third grade.

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. Some of these children are repeating kindergarten and some were delayed entering kindergarten. The study plans to conduct an analysis of children who either were repeating kindergarten or were delayed entering kindergarten in fiscal year 2008. The ECLS-K is scheduled to follow children through the cohort's eighth grade year in school year 2008-09.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Preschool Grants program was assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) in fiscal year 2002. The overall PART assessment rating for this program was "Results Not Demonstrated." The assessment determined that the purpose of the program is clear and unambiguous, it addresses a specific and existing need, and all funds are obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose. However, the Department had not established long-term performance measures and the annual measures did not relate to the key purpose of the program, which is to improve student outcomes. The assessment further found that the program only supplements existing funding provided under the Grants to States program; Preschool Grants has no separate programmatic requirements for preschool children with disabilities; and there are no independent evaluations of the program to indicate that it is effective and achieving results. 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 addressing the PART findings. 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. The PART Improvement Plan required the Department to establish long-term outcome-oriented objectives, and to develop a strategy to collect annual performance data in a timely manner. These have been completed. The PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department's actions to address them.

- *Collect national point of entry data for children entering programs funded by the Preschool Grants program.* In February 2007, the Department collected 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. The Department will collect a second round of data in February 2008.
- *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 will collect initial data on child progress for children exiting programs funded by the Preschool Grants program in February 2008.
- *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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

outcomes. The Department ran another competition in fiscal year 2006 and made 9 new awards focusing on early childhood. A new competition is planned for fiscal year 2008 that will include a focus area on early childhood outcomes. The average duration of a GSEG grant is approximately 18 months.

The Department conducted a series of conference calls in fiscal years 2006 and 2007 related to measuring outcomes in which a variety of State presenters, including GSEG project coordinators, shared information and experiences related to measuring early childhood 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 2008 and 2009.

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. The Department is sponsoring a series of early childhood outcomes technical assistance meetings to provide opportunities for States to discuss issues and potential solutions. At these meetings, States lead many of the breakout sessions, share their approaches, and facilitate discussion on how to address specific challenges to developing outcomes systems. 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 2008 and additional materials will be developed to respond to issues that have emerged as States develop and implement their outcomes systems.

The Department awarded a grant to establish the National Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) in September 2003. Since then, the ECO has evaluated current State practices, recommended methodology and measurement options, and developed resource documents. ECO also 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 2007 indicated that 28 States were using the COSF, 2 were using the COSF in addition to another approach, and 4 additional States were planning to switch to the COSF. This form assists States and local programs to aggregate data compiled from various tools and multiple data sources. The COSF provides a common "metric" to which data from different assessments can be converted. In addition to the COSF, 11 States stipulate a single state-wide tool for use by LEAs, 5 use on-line systems developed by publishers, and 7 used a variety of 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 is continuing to work intensively with a number of the States that formerly received GSEG awards, is working with additional States to help them develop their systems, is coordinating with a group of States interested in staff training regarding how to conduct reliable and valid assessments, and is providing a wide range of technical assistance to the other States. ECO posts key information as it becomes available on the following website: (<http://www.the-eco-center.org>).

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Preschool grants

- *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. 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 2009 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

6

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$435,654	\$435,654	0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) gives States the discretion to extend eligibility for Part C services to children with disabilities who are eligible for services under the IDEA, section 619, Preschool Grants program, and who previously received services under Part C until such children enter or are eligible under State law to enter kindergarten or elementary school, as appropriate. The Act further stipulates that any Part C programs serving children aged 3 or older must provide an educational component that promotes school readiness and incorporates preliteracy, language, and numeracy skills and provide a written notification to parents of their rights regarding the continuation of services under Part C and eligibility for services under section 619.

The statute also includes authority for a State Incentive Grants program. The purpose of this program is to provide funding to assist States that have elected to extend eligibility for Part C services to children with disabilities aged 3 years until entrance into kindergarten or elementary school. The State Incentive Grants program would go into effect in any fiscal year in which the appropriation for Part C exceeds \$460 million.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

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

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

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.

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: Grants for infants and families

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

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$444,363
2005.....	440,808
2006.....	436,400
2007.....	436,400
2008	435,654

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$435.7 million for the Grants for Infants and Families program for fiscal year 2009, the same as the fiscal year 2008 level. These funds 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.

Research has shown that early intervention for children with disabilities can result in important gains in the intellectual, social, and adaptive behavior of infants and toddlers with disabilities. An analysis of research in early intervention indicated that, "There now exists unequivocal evidence that the declines in intellectual development that occur in the absence of systemic systems of early intervention can be substantially reduced by interventions implemented and evaluated during the first five years of life." The same analysis found that, "By linking families with the support services they need, early intervention personnel can help to strengthen the family and thus improve the child rearing environment."⁴ According to the National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, "The basic principles of neuroscience and the technology of human skill formation indicate that later remediation for highly vulnerable children will produce less favorable outcomes and cost more than appropriate intervention at a younger age." This source also reported that an analysis of longitudinal studies of the effectiveness of early childhood programs indicates an overall benefit to cost ratio of 17.07:1.⁵ The Grants for Infants and Families program helps States to address the needs of infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families at the earliest point practicable.

NUMBERS SERVED

In fiscal year 1993 (December 1, 1992 count), the States served 139,207 infants and toddlers with disabilities through the Grants for Infants and Families program. This number rose to 304,510 in fiscal year 2007 (December 1, 2006 count), an increase of 118.7 percent over the 14-year period and an 2.1 percent increase over the 298,150 children served under the Grants for Infants and Families program in fiscal year 2006. The small increase in fiscal year 2007 reversed what appeared to be an upward trend over the past few years. For example, the

⁴ "Effectiveness of Early Intervention for Vulnerable Children: A Developmental Perspective" by Michael J. Guralnick, as published in Early Intervention, edited by Maurice Abraham Feldman, Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

⁵ "The Science of Early Childhood Development: Closing the Gap Between What We Know and What We Do," A publication of the National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, Center on the Developing Child, Harvard University, 2007.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

number of children served rose by 5.5 percent in 2006 over fiscal year 2005, 3.8 percent in fiscal year 2005 over 2004 and 1.5 percent in year 2004 over 2003. Despite the unevenness, the overall growth in the number of children served is significant because it consistently exceeds the growth in the Nation's overall annual population of birth through 2-year-olds. For example, between 1993 and 2006, the Nation's overall annual population of birth through 2-year-olds increased by only 4.8 percent. The percentage of the general population aged birth through 2 served under the Part C program increased from 1.2 percent in fiscal year 1993 to 2.4 percent in fiscal year 2006, a 100 percent increase.

Growth Rates in the Number of Children Served: The Department anticipates that the number of children served and the percent of total population served will continue to increase. Based on the census and historical patterns in the child count data, the Department predicts that the number of children to be served by Part C will increase by approximately 3 percent in fiscal years 2008, and 2009.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u> ¹	<u>2009</u> ¹
Range in size of awards to States:			
Smallest State award ^{2,3}	\$2,139	\$2,135	\$2,135
Average State award ²	8,226	8,213	8,213
Largest State award ²	54,061	53,978	53,978
Children served	304,510	313,600	323,000

¹ Estimates.

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

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

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 2009 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.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

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: Targets and baseline data 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 baseline data on entering students in the Annual Performance Reports (APRs) submitted in February 2007. The data covered the July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006 reporting period and included the status of children at entry into the program.

The initial data indicates 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. It should be noted that there are a number of concerns with this initial data. 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. In addition, 15 States based their reports on pilot programs that did not go state-wide until June 30, 2006 – June 30, 2007 and 4 on pilot programs that would not go state-wide until June 30, 2007 – June 30, 2008. The Department will continue to work with the States in fiscal years 2008 and 2009 to resolve these issues and improve the reliability of the data they submit.

States collected exit data on child outcomes for these children for the period covering July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007 and will aggregate and report the data by February 2008. The States also will submit a second year of entry data on the status of children at entry into the program. In February 2009, States will report a third year of entry data and second year of data on child progress. These data will provide the baseline for establishing targets for the performance measure on child progress. Under the section on “Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations,” 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 2007. 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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

(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 had the skills necessary to help their children develop and learn.

