# **Archived Information**

**CFDA Numbers:** <u>84.323</u> - Special Education\_State Program Improvement Grants for Children with Disabilities

84.324 - Special Education\_Research and Innovation to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities

84.325 - Special Education\_Personnel Preparation to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities

84.326 - Special Education\_Technical Assistance and Dissemination to Improve Services and Results for Children with Disabilities

84.327 - Special Education\_Technology and Media Services for Individuals with Disabilities

84.328 - Special Education\_Parent Information Centers

# Goal 8: To link best practices to states, school systems and families to improve results for infants, toddlers and children with disabilities

Objective 8.1 of 5: Programs respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families

Indicator 8.1.1 of 1: Responsive to critical needs: The percentage of IDEA program activities that are determined by expert panels to respond to critical needs of children with disabilities and their families will increase: (a) Research and innovation, (b) Technology, (c) Personnel preparation, (d) Technical assistance, and (e) State improvement.

	Targets and Performance	Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality		
Research & Inn	ovation		Status: Unable to judge	Additional Source Information:		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>Explanation:</b> Actual data for the years 2000	Expert Panel		
1999	91		and earlier have been moved back one year	Frequency: Annually.		
2000	72		compared to the FY 2001 report. This adjustment reflects the year in which the data	Collection Period: 2002 Data Available: September 2003		
2001	83		were collected rather than reported.	Validated By: No Formal		
2002		85		Verification.		
			Fluctuations in previous year data are expected for several years while the data			
Technology (fro	m Technology & Media)	•	collection methodology is refined. There is a			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	one-year lag in data. Projects are evaluated			
2000	75		by an expert panel after a full year of funding.			
2001	77					
2002		85				
Media (from Teo	chnology & Media program)		1			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets				
2000	41					
2001	74					
2002		85				
μ			l]	1		

1/31/2003

Personnel prepara	ation	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1999	67	
2000	68	
2001	78	
2002		85
Technical assista	nce	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2000	57	
2001	75	
2002		85
State improvemen		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	80	
2002		85
Devent training		
Parent training		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
2001	88	
2002		85

**Objective 8.2 of 5: Projects use high-quality methods and materials.** 

Indicator 8.2.1 of 1: Highest standards for methods and materials: Highest standards for methods and materials: Expert panels determine that IDEA-funded projects use exceptionally rigorous quantitative or qualitative research and evaluation methods (for Research and innovation and Technology and media activities); or use current research-validated practices and materials (for Personnel preparation, Technical assistance, and State improvement activities).

						Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
Perce	Percentage of projects that meet exceptionally high standards: research and innovation										Status: Target exceeded	Additional Source	
Year			Act	ual Per	forma	nce			Pe	rformance Targets	Explanation: Actual data for	Information: Expert Panel	
	Resea	ırchDen	10.Outr	eachPl	PrepTA	State Paren ATechImprvtTrainin		ırchDer	no.Ou	State Parent utreachPPrepTATechImprvtTraining	the years 2000 and earlier have been moved back one	Frequency:	
1998									year compared to the FY 2001 report. This adjustment	Biennially. Collection Period:			
1999	<b>1999</b> 50 70 20 50 97 94 65 20 25										reflects the year in which the	2002	
P										1	1	I I	

2000	77	13	11	50	8	40		<b> </b>							data were collected rather than reported. There is a March 2003
2001 2002	69	66	50	16	27	33	66	75	70	55	20	40	40	70	one-year lag in data. Projects are evaluated by an expert panel after a full year of funding.
															All successful applications under IDEA programs include high quality methods and materials, as judged by panels during the review process. This indicator applies a more rigorous standard to assess projects that have exceptionally high standards. It takes at least three years to achieve stability in review and assessment process. For Research, Demonstration and Outreach Activities, which have had four years of measurement, the data indicate continuing positive progress. This results from increased emphasis in the application requirements on project evaluation, and increased size of the grant funding to support improved methods and materials. It is too soon to assess progress for six of these programs.

## Objective 8.3 of 5: Projects communicate appropriately and products are used to improve results for children with disabilities and their families.

