Institute of Education Sciences

Supplemental Volume
NCEE 2023 007c
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

IDEA State and Local Implementation Study 2019: Compendium of Survey Results

A Publication of the National Center for Education Evaluation at IES

U.S. Department of Education
Miguel A. Cardona
Secretary

Institute of Education Sciences
Mark Schneider
Director

National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance
Matthew Soldner
Commissioner

Lauren Angelo
Project Officer

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) is the independent, nonpartisan statistics, research, and evaluation arm of the U.S. Department of Education. The IES mission is to provide scientific evidence on which to ground education practice and policy and to share this information in formats that are useful and accessible to educators, parents, policymakers, researchers, and the public.

We strive to make our products available in a variety of formats and in language that is appropriate to a variety of audiences. You, as our customer, are the best judge of our success in communicating information effectively. If you have any comments or suggestions about this or any other IES product or report, we would like to hear from you. Please direct your comments to ncee.feedback@ed.gov.

This report was prepared for the Institute of Education Sciences under Contract ED-IES-17-C-0069 by Mathematica. The content of the publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

July 2023

This report is in the public domain. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, it should be cited as:

Potamites, E., Lai, I., Coopersmith, J., Larson, A., Lipscomb, S., and Johnson, A. (2023). IDEA State and Local Implementation Study 2019 (NCEE-2023-007c). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee.

This report is available on the Institute of Education Sciences website at http://ies.ed.gov/ncee

IES Institute of Education Sciences

IDEA State and Local Implementation Study 2019: Compendium of Survey Results

Supplemental Volume

July 2023

Elizabeth Potamites
Ijun Lai
Jared Coopersmith
Addison Larson
Stephen Lipscomb
Amy Johnson

Mathematica

NCEE-2023-007c
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Federal policy has long played a key role in the education of the more than 1 in every 10 US children who are identified with a disability. But the context for those policies has been shifting. Recent court decisions, regulations, and guidance; students' increasing language diversity; and environmental and health issues like the opioid crisis are expected to influence both the extent of supports needed and the ways practitioners and officials work to meet those needs through early intervention and special education. The IDEA State and Local Implementation Study 2019, conducted by the National Center for Education Evaluation (NCEE), provides a national picture of implementation of the Individuals with Disability Education Act (IDEA) 15 years after the law was last updated. It describes how states and districts have adapted their policies and practices to the changing landscape, comparing data from 2019 to data from a similar study conducted in 2009.

This new information will lay the groundwork for an upcoming reauthorization of IDEA. The study addresses the following research questions.

1. What are the state and local policies and practices related to identifying children with disabilities, promoting access to the general education curriculum, and providing services?
2. What key resource decisions do states and districts make to support children with disabilities, including funding for various activities and the hiring and retention of personnel?
3. How have key policies and practices changed over time?

Data collection for the study included surveys of state administrators from all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and entities receiving IDEA funding, as well as surveys of a nationally representative sample of school districts and schools. The surveys focused on the 2019-20 school year, with most responses provided before the coronavirus pandemic shut down schools in many communities. The results will be provided in topical reports.

This compendium presents comprehensive information from the study and serves as a supplement to the study reports, which synthesize the data into sets of key findings. Chapter 1 of this document provides information on the study methodology, including the samples, data sources, and statistical tests used to determine if findings presented in the reports are reliable and not due to chance. Chapter 2 includes tables that present the results for each item in the surveys the study administered. Chapter 3 includes the survey instruments used to collect the study data.

Contents

Chapter 1. Methodology 1

Data sources 2

Analysis and statistical tests 10

Reference 11

Chapter 2. Compendium of Data Tables 13

Overview 14

2.0.1. Background context: Populations served 15

2.1.1. Identification for services: Child find 22

2.1.2. Identification for services: Eligibility determination and MTSS 133

2.1.3. Identification for services: Significant disproportionality in identification 167

2.2.1. Individualized plans to meet challenging objectives: Engagement in IEP/IFSP development 177

2.2.2. Individualized plans to meet challenging objectives: IEP/IFSP content 209

2.2.3. Individualized plans to meet challenging objectives: Monitoring progress 307

2.3.1. Access to general education programs and supports: Environment and significant disproportionality in placement 326