There were a number of issues reported related to the first data collection. For example, there were several variations on the definition of the population to be included in the data collection and timing of the survey. Twenty-three States defined the population as those enrolled in the Part C program at the time of the survey or during a specific time period. Ten States added that the enrolled families had to have been receiving services for at least six months. Eight States surveyed families who had exited the program during a specified period. Five additional States surveyed families who had exited the program and had participated for at least six months. Two States included all families enrolled in the program, as well as those who recently exited. In addition, some States sampled families, and others included all families. States also varied in the method used to conduct the surveys, such as hand delivery, mail, telephone, and combinations of the three.

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. The fiscal year 2007 and 2008 data will be used to establish a baseline level for this measure. 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.*

Measure: The number of States that serve at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under age one through Part C.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	37	23
2005	27	24
2006	27	25
2007	27	24
2008	27	
2009	27	

Assessment of progress: The number of States that serve at least 1 percent of infants in the general population under the age of one increased from 2004 to 2006, but declined in 2007. In addition, the program did not meet the target in any year, and fewer than half of the States are meeting this criterion. 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,

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

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 2008 (December 1, 2007 child count) in October 2008.

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
2004	30	28
2005	31	30
2006	31	30
2007	31	29
2008	31	
2009	31	

Assessment of progress: Fiscal year targets established for this measure have not been met. 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 U.S. Census Bureau provides the population data used for this measure. The Department expects to receive data for fiscal year 2008 in October 2008.

Measure: The percentage of children receiving age-appropriate early intervention services in the home or in programs designed for typically developing peers.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004	79	85
2005	83	87
2006	85	93
2007	86	
2008	86	
2009	87	

Assessment of progress: The Department has met 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. The Department expects that fiscal year 2008 data will become available in October 2008. To assist States to continue to improve their performance in this area, the Department provides technical

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

assistance and disseminates information on effective home visiting and other practices related to providing services in natural settings.

Efficiency Measures

Measure: The average number of workdays between the completion of a site visit and the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) response to the State.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		60
2007		
2008	Set baseline	
2009	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 2006 indicate that the Office of Special Education programs conducted 11 site visits that year, with an average of 60 days from the site visit to the response to the State. 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 Early Intervention Longitudinal Study (NEILS) describes the experiences of infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families with regard to early intervention services and early elementary school. NEILS focuses on three different outcome areas for assessment: a) short-term results for children, b) long-term results for children, and c) results for families. (www.sri.com/neils)

The study has now concluded, and the final report was released in January 2007. The study included a discussion of how some of its findings contradicted certain previously held assumptions. For example, prior to the study, the general consensus in the field was that children are being identified later than necessary. The study found that this depended on the nature of the disability. The study agreed with other studies that found that children with diagnosed conditions who were identified at ages 1 through 2 could frequently have been diagnosed and served much earlier. However, it found that it is not necessarily true that children who receive early intervention services because of developmental delays are being identified late, especially children with language delays. Children with developmental delays are the most difficult to identify. As such, children with developmental delays primarily related to language and communication are unlikely to be identified until they miss major milestones at 12 or 18 months of age. The differences at entry for children with diagnosed conditions and children with developmental delays suggest the need to monitor and implement child find procedures differently for children who are eligible for early intervention for different reasons.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

NEILS tracked the children participating in the study as far as kindergarten. The study found that 63 percent of the children who received early intervention services go on to other early childhood special education programs at 36 months, 16 percent leave before 36 months of age, and 20 percent leave at 36 months of age and do not go on to other early childhood special education programs. Of the 20 percent who did not go on to receive additional special services after leaving early intervention, 50 percent reported that services were no longer needed, 5 percent that the child was not found eligible to continue services, 13 percent were on a waiting list for services, 5 percent were waiting for assessments, 7 percent were having difficulties with the next agency or program, 10 percent stated that services were not available, and 3 percent declined further services.

Children participating in the study who received early intervention were tracked into kindergarten. Of these children, 58 percent of the former participants had individualized education programs (IEPs) in kindergarten, 10 percent were identified as having a disability, but no IEP, and 32 percent were identified as not having a disability. By way of comparison, State data reported to the Department indicate that at least 68.5 percent of children transitioning from Part C at age 3 are found Part B eligible. While the data are derived from different sources, the NEILS data indicate that the number of children in special education by kindergarten was at least 10.5 percentage points less than the percentage found eligible for Part B at age 3.

The study did not follow these children into the early elementary grades to assess whether the children who were not identified as having a disability returned to special education in elementary school when the academic and social demands on children increase or why the 10 percent identified as having a disability, but no IEP, were not being served. However, the data indicates that a substantial number of children served in early intervention are doing well by kindergarten and are no longer identified as having a delay or disability. The data show that, to varying extents, children across the categories of developmental delay, diagnosed condition, and at risk are identified as not having an IEP or disability at kindergarten. In addition, overall, 55 percent of the children that were served in early intervention were rated as average or above average in academic skills by their kindergarten teachers; 70 percent were rated as having as many or more friends than most children; and 60 percent were rated as being normal for their age in their ability to understand others. Many children continued to have issues that required special education and related services, particularly in the communication and social/emotional areas. However, the study findings 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 National Center for Education Statistics is sponsoring the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study - Birth Cohort (ECLS-B). This is a nationally 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. Data for the ECLS-B cohort has been collected from birth, at 9 months, 2 years, and 4 years of age. Each data collection solicits detailed information about the children's health and development. We expect that a number of

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

the study questions will produce data that have implications for children with disabilities, including the following:

- 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?

Data are collected by directly observing and assessing children and interviewing parents, child care providers, and teachers regarding the cognitive, social, emotional and physical (gross and fine motor) development of the children across multiple settings (e.g., home, child care, school). Interview data are supplemented by videotapes and audiotapes of children's early learning and language production. The study provides data on outcomes experienced by children with disabilities participating in early care and education programs relative to outcomes experienced by nondisabled children. The Office of Special Education Programs collaborated with NCES on the design and implementation of the study as it pertains to children with disabilities.

(<http://nces.ed.gov/ecls/Birth.asp>)

The National Center for Special Education Research (NCSE) in the Institute of Education Science and its predecessor program in the Office of Special Education Programs provided funding to supplement the ECLS-B data collection to over-sample moderately low and very low birth-weight children because low birth weight is associated with developmental issues, including a variety of disabilities. Approximately 6.2 percent of the children in the sample born in 2001 were born with moderately low birth weight and 1.3 percent with very low birth weight. 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 2001 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. For example, 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.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

The Grants for Infants and Families program underwent a PART analysis in 2002. At that time, the program was rated "Results Not Demonstrated." To a large extent, this was due to the lack of data on the child and family outcomes experienced by participants in Part C programs. Annual data show

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

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 the PART findings. This includes implementing new data collection requirements 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 on the Part C program. The PART Improvement Plan required the Department to establish long-term outcome-oriented objectives, and develop a strategy to collect annual performance data in a timely manner. These have been completed.

The PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department's actions to address them.

- *Collect national point of entry data for children entering the Part C service system.* In February 2007, the Department collected 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. The Department will collect a second round of data in February 2008.
- *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 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 will collect initial data on child progress for children exiting the Part C system in February 2008.
- *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 another competition in fiscal year 2006 and made 9 new awards focusing on early childhood. A new competition is planned for fiscal year 2008 that will include a focus area on early childhood outcomes. The average duration of a GSEG grant is approximately 18 months.

The Department conducted a series of conference calls in fiscal years 2006 and 2007 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 2008 and 2009.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

State grants: Grants for infants and families

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 to provide opportunities for States to discuss issues and potential solutions. At these meetings, States lead many of the breakout sessions, share their approaches, and facilitate discussion on how to address specific challenges to developing outcomes systems. 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 2008 and additional materials will be developed to respond to issues that have emerged as States develop and implement their outcomes systems.

The Department established the National Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) in September 2003. Since then, the Center has evaluated current 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 2007 indicated that 36 States were using the COSF and 4 additional States were planning to switch to the COSF. In addition to the COSF, 7 States stipulate a single statewide tool, 2 use on-line systems developed by publishers, and 10 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 2008. ECO also will continue to work intensively with States in fiscal year 2008 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 2009 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$22,598	\$48,000	+\$25,402

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The State Personnel Development (SPD) program, established by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) Amendments of 2004, 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.