Indica will in	Indicator 8.3.1 of 2: Communication with target audiences: The percentage of IDEA-funded projects that communicate appropriately with target audiences will increase. (a) Research and innovation (b) Technology (c) Personnel preparation projects of national significance (d) Technical assistance.									
	Targets and Perfor	mance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality						
Perce	entage of projects that meet exceptionally high sta	ndards: Research and Innovation	Status: Unable to judge	Additional Source						
Year	Actual Performance	Progress: FY 2001 data	Information: Project information.							
μ		1	l							

	Resear	rchDen	no Outr	aachTech	Paren PrepTATrainin		archDe	mo Out	reachTech	Pare	
2000	60	40	10.000	40	100	ig i vese		no.Out		in ricprArialli	Explanation: Actual data for the Collection Period: 200
2000	91	57	80	80	71						years 2000 and earlier have been moved back one year compared to September
2002	51	57	00	00	7.1	85	60	85	85	80	the FY 2001 report. This Validated By: No Form
											<ul> <li>adjustment reflects the year in which the data were collected rather than reported.</li> <li>There is a one-year lag in data. Projects are evaluated by an expert panel after a full year of funding. Projects are expected to be of high quality and communicate findings through appropriate referred journals and other vehicles such as the Internet, association publications, CD-ROMs, films, teaching modules, state and national directories, career plan, radio interviews, course syllabi, and Federally-funded technical</li> <li>Verification. Project information is reviewed by a panel consisting of independent, third partreviewers who are experts in the program content and trained in the review procedures. The panel results are analyzed by experts in evaluation research.</li> </ul>
											assistance providers, and to include a citation of funding support under IDEA.
is app	oropria	te, use	e produ	ucts and nnel prep	practices develo	oped the nnical as	rough I ssistan	DEA p	rograms to	o improve res	assistance providers, and to include a citation of funding support under
is app b) Teo	oropria chnolo	ite, use gy (c)	e produ Persor	ucts and nnel prep	practices develo aration (d) Tech Targets and Perf	oped the	rough I ssistan e Data	DEA pi ce (e) j	rograms to parent train	o improve res	assistance providers, and to include         a citation of funding support under         IDEA.         ding policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or other         alts for children with disabilities. (a) Research and innovation         tate improvement.         Assessment of Progress         Sources and Data         Quality         Status: Unable to judge
is app b) Teo	oropria chnolo	ite, use gy (c)	e produ Persor	ucts and nnel prep list with p	practices develo aration (d) Tech	oped the nnical as formance ation: Re	rough I ssistan e Data	DEA pi ce (e) p & Innov	vation	o improve res	assistance providers, and to include         a citation of funding support under         IDEA.         ding policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or other         alts for children with disabilities. (a) Research and innovation         tate improvement.         Assessment of Progress         Sources and Data         Quality         Status: Unable to judge         Additional Source         Information: Project
s app b) Teo	oropria chnolo ntage c	ite, use gy (c)	e produ Persor	ucts and nnel prep list with p	practices develo aration (d) Tech Targets and Perf ositive determina	oped the nnical as formance ation: Re	rough I ssistan e Data	DEA pi ce (e) p & Innov	vation	o improve res ning, and (f) S	assistance providers, and to include         a citation of funding support under         IDEA.         ding policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or othe         auts for children with disabilities. (a) Research and innovation         tate improvement.         Assessment of Progress         Sources and Data         Quality         Status: Unable to judge         Explanation: Actual data for the         years 2000 and earlier have been
s app b) Teo	ntage of Year	ite, use gy (c)	e produ Persor	ucts and nnel prep list with p	practices develor aration (d) Tech Targets and Perf ositive determina tual Performanc	oped the nnical as formance ation: Re	rough I ssistan e Data	DEA pi ce (e) p & Innov	vation	o improve res ning, and (f) S	assistance providers, and to include         a citation of funding support under         IDEA.         ding policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or othe         auts for children with disabilities. (a) Research and innovation         tate improvement.         Assessment of Progress         Status: Unable to judge         Explanation: Actual data for the         years 2000 and earlier have been         moved back one year compared to
as app b) Teo	ntage of Year 2000	ite, use gy (c)	e produ Persor	ucts and nnel prep list with p	practices develo aration (d) Tech Targets and Perf ositive determina tual Performanc 53	oped the nnical as formance ation: Re	rough I ssistan e Data	DEA pi ce (e) p & Innov	vation	o improve res ning, and (f) S ce Targets	assistance providers, and to include         a citation of funding support under         IDEA.         ding policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or other         auts for children with disabilities. (a) Research and innovation         tate improvement.         Assessment of Progress         Status: Unable to judge         Explanation: Actual data for the         years 2000 and earlier have been         moved back one year compared to         the FY 2001 report. This         adjustment reflects the year in
as app b) Teo Percel	ntage c Year 2000 2001 2002	ite, use gy (c)	rt pane	list with p	practices develo aration (d) Tech Targets and Perf ositive determina tual Performanc 53 58	oped thinnical as formance ation: Re	e Data	DEA pi ce (e) p & Innov F	vation Performance 65	o improve res ning, and (f) S ce Targets	assistance providers, and to include         a citation of funding support under         IDEA.         ding policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or othe         auts for children with disabilities. (a) Research and innovation         tate improvement.         Assessment of Progress         Status: Unable to judge         Explanation: Actual data for the         years 2000 and earlier have been         moved back one year compared to         the FY 2001 report. This         adjustment reflects the year in         which the data were collected         rather than reported.
as app b) Teo Percel	ntage c Year 2000 2001 2002	ite, use gy (c)	rt pane	list with p	practices develo aration (d) Tech Targets and Perf ositive determina tual Performanc 53	oped thinnical as formance ation: Re ce	e Data	DEA pi ce (e) p & Innov F	vation Performance 65 media	o improve res ning, and (f) S ce Targets	assistance providers, and to include         a citation of funding support under         IDEA.         ding policy-makers, administrators, teachers, parents, or othe         auts for children with disabilities. (a) Research and innovation         tate improvement.         Assessment of Progress         Status: Unable to judge         Explanation: Actual data for the         years 2000 and earlier have been         moved back one year compared to         the FY 2001 report. This         adjustment reflects the year in         which the data were collected