2.3.2. Access to general education programs and supports: Curriculum/activities 389

2.3.3. Access to general education programs and supports: Assistive technology 469

2.3.4. Access to general education programs and supports: Coordination/collaboration 502

2.4.1. Support for transitions: Coordination/collaboration (this includes interagency coordination) 520

2.4.2. Support for transitions: Family involvement 537

2.4.3. Support for transitions: Transition services/supports 540

2.4.4. Support for transitions: Follow-up after transition 558

2.5.1. Behavioral policies and supports: Discipline policy 575

2.5.2. Behavioral policies and supports: Significant disproportionality in discipline 628

2.5.3. Behavioral policies and supports: Supports provided 635

2.6.1. Evidence from research: Identifying evidence 669
2.6.2. Evidence from research: Supporting use of evidence 696
2.7.1. Funding allocation: Funding sources 725
2.7.2. Funding allocation: Distribution of funding 752
2.7.3. Funding allocation: Use of funds 779
2.8.1. Personnel allocation: Qualification standards 866
2.8.2. Personnel allocation: Staffing shortages and initiatives 894
2.8.3. Personnel allocation: Staff retention and initiatives to address retention challenges 915

Chapter 3. Survey Instruments 945

Overview 946
State education agency survey on IDEA implementation for school-age children 947
State education agency survey on IDEA implementation for preschool-age children 1017
State education agency survey on IDEA implementation for infants and toddlers 1072
District survey on IDEA implementation for school-age children 1114
District survey on IDEA implementation for preschool-age children 1199
School survey on IDEA implementation for preschool- and school-age children 1243

Chapter 1. Exhibits

Exhibit 1.1. District strata 4
Exhibit 1.2. School strata within district sample 6
Exhibit 1.3. District response counts and response rates by sampling strata, school-age IDEA survey 7
Exhibit 1.4. District response counts and response rates by sampling strata, preschool-age IDEA survey 8
Exhibit 1.5. School response counts and response rates by sampling strata 8

Chapter 2. Tables

2.0.1. Background context: Populations served 15

Table 2.0.1.1. Student populations for whom designated state special education directors are responsible (school-age children) 15
Table 2.0.1.2. Student populations for whom designated state special education directors are responsible (preschool-age children) 16
Table 2.0.1.3. Populations for whom designated early intervention coordinators are responsible 17
Table 2.0.1.4. Student populations for whom designated district special education coordinators are responsible (school-age children) 18
Table 2.0.1.5. Student populations for whom designated district special education coordinators are responsible (preschool-age children) 19
Table 2.0.1.6. Roles held by school-level staff with knowledge about school special education policies and practices 20
Table 2.0.1.7. Grade levels offered by schools 21

2.1.1. Identification for services: Child find 22

Table 2.1.1.1. Number of state agencies that have posted their current eligibility criteria for special education and related services on the agency website 22
Table 2.1.1.2. Number of states with public charter schools 23
Table 2.1.1.3. Number of states with public virtual schools 24
Table 2.1.1.4a. Professional development state agencies provide to district or school staff to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children, by school types (50 states and DC) 25
Table 2.1.1.4b. Professional development state-level agencies provide to district or school staff to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children, by school types (entities) 26
Table 2.1.1.5a. Written materials and resources state agencies provide to district or school staff to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children, across school types (50 states and DC) 27
Table 2.1.1.5b. Written materials and resources state-level agencies provide to district or school staff to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children, across school types (entities) 28
Table 2.1.1.6. Number of state agencies that provide written materials and resources on referrals or identification to parents/guardians of school-age children, by school type 29
Table 2.1.1.7a. Number of state agencies that monitor and provide targeted assistance to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children, across school types (50 states and DC) 30
Table 2.1.1.7b. Number of state-level agencies that monitor and provide targeted assistance to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children, across school types (entities) 31