As compared to its predecessor, the State Improvement Grants (SIG) program, the new program focuses more exclusively 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 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 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)
2004	\$51,061 ¹
2005	50,653
2006	50,146
2007	0 ²
2008	22,598

¹ Funds were provided under the antecedent State Improvement grants program.

² 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 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$48 million for State personnel development, \$25.4 million more than the 2008 appropriation, 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 fiscal year 2008 appropriation (\$22.598 million) does not include sufficient funds to cover the 2008 continuation awards (\$41.176 million) or provide new funding for the 6 States whose projects expire on September 30, 2008. The funds requested would provide for the full cost of continuation awards to 41 States and new awards to 5 States. The requested amount would restore the program to near its fiscal year 2006 level and ensure that States with approvable applications receive funding for these important activities.

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.

Activities funded through this program are intended to support a statewide strategy to prepare, recruit, and retain teachers who are highly qualified under IDEA and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB); 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 assistance under the SPD program must also develop a plan for coordinating professional development activities funded under the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Program and professional development activities funded through other Federal, State, and local programs.

SPD funds assist States to improve the knowledge of special education and regular education teachers by providing training in effective interventions. Examples of such interventions include positive behavioral interventions and supports to improve student behavior in the classroom,

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: State personnel development

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 support regional "Centers for Excellence" that focus on providing professional development for teachers in high needs schools on either reading, writing, mathematics and/or behavior. Students with disabilities in high needs districts that worked with the Centers for Excellence progressed at statistically higher rates on North Carolina's State assessments than students with disabilities in districts not affiliated with the Centers for Excellence. For example, scores for the group of students affiliated with the Centers improved 9 more percentage points in the 2005/2006 school year and 11 percentage points more in the 2006/2007 school year as compared to the students with disabilities in districts not affiliated with the Centers.
- Tennessee has used its SPD funds to support statewide implementation of a scientifically-based three-tiered *Response to Intervention* instructional model that has resulted in academic gains in rural and urban school districts. The initiative has included the development of web-based professional development training modules that are being used across the country. While led by the special education team, the initiative is designed to assist general educators implement effective school improvement strategies needed to achieve Annual Yearly Progress goals under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.
- Colorado and Nebraska have used their SPD funds to support Positive Behavior Supports (PBS) Statewide initiatives. In schools and school districts where PBS has been implemented, there have been significant reductions in office referrals, suspensions and expulsions as well as evidence of academic gains.

The SPD program also supports States in developing and implementing strategies to effectively promote 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.

- New York has used its SPD funds to support a teacher retention/recruitment initiative in New York City designed to address chronic shortages in the number of certified special education teachers. In 2002, there were over 1,250 uncertified special education teachers in NYC. The SPD project's activities were part of a larger effort, conducted in partnership with the United Federation of Teachers, to provide retraining of uncertified teachers, including intensive professional development and systematic mentoring. By 2007, the SPD project had helped to reduce the number of uncertified special education teachers in NYC to approximately 25.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: State personnel development

- Alaska has developed a unique relationship with the New Teacher Center of Santa Clara University. They are recruiting new teachers, providing a systematic formal induction and mentoring program. The new teachers are eventually trained as recruiters who recruit additional teachers and become the new teachers' mentors. This program is specifically targeting remote school 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 fiscal years 2006 and 2007 to applicants that proposed projects to prepare teachers, para-professionals, administrators, related services personnel, and principals to deliver scientifically based instruction or evidence-based instructional practices; and to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers who are prepared to deliver scientifically based instruction or evidence-based instruction in order to improve results for children with disabilities. The Department plans to award new grants in FY 2009 under the same priority used in fiscal years 2006 and 2007.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u> ¹	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Project funding:			
SPD awards			
New	\$26,652	0	\$4,965
Continuations	18,885 ²	\$22,598 ³	43,005
State Improvement Grant awards (continuations from expiring authority)	4542	---	---
Peer review of new award applications	<u>67</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>30</u>
Total funding	<u>50,146</u>	<u>22,598</u>	<u>48,000</u>
 Average award	 \$1,023	 \$600 ³	 \$1,042
 Number of awards:			
New awards	24	0	5
Continuation awards	<u>23</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>41</u>
Total awards	<u>47</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>46</u>

¹ 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.

² About \$2.015 million of these funds were used to support FY 2008 continuation costs.

³ 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 than the FY 2007 average award.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: State personnel development

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, 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 2009 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*

Annual Measures

Measure: 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	

Assessment of progress: This measure is the percentage of personnel who received professional development based on scientific- or evidence-based instructional practices of the total number of personnel who received professional development provided by SPD projects that are in at least their second budget period. 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. 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. The pool of projects available for review will increase in future years. In FY 2008, there will be a total of 17 SPD projects that are in at least their second budget period and in FY 2009 there will be a total of 41 such projects.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: State personnel development

Measure: 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	

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 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 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. As stated previously, the pool of projects available for review will increase in fiscal years 2008 and 2009.

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 OSEP. Performance on this measure will be assessed beginning with the first cohort of grants under the SPD authority that end in FY 2010.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: State personnel development

Annual Measure

Measure: 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	

Assessment of progress: This measure is the percentage of professional development activities provided by the SPD project that are professional development activities 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 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 SPGD 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.*

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.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: State personnel development

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. Data will be collected and a performance range and targets will be established in FY 2008.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$48,049	\$48,049	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 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 awards are made typically at the end of the fiscal year of appropriation, with budget periods beginning at the start of the subsequent fiscal year. The duration of awards varies with the award's purpose. Most awards are made for periods of 5 years.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$52,819
2005.....	52,396
2006.....	48,903
2007.....	48,903
2008.....	48,049

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2009, the Administration is requesting \$48.0 million for the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program, the same as the 2008 level. The request includes about \$10.1 million for new technical assistance, dissemination, and model projects, and \$38.0 million for continuation projects.

Most funds available for new awards (\$7.8 million of \$10.1 million) would be used to continue support for Regional Resource Centers, which provide technical assistance as requested to States in 6 regions. Funds would also be used for new model demonstration projects and a center on postsecondary outcomes.

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>)

Projects focusing on children with disabilities by age or grade:

- Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center – This Center disseminates information and provides technical assistance to improve transition planning, services, and outcomes for youth with disabilities. (University of North Carolina) (<http://www.nsttac.org/>)
- 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/>)

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

- 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>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<u>Program funding:</u>			
Specialized technical assistance and dissemination:			
New	\$3,829	\$6,085	0
Continuations	<u>7,715</u>	<u>5,627</u>	<u>\$10,487</u>
Subtotal	11,544	11,712	10,487
Model Demonstration Centers:			
New	1,199	0	1,200
Continuations	<u>3,195</u>	<u>2,955</u>	<u>2,956</u>
Subtotal	4,394	2,955	4,156
Regional/Federal Resource Centers:			
New	0	0	7,800
Continuations	<u>8,599</u>	<u>7,798</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	8,599	7,798	7,800
Early childhood technical assistance:			
New	700	800	0
Continuations	<u>4,594</u>	<u>4,326</u>	<u>5,300</u>
Subtotal	5,294	5,126	5,300
Secondary, transition and postsecondary technical assistance:			
New	0	700	700
Continuations	<u>3,249</u>	<u>3,249</u>	<u>3,099</u>
Subtotal	3,249	3,949	3,799

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Technical assistance for children who are both deaf and blind:			
New	0	\$9,500	0
Continuations	<u>\$11,350</u>	<u>1,850</u>	<u>\$11,350</u>
Subtotal	11,350	11,350	11,350
Transfers to Elementary and Secondary Education:			
Continuations	3,000	3,000	3,000
Special projects:			
New	0	300	0
Continuations	<u>200</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>500</u>
Subtotal	200	500	500
Federal technical assistance, technical assistance in data analysis, State and Federal information exchange, other:			
New	480	167	179
Continuations	<u>722</u>	<u>1,162</u>	<u>1,278</u>
Subtotal	1,202	1,329	1,457
Peer review of new award applications	71	330	200
Total:			
New	6,208	17,552	9,879
Continuations	42,624	30,167	37,970
Peer review of new award applications	<u>71</u>	<u>330</u>	<u>200</u>
Total	48,903	48,049	48,049

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including GPRA 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 2009 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

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 Technical Assistance and Dissemination program. Baseline data for 2005 were incomplete and not of high quality. 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 targets have been established based on these more accurate data. The measures are:

Measure: The percentage of Technical Assistance and Dissemination products and services deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2005		56
2006		74
2007	61	
2008	76	
2009	77	

Measure: 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
2005		63
2006		94
2007	68	
2008	94	
2009	94	

Measure: 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
2005		43
2006		46
2007	48	
2008	50	
2009	52	

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. (Baseline data for 2007 will be available in October 2008.)
- Of the Technical Assistance and Dissemination projects responsible for developing models, the percentage of projects that identify, implement and evaluate effective models. (Baseline data for 2006 will be available in October 2008.)