1999		89	panel after a full year of funding.	improvement grant
2000	47		Fluctuations in data are expected for several years while the data	program are being collected through an
2002		65	Collection methodology is refined. To improve the quality of the	evaluation study and be available in 2002.
Percentage of expert p	anelist with positive determination: Persor	nnel Preparation	evaluations the size of the review panel representing the variety of	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	stakeholders in special education	
2000	55		was increased from 5 persons in 2000 to 80 in 2001. This	
2002		65	improvement has resulted in a	
			much more robust and accurate measure of this indicator.	
Percentage of expert p	panelist with positive determination: Techn	ical Assistance		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1998	67			
1999		78		
2000	59			
2001	69			
Percentage of expert p	panelists with positive determination: Parer	nt information		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	75			
Percentage of panelist	s with positive determination: State improv	vement		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
2001	80			

#### Objective 8.4 of 5: PERSONNEL ARE PREPARED TO SERVE CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.

Indicator 8.4.1 of 3: Persons trained to serve children with disabilities: The percentage of persons who obtain their degrees with IDEA support and serve children with disabilities as teachers, early intervention personnel, related services personnel, or leadership personnel within 3 years of receiving their degrees will increase.

Targets and Performance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
- No Targets And Performance Data -	<b>Explanation:</b> This indicator is under review by the Department. No data to report for FY2002.	<ul> <li>Additional Source Information: Annual Performance Reports.</li> <li>Frequency: Annually.</li> <li>Validated By: Federal Statistical Agencies.</li> </ul>

Limitations: In 2001 this indicator will be revised to reflect employment, 1 year after receipt of degrees. This data is more readily accessible and timely than data in the current indicator.

Indicator 8.4.2 of 3: Grants to minority institutions: The percentage of IDEA grants for personnel preparation awarded to Historically Black Colleges and Universities and other minority institutions, including tribal colleges, will increase.

	Targets and Performance	Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
Percentage of all to minority institu	l personnel-preparation awards (net tions	w and continuation) that went	<b>F</b> our la constitución This indicator is under revision	Additional Source Information: Analysis of project information.	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>Explanation:</b> This indicator is under review by the Department. No data to report for		
1997	15.40		FY2002.	Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.	
1998	17.70			By ED.	
1999	26.40			Limitations: See explanation.	
2000	34	28			
2001		32			
	Targets and Performance	Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
financial assista	nce for training under IDEA will i Targets and Performance - No Targets And Performan	Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality Additional Source Information:	
			<b>Explanation:</b> This indicator is under review by the Department. No data to report for FY2002.	Performance Report. Validated By: On-Site Monitoring By ED.	
				<b>Limitations:</b> Self-report by projects may hamper validity. OSEP will verify results with follow-up survey.	

### Objective 8.5 of 5: FAMILIES RECEIVE INFORMATION ABOUT SERVICES FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.

	Indicator 8.5.1 of 1: Increase in informed families: The percentage of families that report that the training and technical assistance received from the Parent Information and Training Centers made a positive difference in their child's supports and services will increase.							
Targets and Performance Data     Assessment of Progress     Sources and Data Quality								
[	¬[							

Percentage of t	amilies reporting posi	tive difference				Additional Source Information:		
Year	Actual Perf	ormance	Performanc	ce Targets	Explanation: This indicator is under review	Project Performance Data.		
1999	71				by the Department. No data to report for			
2000	86.5	0	75	5	FY2002.	Limitations: Self-report by projects		
	•		-			may hamper validity. OSEP will		
Percentage of t telephone sess	amilies reporting posi ions	tive difference fro	m face-to-face a	and		verify results with follow-up survey.		
Year	Actual Perf	ormance	Performanc	ce Targets				
	Face-to-face	Telephone	Face-to-face	Telephone				
2001	97	69						