Table 2.1.1.8. Number of state agencies that have a system in place for schools to notify the state if they identify a school-age child with a disability, by school type 32
Table 2.1.1.9. Number of state agencies that take some type of additional action to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children with disabilities in traditional public schools 33
Table 2.1.1.10. Number of state agencies that take some type of additional action to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children with disabilities in public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district 34
Table 2.1.1.11. Number of state agencies that take some type of additional action to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children with disabilities in public charter schools that are their own school district 35
Table 2.1.1.12. Number of state agencies that take some type of additional action to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children with disabilities in public virtual schools 36
Table 2.1.1.13. Number of state agencies that take further action to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children with disabilities in private schools 37
Table 2.1.1.14. Supports state agencies provide to help districts apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination period (school-age children) 38
Table 2.1.1.15a. Actions state agencies take with other state and local agencies and programs to identify or determine eligibility of school-age children who have experienced emerging health concerns (50 states and DC) 39
Table 2.1.1.15b. Actions state-level agencies take with other state and local agencies and programs to identify or determine eligibility of school-age children who have experienced emerging health concerns (entities) 40
Table 2.1.1.16. Number of state agencies with policies and practices for identifying students with specific learning disabilities that differ by grade level (school-age children) 41
Table 2.1.1.17. Activities or services state agencies offer to ensure non-English-speaking parents/guardians understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes for school-age children 42
Table 2.1.1.18. Activities state agencies perform to ensure referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent (school-age children) 43
Table 2.1.1.19. Challenges state agencies experience in ensuring referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent (school-age children) 44
Table 2.1.1.20. Number of state agencies that have posted their current eligibility criteria for the preschool-age special education program and related services on the agency website 45
Table 2.1.1.21. Activities state agencies conduct to support the identification of preschool-age children in need of special education services 46
Table 2.1.1.22a. Actions state agencies take with other state or local agencies to identify and determine eligibility of preschool-age children suspected of having a disability (50 states and DC) 47
Table 2.1.1.22b. Actions state-level agencies take with other state-level or local agencies to identify and determine eligibility of preschool-age children suspected of having a disability (entities) 48
Table 2.1.1.23. Supports state agencies provide to parents/guardians of infants and toddlers who received early intervention services and who are not determined eligible for preschool special education services 49
Table 2.1.1.24. Supports state agencies provide to help districts apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination period (preschool-age children) 50
Table 2.1.1.25a. Actions state agencies take with other agencies and programs to identify and determine eligibility of preschool-age children who have experienced emerging health concerns (50 states and DC) 51
Table 2.1.1.25b. Actions state-level agencies take with other agencies and programs to identify and determine eligibility of preschool-age children who have experienced emerging health concerns (entities) 52

Table 2.1.1.26. Number of state agencies with policies and practices for identifying students with specific learning disabilities that differ by grade level (preschool-age children) 53
Table 2.1.1.27. Activities or services state agencies offer to ensure non-English-speaking parents/guardians understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes for preschool-age children 54
Table 2.1.1.28. Activities state agencies perform to ensure referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent (preschool-age children) 55
Table 2.1.1.29. Challenges state agencies experience in ensuring referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent (preschool-age children) 56
Table 2.1.1.30. Number of lead agencies that have posted their current eligibility criteria for Part C early intervention services on the agency website 57
Table 2.1.1.31a. Actions lead agencies take with other state or local agencies to identify and determine eligibility of infants and toddlers suspected of having a disability (50 states and DC) 58
Table 2.1.1.31b. Actions lead agencies take with other state-level or local agencies to identify and determine eligibility of infants and toddlers suspected of having a disability (entities) 59
Table 2.1.1.32. Status of lead agencies' adoption of the screening procedures option made available in the 2011 Part C regulations 60
Table 2.1.1.33. Lead agencies' experiences in using the screening procedure option made available in the 2011 Part C regulations 61
Table 2.1.1.34. Primary reasons lead agencies are not adopting the screening procedures option made available in the 2011 Part C regulations 62
Table 2.1.1.35. Activities lead agencies conduct to support the identification of infants and toddlers in need of early intervention services 63
Table 2.1.1.36. Referral sources lead agencies listed as their top three largest for Part C early intervention services 64
Table 2.1.1.37a. Actions lead agencies take with other state or local agencies and programs to identify and determine eligibility of infants and toddlers who have experienced emerging health concerns (50 states and DC) 65
Table 2.1.1.37b. Actions lead agencies take with other state-level or local agencies and programs to identify and determine eligibility of infants and toddlers who have experienced emerging health concerns (entities) 66
Table 2.1.1.38. Activities or services lead agencies offer to ensure non-English-speaking parents/guardians understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes and in early intervention services 67
Table 2.1.1.39. Activities lead agencies perform to help ensure referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent 68
Table 2.1.1.40. Challenges states experience in ensuring referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent 69
Table 2.1.1.41. Actions districts take with other agencies and programs to identify or determine eligibility of school-age children who have experienced emerging health concerns 70
Table 2.1.1.42. Percentage of districts that administer a kindergarten readiness screener 71
Table 2.1.1.42a. Percentage of districts that administer a kindergarten readiness screener, by district type 72
Table 2.1.1.42b. Percentage of districts that administer a kindergarten readiness screener, by district size 73
Table 2.1.1.42c. Percentage of districts that administer a kindergarten readiness screener, by district rurality 74
Table 2.1.1.43. Skills districts measure with their kindergarten readiness screener 75
Table 2.1.1.44. Percentage of districts that use the results of their kindergarten readiness screener to inform student evaluation for special education services 76