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 2008.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

A PART analysis of the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program was conducted in 2004. At that time, the program was rated “Results Not Demonstrated.” The assessment found that providers of IDEA services have a need for high quality assistance to address issues that cut across a wide range of disability types, severity, services, and age ranges. The assessment also found that the Office of Special Education Programs, which administers the Technical Assistance and Dissemination program, had addressed some strategic planning deficiencies, but had not built on this work to develop meaningful long-term goals or measures to determine if the program is achieving its objectives. The Office of Special Education Programs has now developed three annual measures and an efficiency measure for this program as part of a cross-departmental effort to develop common measures for technical assistance programs. It has also developed two meaningful, specific, and ambitious long-term performance goals and indicators for the program.

PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department’s actions to address them.

- *Develop 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 October 2008.
- *Use performance and other program information to actively manage the overall Technical Assistance and Dissemination program portfolio by adjusting issue coverage and*

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technical assistance and dissemination

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.

- *Develop 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 2008.
- *Develop a strategy for evaluating the impact and effectiveness of program activities.* The Office of Special Education Programs, which administers the Technical Assistance and Dissemination 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.
- *Establish baselines and targets for 2 of the 3 annual program performance measures dealing with quality and usefulness of program products and services.* Baselines and targets have been established for all of the program's annual measures including those that deal with quality and usefulness.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$88,153	\$88,153	0

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Personnel Preparation program assists States in meeting their responsibilities for training, hiring, and certifying personnel to serve children with disabilities. The program supports competitive awards to:

- Help address State-identified needs for personnel in special education, related services, early intervention, and regular education to work with children with disabilities,
- Ensure that those personnel are highly qualified, and have the skills and knowledge that are needed to serve children with disabilities, and that such skills and knowledge are derived from practices determined to be successful through research and experience, and
- Ensure that regular education teachers have the necessary knowledge and skills to provide instruction to students with disabilities in the regular education classroom.

Under the program authority, as revised by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, the Secretary is required to support at least one activity in the broadly defined area of personnel development, along with providing enhanced support for beginning special educators. The Secretary is also required to support training for leadership personnel and personnel who work with children with low incidence disabilities.

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

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 5th 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, rigorous ongoing evaluations, and experience. These include practices related to training teachers and other personnel and providing special education, related services, and early intervention services.

While students are not eligible for awards under the Personnel Preparation program, grantees may provide scholarship support. In recent years, approximately half of the program’s funds have been used for this purpose. Students receiving scholarships must work in the areas for which they receive training or repay part or all of the scholarship funds they receive. 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.

Additional support for personnel preparation activities is provided through the new State Personnel Development Grants (formerly State Improvement Grants) program, under which the

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

Secretary makes competitive awards to help SEAs reform and improve their systems for personnel preparation and professional development.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$91,357
2005.....	90,626
2006.....	89,720
2007.....	89,720
2008.....	88,153

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2009, the Administration requests \$88.2 million for the Personnel Preparation program, the same level as the 2008 appropriation. Of this amount, at least \$20.2 million would be used for new projects (including peer review costs of approximately \$.7 million) and \$68.0 million for 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 of personnel needed does not typically justify local or State support.

Available data relating to the current shortage crisis in special education, like those contained in State-reported data reports (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 identified since the enactment of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). While significant shortages exist in regular education, the problem is more severe in special education. According to the Study of Personnel Needs in Special Education (SPeNSE), special education teachers have the highest turnover rate in the teaching profession (see <http://www.spense.org>). Six percent of special education teachers expressed the intent to leave the field as soon as possible, double the percent of regular education teachers. Special education teachers planning to leave the field as soon as possible reported that their workload was not at all manageable and that paperwork interfered with teaching.

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. Starting in the 2005–2006 academic year, all veteran special education teachers were required to be highly qualified.⁶

⁶ New special education teachers who teach core academic content must be highly qualified when they are hired. Assuming that such teachers are already highly qualified in at least mathematics, language arts, or science, new special education 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

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

- 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.

Data from a recent report designed to assess the progress of States, districts, and schools in implementing these requirements, *Teacher Quality Under No Child Left Behind: Interim Report*, illustrate the challenge. According to this study, developed by the Department with the American Institutes for Research, special education teachers were nearly four times as likely to report that they were not considered highly qualified (15 percent) than were general education teachers (4 percent). Of all special education teachers, 52 percent reported they were highly qualified. The percentage of special education teachers who reported they were highly qualified varied by school level: the percentage was lower for high school teachers (39 percent) than for elementary and middle school teachers (61 percent and 53 percent, respectively). (See: <http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/teaching/nclb/execsum.html>)

As States work to address this problem, program funds are being used to provide critical support for promising practices. For example, in fiscal year 2006, the Department: 1) established the National Center to Enhance the Professional Development of School Personnel Who Share Responsibility for Improving Results for Children with Disabilities to address the critical need for highly qualified teachers and school personnel; and 2) required that all applicants under the Personnel Preparation combined priority (through which most of the program’s scholarships are funded under grants to IHEs) demonstrate that all scholars will be highly qualified upon completion of the proposed training program. Beginning in fiscal year 2007, the Department is allocating more program funds to support Special Education Pre-Service Training Improvement grants, which will provide approximately 43 grants to IHEs in fiscal years 2007 and 2008, for the purpose of restructuring or redesigning preparation programs for special educators who teach grades K through 12, to ensure that training program 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 will also support Paraprofessional Pre-service Training Improvement Grants, which would provide grants to IHEs to improve the coursework and curricula, internships, and mentoring components of training programs to better

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

align them with the evidence-based practices, the qualification standards for paraprofessionals contained in NCLB, and State certification and licensing 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 have now been made permanent. These provisions 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 No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<u>Expired Program funding:</u>			
Low incidence disabilities continuation grants:	\$11,939	\$6,061	---
High incidence disabilities continuation grants:	2,985	---	---
Leadership continuation grants:	3,234	---	---
National significance continuation grants:	<u>3,525</u>	<u>1,310</u>	<u>---</u>
Expired program totals:	21,683	7,371	---
<u>New Program funding:</u>			
Low incidence disabilities grants:			
New	3,586	4,000	\$4,080
Continuations	<u>6,780</u>	<u>11,699</u>	<u>13,568</u>
Subtotal	10,366	15,699	17,648
Leadership training grants:			
New	4,739	4,232	4,232
Continuations	<u>10,921¹</u>	<u>11,887</u>	<u>13,829</u>
Subtotal	15,660	16,119	18,061
Minority institution grants: ²			
New	2,937	2,800	2,800
Continuations	<u>5,146</u>	<u>8,735</u>	<u>10,000</u>
Subtotal	8,083	11,535	12,800
Training improvement grants			
New	3,133 ³	3,100	2,500
Continuations	<u>0</u>	<u>1,179</u>	<u>5,250</u>
Subtotal	3,133	4,279	7,750

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Other personnel development grants: ⁴			
New	\$6,436	\$5,400	\$4,421
Continuations	<u>15,817⁵</u>	<u>16,791</u>	<u>15,044</u>
Subtotal	22,253	22,191	19,465
National Activities: ⁶			
New	2,603	3,200	1,473
Continuations	<u>5,184</u>	<u>7,058</u>	<u>10,256</u>
Subtotal	7,787	10,258	11,729
Peer review of new award applications	755	700	700
New program totals:			
New	23,434	22,733	19,506
Continuations	43,848	57,349	67,947
Peer review of new award applications	<u>755</u>	<u>700</u>	<u>700</u>
Total	68,037	80,782	88,153
Program total	89,720	88,153	88,153

¹ The FY 2007 continuations total includes approximately \$2.369 million in FY 2008 continuation costs.

² This category includes awards to institutions with minority enrollments of not less than 25 percent. Under IDEA, Part D, Sec. 681(c)(2), the Secretary is required to reserve not less than 2 percent of the total amount of funds appropriated under Part D, subparts 2 and 3 for outreach and technical assistance activities for historically Black colleges and universities and IHEs with minority enrollments of not less than 25 percent, which translates into \$4.055 million in fiscal year 2007, and is estimated to be \$4.041 million in fiscal years 2008 and 2009.

³ The FY 2007 new awards total includes approximately \$.984 million in FY 2008 continuation costs.

⁴ 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.

⁵ The FY 2007 continuation awards total includes approximately \$2.963 million in FY 2008 continuation costs.

⁶ 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, the National Center to Enhance the Training of Personnel Who Share Responsibility for Young Children with Disabilities, and the National Center to Inform Policy and Practice in Special Education Professional Development.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Department is working to develop reliable and systematic methods for assessing program performance for Personnel Preparation activities. While State-reported data and recent reports, like SPeNSE, 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 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 2009 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The program has two long-term measures that are designed to provide information on various aspects of the quality of training programs supported with program funds, and the classroom teaching skills of scholars supported using program funds. These measures are: the percentage of scholars completing IDEA-funded training programs that are knowledgeable and skilled in scientific- or evidence-based practices for children with disabilities; and the percentage of low incidence positions that are filled by personnel who are fully qualified under IDEA. One year of preliminary data are available for the first measure, and according to these data, approximately 91 percent of scholars completing IDEA-funded training programs are knowledgeable and skilled in evidence-based practices. No data are yet available for the second indicator, but should be available by October 2008. The Department's goal is to establish baselines and targets for both long-term measures by October 2008, using data from FY 2007 and 2008.

The program also has two annual performance measures for which there are currently no data available, and three measures for which data are available. All five of these measures are designed to provide information on various aspects of program quality. The two measures for which there are currently no data are: 1) the 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, and 2) the percentage of degree/certification recipients who maintain employment in the area(s) for which they are trained for 3 or more years and who are fully qualified under IDEA.

Performance data for measure one will be collected annually through the Personnel Preparation Grants Student Data Report (PPD) web-site (<http://www.osepppd.org>). Likewise, data for measure two will be collected and analyzed periodically by an independent contractor, by following up with a representative sample of program completers who are 3 or more years beyond program completion. The Department expects initial data for both measures by fall 2008.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

The three annual measures for which data are currently available are:

Measure: Percentage of projects that incorporate scientifically- or evidence-based practices.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		41.5
2007	n/a	
2008	n/a	
2009	n/a	

Assessment of progress: The Department intends to collect 2 years of actual data before establishing targets for this measure. Data are collected and analyzed by a contractor, using an expert panel of reviewers who assess grant implementation by reviewing grant applications against a listing of scientific- or evidence-based practices in key target areas that have been identified by the Department as critical areas that all projects should address.

Measure: Percentage of scholars who exit training programs prior to completion due to poor academic performance.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		1.3
2006	0.99	1.7
2007	0.99	
2008	0.99	
2009	0.99	

Assessment of progress: Grantees submit data annually through the PPD web-based data collection. Data suggest that grantees are currently doing a reasonably good job of ensuring that scholars maintain reasonable levels of academic performance.

Measure: Percentage of degree/certification recipients who are working in the area(s) for which they are trained upon program completion.		
Year	Target	Actual
2004		62.8
2005		63.1
2006		59.1
2007	69	
2008	72	
2009	75	

Assessment of progress: Grantees submit data annually through the PPD web-based data collection. Grantee reported data suggest that, over time, the program has made small improvements in targeting scholarship funds to those scholars most likely to find employment in the area for which they were trained upon program completion.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

Efficiency Measures

One efficiency measure has been adopted for the Personnel Preparation program. This measure reflects the percentage of funds expended on students who drop out of programs because of: 1) poor academic performance, and 2) scholarship support being terminated when the Federal grant to their institutions ends. This measure is derived by dividing the number of students who drop out by the total number of student scholars. Ideally, this ratio would be calculated for each institution and multiplied by the amount of each award to determine the amount of funds associated with preventable dropouts for each institution funded under the program. The goal would be to reduce the amount of funds expended on: 1) academic dropouts, by encouraging institutions receiving Federal grants to allocate student stipends more effectively (e.g., by making stipends only to those students most likely to perform reasonably well), and 2) scholars in programs where the institution fails to ensure that adequate funds exist to carry all scholars receiving support through to completion of training, even if the Federal grant to the institution ends.

One year of data for this measure are now available, which indicate that in fiscal year 2006 approximately .29 percent of program funds were expended on students who either dropped out of the program for academic reasons or because scholarship support was terminated prior to the end of their grant. A small percentage of students in every program predictably drop out each year for a variety of non-academic reasons (e.g. job, family, or financial reasons). When this measure was initially developed in fiscal year 2004, preliminary estimates showed that the Department could reasonably expect improvement in both of these areas. However, several years ago the Department started requiring all grantees to ensure that adequate funds exist to support scholars through to the completion of training, even when the Federal grant to the institution ends prior to the completion of training for grant-supported scholars. This new requirement has effectively reduced the percentage of institutions failing to ensure that adequate funds exist to carry all scholars receiving support through to completion of training, even if the Federal grant to the institution ends. The Department is currently exploring the feasibility of several alternate efficiency measures for this program.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

In a 2003 Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review, the Personnel Preparation program received a rating of "Results Not Demonstrated." The assessment highlighted numerous areas in which improvements would enable the program to operate more effectively. Areas of primary concern included the following: the program does not have quantifiable long-term performance goals that focus on either quantitative or qualitative aspects of the program's purpose; the program does not have a limited number of annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals; the program does not have efficiency measures; the program does not regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance; and no independent evaluations of the program have been conducted.

The Department has completed a number of actions to improve program performance, including: developing new annual and long-term program measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program, developing one program efficiency measure, and implementing a data collection strategy. The Department has also started utilizing data from

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Personnel preparation

the PPD data collection for program management purposes. Beyond these actions, beginning in fiscal year 2007 the Department announced a 4-year independent evaluation of the Personnel Preparation program. In fiscal year 2006, the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) dedicated approximately \$300,000 from the Studies and Evaluation program to design this evaluation. Based on the work of this contract, which was intended to prepare a set of design options for the evaluation, the Department has decided that this study will examine the outcomes and impacts the program has had on improving the skills and knowledge of special education personnel and whether the preparation received has changed teacher practices and student outcomes. IES awarded this \$2.8 million, 4-year evaluation contract at the end of fiscal year 2007. Final results are expected by fall 2011.

The PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department's actions to address them.

- *Take 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 aggregated on a program-wide level and disaggregated at the grantee level. The Department is currently working to address this issue.
- *Implement the new program evaluation, to determine how effectively the program achieves its key outcomes.* The Department has already awarded the contract for this activity. Final results are expected by fall 2011.
- *Ensure that reliable and accurate data are collected for the program's new annual, long-term, and efficiency measures.* At least one year of data have already been collected for 6 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 2009 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$26,528	\$26,528	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 awards to 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)
2004.....	\$26,173
2005.....	25,964
2006.....	25,704
2007.....	25,704
2008.....	26,528

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's request for the Parent Information Centers program is \$26.5 million, the same level as the fiscal year 2008 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 with administrators and teachers in the development of their child's individualized education

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

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 No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) has placed increased emphasis on 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. (See <http://www.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/parentinguid.doc>).

In particular, parents need to be kept abreast of the evolving NCLB requirements for participation of their children in assessments. Under IDEA and NCLB, 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 Secretary 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.