Table 2.1.1.45. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having dyslexia 77
Table 2.1.1.45a. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having dyslexia, by district type 78
Table 2.1.1.45b. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having dyslexia, by district size 79
Table 2.1.1.45c. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having dyslexia, by district rurality 80
Table 2.1.1.46. Special assessments districts require or recommend to determine eligibility for special education for school-age children with dyslexia 81
Table 2.1.1.47. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having autism spectrum disorder 82
Table 2.1.1.47a. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having autism spectrum disorder, by district type 83
Table 2.1.1.47b. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having autism spectrum disorder, by district size 84
Table 2.1.1.47c. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having autism spectrum disorder, by district rurality 85
Table 2.1.1.48. Special assessments districts require or recommend to determine eligibility for special education for school-age children with autism spectrum disorder 86
Table 2.1.1.49. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children who are English learners 87
Table 2.1.1.49a. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children who are English learners, by district type 88
Table 2.1.1.49b. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children who are English learners, by district size 89
Table 2.1.1.49c. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children who are English learners, by district rurality 90
Table 2.1.1.50. Special assessments districts require or recommend to determine eligibility for special education for school-age children who are English learners 91
Table 2.1.1.51. Activities or services districts offer to ensure non-English-speaking parents/guardians understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes for school-age children 92
Table 2.1.1.51a. Activities or services districts offer to ensure non-English-speaking parents/guardians understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes for school-age children, by district type 93
Table 2.1.1.51b. Activities or services districts offer to ensure non-English-speaking parents/guardians understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes for school-age children, by district size 94
Table 2.1.1.51c. Activities or services districts offer to ensure non-English-speaking parents/guardians understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes for school-age children, by district rurality 95
Table 2.1.1.52. Challenges districts experience in ensuring referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent 96
Table 2.1.1.52a. Challenges districts experience in ensuring referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent, by district type 97

Table 2.1.1.52b. Challenges districts experience in ensuring referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent, by district size 98
Table 2.1.1.52c. Challenges districts experience in ensuring referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent, by district rurality 99
Table 2.1.1.53. Average number of students newly evaluated for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B and found eligible for special education services during the 2018-2019 school year, by grade 100
Table 2.1.1.54. Supports districts provide to help staff apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination process (school-age children) 101
Table 2.1.1.54a. Supports districts provide to help staff apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination process, by district type (school-age children) 102
Table 2.1.1.54b. Supports districts provide to help staff apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination process, by district size (school-age children) 103
Table 2.1.1.54c. Supports districts provide to help staff apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination process, by district rurality (school-age children) 104
Table 2.1.1.55. Parties in districts responsible for identifying students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools 105
Table 2.1.1.55a. Parties in districts responsible for identifying students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools, by district type 106
Table 2.1.1.55b. Parties in districts responsible for identifying students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools, by district size 107
Table 2.1.1.55c. Parties in districts responsible for identifying students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools, by district rurality 108
Table 2.1.1.56. Approaches districts use to identify students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools 109
Table 2.1.1.56a. Approaches districts use to identify students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools, by district type 110
Table 2.1.1.56b. Approaches districts use to identify students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools, by district size 111
Table 2.1.1.56c. Approaches districts use to identify students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools, by district rurality 112
Table 2.1.1.57. Average number of students with disabilities and parentally placed in private schools that districts evaluated for special education services in the 2018-2019 school year 113
Table 2.1.1.58. Average number of students with disabilities and parentally placed in private schools that were found eligible for special education services in the 2018-2019 school year 114
Table 2.1.1.59. Activities districts conduct to support the identification of preschool-age children in need of special education services 115
Table 2.1.1.59a. Activities districts conduct to support the identification of preschool-age children in need of special education services, by district type 116
Table 2.1.1.59b. Activities districts conduct to support the identification of preschool-age children in need of special education services, by district size 117
Table 2.1.1.59c. Activities districts conduct to support the identification of preschool-age children in need of special education services, by district rurality 118
Table 2.1.1.60. Supports districts provide to parents/guardians of infants and toddlers who received early intervention services and who are not determined eligible for preschool special education services 119