The 2009 request includes \$20.9 million for new and continuing parent training and information centers and \$3.0 million for new and continuing community parent resource centers. In addition, \$2.4 million would be used to fund seven continuation awards to provide technical assistance to centers.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<u>Program funding:</u>			
Parent training and information centers:			
New	\$9,323	0	\$3,664
Continuations	<u>11,000</u>	<u>\$21,051</u>	<u>17,200</u>
Subtotal	20,323	21,051	20,864
Community parent resource centers:			
New	998	1,000	1,000
Continuations	<u>1,852</u>	<u>1,877</u>	<u>1,999</u>
Subtotal	2,850	2,877	2,999
Technical assistance:			
New	0	2,415	0
Continuations	<u>2,299</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2,400</u>
Subtotal	2,299	2,415	2,400
Other:			
Continuations	128	135	135
Peer review of new award applications	104	50	130
Total:			
New	10,321	3,415	4,664
Continuations	15,279	23,063	21,734
Peer review of new award applications	<u>104</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>130</u>
Total	25,704	26,528	26,528

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<u>Number of projects:</u>			
Parent training and information centers:			
New	27	0	14
Continuations	<u>43</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>56</u>
Subtotal	70	70	70
Community parent information centers:			
New	10	10	10
Continuations	<u>20</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>20</u>
Subtotal	30	29	30
Technical assistance:			
New	0	7	0
Continuations	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>
Subtotal	7	7	7
Other:			
Continuations	3	3	3
 Total:			
New	37	17	24
Continuations	<u>73</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>86</u>
Total	110	109	110

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including GPRA 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 2009 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Six performance measures have been developed for the Parent Information Centers 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 Parent Information Centers program. Baseline data for 2005 were incomplete and not of high quality. Actual data for 2006 reflect more accurate measurements of program activities and a change in the rating standards used to judge performance for the

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

measures. Targets for 2008 have been revised and 2009 targets have been established based on these more accurate data. The measures are:

Measure: The percentage of materials used by Parent Information Centers projects that are deemed to be of high quality.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2005		40
2006		70
2007	42	
2008	72	
2009	73	

Measure: The percentage of Parent Information Centers products and services deemed to be of high relevance to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of qualified members of the Parent Information Centers target audience.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2005		47
2006		96
2007	49	
2008	96	
2009	96	

Measure: The percentage of all Parent Information Centers products and services deemed to be useful by target audiences to improve educational or early intervention policy or practice.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2005		27
2006		96
2007	29	
2008	96	
2009	96	

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 parents receiving Parent Information Centers services who promote scientific- or evidence-based practices for their infants, toddlers, children, and youth. (Baseline 2006, 69 percent. Target 2008, 71 percent. Target 2010, 73 percent. Target 2012, 75 percent.)

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

- The percentage of parents receiving Parent Information Centers services who report enhanced knowledge of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act rights and responsibilities. (Baseline 2006, 83 percent. Target 2008, 85 percent. Target 2010, 87 percent. Target 2012, 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 Department has now collected baseline data for the measure. 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 of the materials provided through the program. The Department expects to have data available by October 2008.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

A PART analysis of the Parent Information Centers program was conducted in 2004. At that time, the program was rated “Results Not Demonstrated.” The assessment found that parent involvement and advocacy are important to the development of children with disabilities. Because IDEA services and procedures are complicated, parents sometimes need specialized help that is not readily available from other sources. However, the analysis also noted a number of deficiencies.

PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department’s actions to address them.

- *Develop and implement long-term measures of the programs performance.* The Department has developed and implemented two long-term measures to reflect the program’s performance. Baseline data are available and targets have been established through 2012.
- *Develop 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.
- *Develop baselines and targets for annual performance measures.* The Department has developed baselines and targets for 3 annual program measures.
- *Develop and implement 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.
- *Conduct a data based analysis of the distribution of funds under the program to determine the most effective allocation of funds.* The current funding level for each center is based largely on the prior funding history of the center. The Department will review the funding

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Parent information centers

levels of all centers and the numbers of parents served by each center and other factors to ensure that funds are allocated effectively and equitably among centers.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technology and media services

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$39,301	\$30,949	-\$8,352

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Technology and Media Services program is the primary source of support for technology and media service-related activities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Technology activities promote the development, demonstration, and use of technology. They include 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 includes closed captioning, video description, providing written materials in accessible formats, and other activities that either improve education through the use of media or improve access to educational media.

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 these 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 Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 made several changes in authorized activities for this program. The IDEA now 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 after September 30, 2006 even when they are suitable for use in classrooms. Another change was the elimination of authority to provide cultural experiences for hearing impaired individuals.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technology and media services

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2004.....	\$39,129
2005.....	38,816
2006.....	38,428
2007.....	38,428
2008.....	39,301

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration's request for the Technology and Media Services program is \$30.9 million, \$8.4 million less than the fiscal year 2008 appropriation level of \$39.3 million.

The request does not include funds for 2008 appropriation earmarks totaling \$14.3 million: \$1.5 million for the Greater Washington Educational Television Association (GWETA) to provide information on diagnosis, intervention, and teaching strategies for children with disabilities; and \$12.8 million for Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Inc. (RFB&D) to provide additional free educational materials under section 674(c)(1)(D) of IDEA. The request does increase the amount of funds that would be available for competitive awards by \$3.8 million over the 2008 level.

Technology

Technology activities, which promote the development, demonstration, and use of technology, primarily involve research. Approximately \$13.2 million would support technology projects in 2009, \$4.3 million for new projects and \$8.9 million for continuation projects. Most new and continuation technology research awards would be made under the Steppingstones of Technology Innovation for Students with Disabilities priority. The Department has supported awards for this priority since 1998. Beginning in fiscal year 2005, the Department began to make awards 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 achieve educational purposes for students with disabilities. Examples of projects supported under this priority include research at Western Oregon University on the effects of cochlear implants on a sample of 250 children who are both deaf and blind, and a project at the Research and Development Institute that is developing and testing new software for helping students who are blind to learn the Nemeth Code of Braille mathematics notation. Other continuation research projects would study the effectiveness of technology in addressing the needs of students with disabilities.

Technical assistance projects that would receive continuation funding under the request include a center to support State and local educational agencies in implementing and evaluating practices that integrate technology into teaching, a center on promoting the distribution and use

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technology and media services

of technology-related products and approaches, and a center to promote the use of assistive technology approaches for working with infants and toddlers.

IDEA section 682(d)(1)(B) requires that the Secretary use at least \$4.0 million “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 Preparation, and Technology and Media Services programs. Continuation funding for these awards will be provided in 2009. 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 oral transliteration services, cued language transliteration services, sign language transliteration and interpreting 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. Approximately \$16.6 million would be available for awards in FY 2009, including \$4.4 million for new awards and \$12.2 million for continuation awards.

A major use of funds would be to provide continuation funding for an award to Bookshare.org to provide free educational materials, including textbooks, in accessible media for use by students with visual impairments and other print disabilities in accordance with section 674(c)(1)(D) of IDEA. Bookshare.org is using technology in a variety of creative ways to improve the speed and ease of access to materials as well as the volume of materials available to these students. (<http://www.bookshare.org/web/Welcome.html>)

Funding would also be provided for 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.

Continuation support would also be provided for a 2006 award to support the captioning, description, and distribution of educational videos used in classroom settings. The distribution system for these videos 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/>)

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act also required the Department to support a National Instructional Materials Access Center, which is housed in the American Printing House for the Blind. (<http://www.nimac.us/>) Among the responsibilities of the Center are the maintenance of a catalogue of materials prepared in the National Instructional Access

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technology and media services

Standard and available to the Center, providing print instructional materials in accessible media, and developing, adopting and publishing procedures to protect against copyright infringement.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
<u>Program funding:</u>			
Technology:			
Research:			
New	\$3,415	\$4,204	\$4,305
Continuations	<u>3,866</u>	<u>3,090</u>	<u>5,104</u>
Subtotal	7,281	7,294	9,409
Technical assistance and dissemination:			
New	435	600	0
Continuations	<u>3,324</u>	<u>2,885</u>	<u>2,835</u>
Subtotal	3,759	3,485	2,835
Technical assistance to States on accessible media:			
New	6,300	0	0
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):	0	1,474	0
Subtotal, Technology:			
New	10,150	4,804	4,305
Continuations	8,190	6,975	8,939
Earmarks	<u>0</u>	<u>1,474</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	18,340	13,253	13,244

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technology and media services

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

	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
Media services:			
Accessible television and technology media demonstrations:			
New	\$2,500	0	\$4,423
Continuations	<u>8,078</u>	<u>\$3,627</u>	<u>3,630</u>
Subtotal	10,578	3,627	8,053
Educational video captioning, description, and distribution:			
Continuation	1,500	1,500	1,500
National Instructional Media Accessibility Center (NIMAC) – Statutory earmark			
Continuations	539	546	550
Free educational materials competitive award:			
New	6,515	0	0
Continuations	<u>0</u>	<u>6,515</u>	<u>6,515</u>
Subtotal	6,515	6,515	6,515
Appropriation earmark for Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic, Inc.	0	12,773	0
Subtotal, Media services:			
New	9,015	0	4,423
Continuations	10,117	12,188	12,195
Earmarks	<u>0</u>	<u>12,773</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal	19,132	24,961	16,618
Other (e.g. program evaluation, project meeting costs):			
New	0	167	0
Continuations	<u>615</u>	<u>615</u>	<u>782</u>
Subtotal	615	782	782
Peer review of new award applications	341	305	305
Total:			
New	19,165	4,971	8,728
Continuations	18,922	19,778	21,916
Appropriation earmarks	0	14,247	
Peer review of new award applications	<u>341</u>	<u>305</u>	<u>305</u>
Total	38,428	39,301	30,949

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technology and media services

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including GPRA 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 2009 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.

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

Both the quality and completeness of the baseline data collected for 2005 were not high. Actual data for 2006 reflect more accurate measurements of program activities and a change in the rating standard used to judge performance for the measure. The target for 2008 has been revised and the 2009 target has been established based on these more accurate data. The measure is:

Measure: The percentage of Technology and Media Services projects judged to be of high relevance to improving outcomes of infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.		
Year	Targets	Actual
2005		43
2006	43	91
2007	45	
2008	91	
2009	91	

Baseline data for the remaining annual measures became available in October 2007. They are:

- The percentage of Technology and Media Services projects judged to be of high quality. (Baseline 2006 80 percent. Target 2008, 82 percent. Target 2009, 83 percent.)
- The percentage of 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. (Baseline data for 2007 will be available in October 2008.)

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

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Technology and media services

technologies that incorporate evidence-based materials and services. This measure will focus on six target areas: assessment, literacy, behavior, instructional strategies, early intervention, and inclusive practices. (Baseline data for 2006 will be available in October 2008.)

- The percentage of Technology and Media Services projects that make technologies that incorporate evidence-based practices available for widespread use. (Baseline data for 2006 will be available in October 2008.)

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 Media Services outputs such as hours of media captioned and described. However, data are not yet available for Technology outputs. The Media Services measure is based on 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. The adjusted cost of a unit of a media hour was determined to be \$1,021.46. Baseline data for Technology activities are expected in October 2008, and targets will be established at that time.

Follow-up on PART Findings and Recommendations

A PART analysis of the Technology and Media Services program was conducted in 2006. At that time, the program was rated “Results Not Demonstrated.” The PART findings focused on the lack of data on the program’s annual, long-term, and efficiency measures, and the lack of credible external evaluations to demonstrate concrete program outcomes or effectiveness. PART improvement plan recommendations are presented below, followed by a description of the Department’s actions to address them.

- *Develop baselines and targets for the programs 2 long-term performance measures.* Baselines and targets are expected to be available in October 2008.
- *Develop baseline and targets for the program’s efficiency measure.* A baseline for Media Services activities, but not Technology activities, has been established. Targets will be established when the baseline data for Technology activities become available in October 2008.
- *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, is working with the Institute of Education Sciences to develop a plan for evaluating this and other National Activities programs under the IDEA.
- *Establish baselines and targets for two of the three annual program performance measures dealing with quality and usefulness of program products and services.* Baselines and targets for the annual measures dealing with quality and usefulness were established in October 2007.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Special Olympics education programs

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

FY 2009 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$11,790	0	-\$11,790

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

(\$000s)

2004.....	Not Authorized
2005.....	0
2006.....	0
2007.....	0
2008.....	\$11,790

FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is not requesting any funds for the Special Olympics education programs. While the Special Olympics have played an important role in providing opportunities for individuals with intellectual disabilities to engage in sports training and competitive activities, and have led to improvements in the quality of life of these individuals, many activities to be supported under this program, such as increasing the participation of individuals with disabilities in the Special Olympics, are not directly supportive of the Department of Education's mission or achieving its strategic education goals. This request to eliminate funding for this program is consistent with the Administration's policy of increasing resources for higher priority programs, such as the Special Education Grants to States program, and eliminating small categorical programs that have limited impact. In addition, the Administration does not believe that making

SPECIAL EDUCATION

National activities: Special Olympics education programs

awards to designated grantees without the benefit of competition, as would be the case under this program, is the best way of ensuring that public funds are used effectively.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Grants to States

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	170,485,753	172,827,241	177,615,399	4,788,158
Alaska	33,551,635	34,370,062	35,493,394	1,123,332
Arizona	167,830,161	172,908,742	180,825,057	7,916,315
Arkansas	105,159,110	106,603,388	109,556,822	2,953,434
California	1,150,175,848	1,165,972,611	1,198,275,741	32,303,130
Colorado	141,994,060	144,726,035	151,247,641	6,521,606
Connecticut	124,651,626	126,363,618	129,864,507	3,500,889
Delaware	30,749,980	31,680,482	33,130,916	1,450,434
District of Columbia	15,461,181	15,929,040	16,658,322	729,282
Florida	590,329,496	598,437,209	615,016,840	16,579,631
Georgia	295,042,992	303,971,064	317,887,832	13,916,768
Hawaii	37,427,200	37,941,233	38,992,390	1,051,157
Idaho	50,887,494	51,586,394	53,015,589	1,429,195
Illinois	474,790,011	481,310,879	494,645,539	13,334,660
Indiana	239,749,588	243,042,361	249,775,820	6,733,459
Iowa	114,455,809	116,027,770	119,242,305	3,214,535
Kansas	100,184,949	101,560,911	104,374,644	2,813,733
Kentucky	147,980,151	150,012,542	154,168,621	4,156,079
Louisiana	177,474,118	179,911,586	184,896,015	4,984,429
Maine	51,300,101	52,004,668	53,445,451	1,440,783
Maryland	187,712,947	190,291,037	195,563,027	5,271,990
Massachusetts	266,131,779	269,786,890	277,261,303	7,474,413
Michigan	375,542,353	380,700,133	391,247,384	10,547,251
Minnesota	177,961,249	180,405,407	185,403,517	4,998,110
Mississippi	111,568,419	113,100,724	116,234,166	3,133,442
Missouri	212,961,229	215,886,084	221,867,182	5,981,098
Montana	34,571,807	35,120,309	36,243,641	1,123,332
Nebraska	70,004,541	70,965,998	72,932,102	1,966,104
Nevada	63,115,797	65,025,696	68,002,780	2,977,084
New Hampshire	44,491,679	45,102,737	46,352,303	1,249,566
New Jersey	338,873,593	343,527,756	353,045,151	9,517,395
New Mexico	85,444,520	86,618,033	89,017,775	2,399,742
New York	711,691,639	721,466,166	741,454,299	19,988,133
North Carolina	298,208,386	304,551,892	317,915,405	13,363,513
North Dakota	24,968,615	25,724,171	26,901,906	1,177,735
Ohio	410,347,509	415,983,310	427,508,077	11,524,767
Oklahoma	138,669,447	140,573,963	144,468,548	3,894,585
Oregon	120,909,370	122,569,965	125,965,751	3,395,786
Pennsylvania	400,450,268	405,950,138	417,196,938	11,246,800
Rhode Island	40,997,821	41,560,894	42,712,334	1,151,440
South Carolina	164,211,008	166,466,317	171,078,246	4,611,929
South Dakota	29,744,116	30,644,180	32,047,169	1,402,989
Tennessee	218,638,925	221,641,759	227,782,317	6,140,558
Texas	903,726,489	916,138,464	952,229,020	36,090,556
Utah	100,055,068	101,664,279	106,147,404	4,483,125
Vermont	24,074,512	24,803,013	25,938,574	1,135,561
Virginia	264,057,481	267,684,103	275,100,259	7,416,156
Washington	207,507,428	210,357,380	216,185,306	5,827,926
West Virginia	71,199,780	72,177,653	74,177,326	1,999,673
Wisconsin	195,173,313	197,853,865	203,335,382	5,481,517
Wyoming	25,256,549	26,020,818	27,212,134	1,191,316
American Samoa	6,202,408	6,297,058	6,453,900	156,842
Guam	13,752,535	13,962,402	14,310,166	347,764
Northern Mariana Islands	4,713,210	4,785,135	4,904,319	119,184
Puerto Rico	102,590,867	105,695,291	110,534,360	4,839,069
Virgin Islands	8,740,876	8,874,264	9,095,297	221,033
Freely Associated States	6,579,306	6,579,306	6,579,306	0
Indian set-aside (BIA)	87,432,898	88,767,145	90,978,081	2,210,936
Other (non-State allocations)	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	0
Total	10,782,961,000	10,947,511,571	11,284,511,000	336,999,429