Table 2.1.1.60a. Supports districts provide to parents/guardians of infants and toddlers who received early intervention services and who are not determined eligible for preschool special education services, by district type 120
Table 2.1.1.60b. Supports districts provide to parents/guardians of infants and toddlers who received early intervention services and who are not determined eligible for preschool special education services, by district size 121
Table 2.1.1.60c. Supports districts provide to parents/guardians of infants and toddlers who received early intervention services and who are not determined eligible for preschool special education services, by district rurality 122
Table 2.1.1.61. Average number of preschool-age and prekindergarten children districts newly evaluated for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B and found eligible for special education during the 2018–2019 school year 123
Table 2.1.1.61a. Average number of preschool-age and prekindergarten children districts newly evaluated for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B and found eligible for special education during the 2018–2019 school year, by district type 124
Table 2.1.1.61b. Average number of preschool-age and prekindergarten children districts newly evaluated for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B and found eligible for special education during the 2018–2019 school year, by district size 125
Table 2.1.1.61c. Average number of preschool-age and prekindergarten children districts newly evaluated for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B and found eligible for special education during the 2018–2019 school year, by district rurality 126
Table 2.1.1.62. Supports districts provide to help staff apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination process (preschool-age children) 127
Table 2.1.1.62a. Supports districts provide to help staff apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination process, by district type (preschool-age children) 128
Table 2.1.1.62b. Supports districts provide to help staff apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination process, by district size (preschool-age children) 129
Table 2.1.1.62c. Supports districts provide to help staff apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination process, by district rurality (preschool-age children) 130
Table 2.1.1.63. Average number of children with disabilities and parentally placed in private preschools that districts evaluated for special education services in the 2018–2019 school year 131
Table 2.1.1.64. Average number of students with disabilities and parentally placed in private preschools that were found eligible for special education services in the 2018–2019 school year 132

2.1.2. Identification for services: Eligibility determination and MTSS 133

Table 2.1.2.1a. Number of state agencies requiring Multi-Tiered Systems of Support to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children, across school types (50 states and DC) 133
Table 2.1.2.1b. Number of state-level agencies requiring Multi-Tiered Systems of Support to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children, across school types (entities) 134
Table 2.1.2.2. Activities state agencies perform related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention (school-age children) 135
Table 2.1.2.3. State agency initiatives related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, in reading (school-age children) 136
Table 2.1.2.4. State agency initiatives related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, in math (school-age children) 137
Table 2.1.2.5. State agency initiatives related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, in behavior (school-age children) 138

Table 2.1.2.6a. Aspects of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support implementation as part of state agencies' pilot or statewide initiatives that promote Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention in elementary schools, across decision levels (50 states and DC) 139
Table 2.1.2.6b. Aspects of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support implementation as part of state-level agencies' pilot or statewide initiatives that promote Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention in elementary schools, across decision levels (entities) 140
Table 2.1.2.7. State policies related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, state agencies follow for determining eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities (school-age children) 141
Table 2.1.2.8. State policies state agencies follow if permitted to use a discrepancy method in determining specific learning disabilities (school-age children) 142
Table 2.1.2.9. Number of state agencies that have a plan to stop using an IQ-achievement discrepancy model for determining of eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities by the 2020–2021 school year (school-age children) 143
Table 2.1.2.10. Number of state agencies that allow an approach other than Multi-Tiered Systems of Support or IQ-achievement discrepancy to determine the presence of specific learning disabilities (school-age children) 144
Table 2.1.2.11. Activities state agencies perform related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention (preschool-age children)....145
Table 2.1.2.12. State agency initiatives related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, in reading (preschool-age children) 146
Table 2.1.2.13. State agency initiatives related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, in math (preschool-age children) 147
Table 2.1.2.14. State agency initiatives related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, in behavior (preschool-age children)....148
Table 2.1.2.15a. Aspects of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support implementation as part of state agencies' pilot or statewide initiatives that promote Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention in preschools, across decision levels (50 states and DC) 149
Table 2.1.2.15b. Aspects of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support implementation as part of state-level agencies' pilot or statewide initiatives that promote Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention in preschools, across decision levels (entities) 150
Table 2.1.2.16. State policies related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, state agencies follow for determining eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities (preschool-age children) 151
Table 2.1.2.17. State policies state agencies follow if permitted to use a discrepancy method in determining specific learning disabilities (preschool-age children) 152
Table 2.1.2.18. Number of state agencies that have a plan to stop using an IQ-achievement discrepancy model for determining of eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities by the 2020–2021 school year (preschool-age children) 153
Table 2.1.2.19. Number of state agencies that allow an approach other than Multi-Tiered Systems of Support or IQ-achievement discrepancy to determine the presence of specific learning disabilities (preschool-age children) 154
Table 2.1.2.20. Percentage of districts that use progress monitoring data from a tiered intervention system to inform aspects of special education services 155
Table 2.1.2.20a. Percentage of districts that use progress monitoring data from a tiered intervention system to inform aspects of special education services, by district type....156