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Preschool Grants

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	5,599,786	5,506,029	5,506,025	(4)
Alaska	1,263,865	1,241,975	1,241,974	(1)
Arizona	5,378,592	5,259,801	5,259,796	(5)
Arkansas	5,362,909	5,279,323	5,279,319	(4)
California	38,677,082	37,840,710	37,840,675	(35)
Colorado	4,955,794	4,871,136	4,871,132	(4)
Connecticut	4,903,638	4,827,210	4,827,207	(3)
Delaware	1,257,388	1,235,499	1,235,498	(1)
District of Columbia	247,636	240,249	240,248	(1)
Florida	18,482,472	18,170,242	18,170,229	(13)
Georgia	9,821,014	9,637,532	9,637,524	(8)
Hawaii	1,002,741	978,634	978,633	(1)
Idaho	2,186,122	2,152,049	2,152,048	(1)
Illinois	17,650,452	17,369,463	17,369,452	(11)
Indiana	8,896,223	8,757,566	8,757,561	(5)
Iowa	3,990,542	3,928,346	3,928,343	(3)
Kansas	4,332,784	4,265,253	4,265,250	(3)
Kentucky	10,210,755	10,051,610	10,051,604	(6)
Louisiana	6,479,599	6,372,736	6,372,731	(5)
Maine	2,512,715	2,473,552	2,473,550	(2)
Maryland	6,673,966	6,566,015	6,566,010	(5)
Massachusetts	9,889,605	9,735,466	9,735,460	(6)
Michigan	12,563,791	12,355,632	12,355,624	(8)
Minnesota	7,426,561	7,310,811	7,310,806	(5)
Mississippi	4,227,759	4,160,483	4,160,481	(2)
Missouri	6,013,301	5,900,044	5,900,039	(5)
Montana	1,184,868	1,162,983	1,162,982	(1)
Nebraska	2,256,430	2,220,152	2,220,151	(1)
Nevada	2,249,894	2,205,315	2,205,313	(2)
New Hampshire	1,557,434	1,533,160	1,533,159	(1)
New Jersey	11,374,918	11,197,629	11,197,621	(8)
New Mexico	3,186,991	3,137,318	3,137,315	(3)
New York	33,742,306	33,216,002	33,215,980	(22)
North Carolina	11,309,600	11,133,329	11,133,321	(8)
North Dakota	816,499	794,614	794,613	(1)
Ohio	12,552,372	12,321,462	12,321,453	(9)
Oklahoma	3,655,256	3,580,349	3,580,346	(3)
Oregon	3,863,596	3,794,137	3,794,134	(3)
Pennsylvania	13,977,053	13,749,342	13,749,332	(10)
Rhode Island	1,671,061	1,645,016	1,645,015	(1)
South Carolina	7,138,751	7,027,486	7,027,482	(4)
South Dakota	1,464,899	1,442,067	1,442,066	(1)
Tennessee	6,889,672	6,775,233	6,775,228	(5)
Texas	22,953,696	22,438,331	22,438,309	(22)
Utah	3,564,264	3,504,241	3,504,239	(2)
Vermont	866,996	845,111	845,110	(1)
Virginia	9,125,516	8,983,286	8,983,280	(6)
Washington	8,166,835	8,039,547	8,039,541	(6)
West Virginia	3,482,965	3,428,679	3,428,677	(2)
Wisconsin	9,469,800	9,322,204	9,322,198	(6)
Wyoming	1,059,920	1,038,035	1,038,034	(1)
American Samoa	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	(4)
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	3,162,316	3,076,886	3,076,882	(4)
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside (BIA)	0	0	5,506,025	0
Other (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0
Total	380,751,000	374,099,280	374,099,000	(280)

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Grants for Infants and Families

State or Other Area	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate	Change from 2008 Estimate
Alabama	6,004,235	5,995,032	5,995,035	3
Alaska	2,138,714	2,135,436	2,135,437	1
Arizona	9,712,823	9,697,935	9,697,940	5
Arkansas	3,890,674	3,884,710	3,884,712	2
California	54,060,651	53,977,788	53,977,813	25
Colorado	6,842,998	6,832,510	6,832,513	3
Connecticut	3,914,074	3,908,075	3,908,076	1
Delaware	2,138,714	2,135,436	2,135,437	1
District of Columbia	2,138,714	2,135,436	2,135,437	1
Florida	22,723,694	22,688,864	22,688,874	10
Georgia	14,087,196	14,065,604	14,065,610	6
Hawaii	2,138,714	2,135,436	2,135,437	1
Idaho	2,300,134	2,296,609	2,296,610	1
Illinois	17,754,534	17,727,321	17,727,329	8
Indiana	8,677,149	8,663,849	8,663,853	4
Iowa	3,869,434	3,863,502	3,863,503	1
Kansas	3,893,499	3,887,531	3,887,533	2
Kentucky	5,561,552	5,553,028	5,553,030	2
Louisiana	6,073,273	6,063,964	6,063,967	3
Maine	2,138,714	2,135,436	2,135,437	1
Maryland	7,378,419	7,367,109	7,367,113	4
Massachusetts	7,714,170	7,702,346	7,702,350	4
Michigan	12,657,902	12,638,500	12,638,506	6
Minnesota	6,990,083	6,979,368	6,979,371	3
Mississippi	4,241,050	4,234,550	4,234,552	2
Missouri	7,802,986	7,791,026	7,791,029	3
Montana	2,138,714	2,135,436	2,135,437	1
Nebraska	2,589,184	2,585,215	2,585,216	1
Nevada	3,720,986	3,715,283	3,715,285	2
New Hampshire	2,138,714	2,135,436	2,135,437	1
New Jersey	11,066,631	11,049,668	11,049,673	5
New Mexico	2,854,734	2,850,358	2,850,360	2
New York	24,455,135	24,417,651	24,417,662	11
North Carolina	12,295,027	12,276,181	12,276,187	6
North Dakota	2,138,714	2,135,436	2,135,437	1
Ohio	14,699,566	14,677,035	14,677,042	7
Oklahoma	5,126,448	5,118,591	5,118,593	2
Oregon	4,587,737	4,580,705	4,580,707	2
Pennsylvania	14,475,632	14,453,444	14,453,451	7
Rhode Island	2,138,714	2,135,436	2,135,437	1
South Carolina	5,688,361	5,679,642	5,679,644	2
South Dakota	2,138,714	2,135,436	2,135,437	1
Tennessee	8,008,472	7,996,197	7,996,200	3
Texas	38,785,179	38,725,730	38,725,747	17
Utah	5,005,224	4,997,552	4,997,555	3
Vermont	2,138,714	2,135,436	2,135,437	1
Virginia	10,279,887	10,264,131	10,264,135	4
Washington	8,184,641	8,172,096	8,172,099	3
West Virginia	2,138,714	2,135,436	2,135,437	1
Wisconsin	6,997,861	6,987,135	6,987,138	3
Wyoming	2,138,714	2,135,436	2,135,437	1
American Samoa	592,467	577,725	577,725	0
Guam	1,449,722	1,413,648	1,413,649	1
Northern Mariana Islands	454,521	443,211	443,211	0
Puerto Rico	4,968,329	4,960,713	4,960,716	3
Virgin Islands	772,790	753,560	753,561	1
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside (BIA)	5,387,654	5,378,442	5,378,444	2
Other (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0
Total	436,400,000	435,653,802	435,654,000	198