Table 2.1.2.20b. Percentage of districts that use progress monitoring data from a tiered intervention system to inform aspects of special education services, by district size 157
Table 2.1.2.20c. Percentage of districts that use progress monitoring data from a tiered intervention system to inform aspects of special education services, by district rurality 158
Table 2.1.2.21. Data districts use for determining special education eligibility for elementary students with specific learning disabilities 159
Table 2.1.2.21a. Data districts use for determining special education eligibility for elementary students with specific learning disabilities, by district type 160
Table 2.1.2.21b. Data districts use for determining special education eligibility for elementary students with specific learning disabilities, by district size 161
Table 2.1.2.21c. Data districts use for determining special education eligibility for elementary students with specific learning disabilities, by district rurality 162
Table 2.1.2.22. State policies related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, districts follow for determining eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities 163
Table 2.1.2.22a. State policies related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, districts follow for determining eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities, by district type 164
Table 2.1.2.22b. State policies related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, districts follow for determining eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities, by district size 165
Table 2.1.2.22c. State policies related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, districts follow for determining eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities, by district rurality 166

2.1.3. Identification for services: Significant disproportionality in identification 167

Table 2.1.3.1. Status of progress state agencies report in defining significant disproportionality for 2019–2020 167
Table 2.1.3.2. Number of state agencies that have published their current definition of significant disproportionality on the agency website 168
Table 2.1.3.3. Actions state agencies take when a district is required to address significant disproportionality in identification 169
Table 2.1.3.4. Percentage of districts the state has identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years, by school year 170
Table 2.1.3.4a. Percentage of districts the state has identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years, by school year and district type 171
Table 2.1.3.4b. Percentage of districts the state has identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years, by school year and district size 172
Table 2.1.3.4c. Percentage of districts the state has identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years, by school year and district rurality 173
Table 2.1.3.5. Actions districts took to address or prevent significant disproportionality in identification of children with disabilities in the past five school years, across funding sources 174
Table 2.1.3.6. Professional development districts provided to address or prevent significant disproportionality in identification of children with disabilities in the past five school years, across funding sources 175
Table 2.1.3.7. Average amounts districts spent on State Part B and Coordinated Early Intervening Services activities for school-age children with disabilities in the 2018–2019 school year 176

2.2.1. Individualized plans to meet challenging objectives: Engagement in IEP/IFSP development 177

Table 2.2.1.1. Number of states that require districts or schools to provide parents/guardians with information about the Parent Training and Information Center when a referral is made (school-age children) 177

Table 2.2.1.2. Supports state agencies offered to districts in the 2019-2020 school year to promote the involvement of parents/guardians of children with Individualized Education Programs 178

Table 2.2.1.3. Ways in which state agency staff collaborated with the Parent Training and Information Center in the 2019-2020 school year (school-age children) 179

Table 2.2.1.4. Ways in which state agencies supported the Parent Training and Information Center in the 2019-2020 school year (school-age children) 180

Table 2.2.1.5. Number of states that require districts or schools to provide parents/guardians with information about the Parent Training and Information Center when a referral is made (preschool-age children) 181

Table 2.2.1.6. Resources and services state agencies offered to preschool providers in the 2019-2020 school year to promote the involvement of parents/guardians of children with Individualized Education Programs 182

Table 2.2.1.7. Ways in which state agency staff collaborated with the Parent Training and Information Center in the 2019-2020 school year (preschool-age children) 183

Table 2.2.1.8. Ways in which state agencies supported the Parent Training and Information Center in the 2019-2020 school year (preschool-age children) 184

Table 2.2.1.9a. Ways in and levels at which families are involved in the Part C system (50 states and DC) 185

Table 2.2.1.9b. Ways in and levels at which families are involved in the Part C system (entities) 186

Table 2.2.1.10. Number of states that require local early intervention providers to share information about the Parent Training and Information Center with families when a referral is made 187

Table 2.2.1.11. Resources and services lead agencies offered to local early intervention programs in fiscal year 2020 to promote the involvement of families of children with Individualized Family Service Plans 188

Table 2.2.1.12. Ways in which lead agency staff collaborated with the Parent Training and Information Center in fiscal year 2020 189

Table 2.2.1.13. Ways in which lead agencies supported the Parent Training and Information Center in fiscal year 2020 190

Table 2.2.1.14. Assistance districts provide to enable parents/guardians to participate in Individualized Education Program meetings for school-age children with disabilities 191

Table 2.2.1.14a. Assistance districts provide to enable parents/guardians to participate in Individualized Education Program meetings for school-age children with disabilities, by district type 192

Table 2.2.1.14b. Assistance districts provide to enable parents/guardians to participate in Individualized Education Program meetings for school-age children with disabilities, by district size 193

Table 2.2.1.14c. Assistance districts provide to enable parents/guardians to participate in Individualized Education Program meetings for school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 194

Table 2.2.1.15. Topics of written materials, workshops, discussions, or support groups districts offered in the 2019-2020 school year specifically for parents/guardians of students with Individualized Education Programs 195

Table 2.2.1.16. Assistance districts provide to enable parents/guardians to participate in Individualized Education Program meetings for preschool-age children with disabilities 196

Table 2.2.1.16a. Assistance districts provide to enable parents/guardians to participate in Individualized Education Program meetings for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type 197

Table 2.2.1.16b. Assistance districts provide to enable parents/guardians to participate in Individualized Education Program meetings for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size 198
Table 2.2.1.16c. Assistance districts provide to enable parents/guardians to participate in Individualized Education Program meetings for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 199
Table 2.2.1.17. Local agencies or providers with which districts coordinate to engage parents/guardians of preschool-age children with disabilities in developing Individualized Education Programs 200
Table 2.2.1.17a. Local agencies or providers with which districts coordinate to engage parents/guardians of preschool-age children with disabilities in developing Individualized Education Programs, by district type 201
Table 2.2.1.17b. Local agencies or providers with which districts coordinate to engage parents/guardians of preschool-age children with disabilities in developing Individualized Education Programs, by district size 202
Table 2.2.1.17c. Local agencies or providers with which districts coordinate to engage parents/guardians of preschool-age children with disabilities in developing Individualized Education Programs, by district rurality 203
Table 2.2.1.18. Topics of written materials, workshops, discussions, or support groups districts offered in 2019–2020 school year specifically for parents/guardians of preschool-age children with Individualized Education Programs or Individualized Family Service Plans 204
Table 2.2.1.19. Processes or programs districts used to promote the involvement of families of preschool-age children with disabilities in the 2019–2020 school year 205
Table 2.2.1.19a. Processes or programs districts used to promote the involvement of families of preschool-age children with disabilities in the 2019–2020 school year, by district type 206
Table 2.2.1.19b. Processes or programs districts used to promote the involvement of families of preschool-age children with disabilities in the 2019–2020 school year, by district size 207
Table 2.2.1.19c. Processes or programs districts used to promote the involvement of families of preschool-age children with disabilities in the 2019–2020 school year, by district rurality 208

2.2.2. Individualized plans to meet challenging objectives: IEP/IFSP content 209

Table 2.2.2.1. Topics covered in professional development provided by state agencies to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities 209
Table 2.2.2.2. Topics on which state agencies provide written policy or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities 210
Table 2.2.2.3. Resources state agencies provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities 211
Table 2.2.2.4. Agencies or entities responsible for ensuring appropriate development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs of school-age children with disabilities enrolled in public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district 212
Table 2.2.2.5. Agencies or entities responsible for ensuring appropriate development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs of school-age children with disabilities enrolled in public charter schools that are their own school district 213
Table 2.2.2.6. Agencies or entities responsible for ensuring appropriate development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs of school-age children with disabilities enrolled in public virtual schools 214
Table 2.2.2.7. Number of states that use a standardized alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards 215
Table 2.2.2.8. Criteria state agencies use to determine eligibility to participate in alternate assessments 216

Table 2.2.2.9. Number of state agencies whose current guidelines for assessment-eligibility using alternate academic achievement standards are available on a website 217
Table 2.2.2.10. Strategies states use to stay within the 1% cap 218
Table 2.2.2.11. Topics covered in professional development offered to district staff to support understanding of Alternate Assessment Based on alternate academic achievement standards 219
Table 2.2.2.12. Number of states that offer an alternate diploma for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities 220
Table 2.2.2.13. Number of states with alternate diplomas that are standards-based or aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma 221
Table 2.2.2.14. Criteria states use to determine whether school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities are eligible for the state's alternate diploma 222
Table 2.2.2.15. Number of state agencies that offer professional development to district staff to support understanding and use of a state-defined alternate diploma 223
Table 2.2.2.16. Topics covered in professional development offered to district staff to support understanding and use of a state-defined alternate diploma 224
Table 2.2.2.17. Number of states whose early learning standards for preschool-age children align with early learning guidelines or K-12 standards 225
Table 2.2.2.18. Domains covered by early learning standards for preschool-age children 226
Table 2.2.2.19. Number of states with formal written policies on developing and using standards-based Individualized Education Programs for preschool-age children with disabilities in the 2019–2020 school year 227
Table 2.2.2.20. Proportions of state staff who worked with preschool-age children and who participated in professional development on standards-based Individualized Education Program development for preschool-age children with disabilities in the 2019–2020 and 2018–2019 school years 228
Table 2.2.2.21. Topics covered in professional development provided by state agencies to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities 229
Table 2.2.2.22. Topics covered in written policy or guidelines provided by state agencies to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities 230
Table 2.2.2.23. Resources state agencies provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities 231
Table 2.2.2.24. Agencies or entities responsible for ensuring appropriate development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs of preschool-age children with disabilities enrolled in public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district 232
Table 2.2.2.25. Agencies or entities responsible for ensuring appropriate development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs of preschool-age children with disabilities enrolled in public charter schools that are their own school district 233
Table 2.2.2.26. Number of states with general early learning guidelines for infants and toddlers birth through age 2 234
Table 2.2.2.27. Domains covered by state early learning guidelines 235
Table 2.2.2.28. Number of states with formal policies on aligning Part C early intervention services with early learning guidelines in fiscal year 2020 236
Table 2.2.2.29. Number of lead agencies that provided training or professional development on aligning early learning guidelines and Part C early intervention services in fiscal years 2019 and 2020 237
Table 2.2.2.30. Topics covered in professional development provided by lead agencies to promote Individualized Family Service Plan process quality for infants and toddlers with disabilities 238
Table 2.2.2.31. Topics covered in written policy or guidelines provided by lead agencies to promote Individualized Family Service Plan process quality 239

Table 2.2.2.32. Resources lead agencies provide to promote Individualized Family Service Plan process quality 240
Table 2.2.2.33. Topics covered in professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities 241
Table 2.2.2.33a. Topics covered in professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district type 242
Table 2.2.2.33b. Topics covered in professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district size 243
Table 2.2.2.33c. Topics covered in professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 244
Table 2.2.2.34. Target audiences for professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities 245
Table 2.2.2.35. Topics on which districts provide written policies or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities 246
Table 2.2.2.35a. Topics on which districts provide written policies or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district type 247
Table 2.2.2.35b. Topics on which districts provide written policies or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district size 248
Table 2.2.2.35c. Topics on which districts provide written policies or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 249
Table 2.2.2.36. Resources districts provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities 250
Table 2.2.2.36a. Resources districts provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district type 251
Table 2.2.2.36b. Resources districts provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district size 252
Table 2.2.2.36c. Resources districts provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 253
Table 2.2.2.37. Percentage of districts that use an early warning system to identify students with disabilities at risk of dropping out of school 254
Table 2.2.2.37a. Percentage of districts that use an early warning system to identify students with disabilities at risk of dropping out of school, by district type 255
Table 2.2.2.37b. Percentage of districts that use an early warning system to identify students with disabilities at risk of dropping out of school, by district size 256
Table 2.2.2.37c. Percentage of districts that use an early warning system to identify students with disabilities at risk of dropping out of school, by district rurality 257
Table 2.2.2.38. Percentage of districts whose early warning system indicators vary based on the disability category of the student 258
Table 2.2.2.39. Ways in which districts use early warning system data to help students with disabilities 259
Table 2.2.2.40. Percentage of districts with a dropout prevention program 260
Table 2.2.2.40a. Percentage of districts with a dropout prevention program, by district type 261
Table 2.2.2.40b. Percentage of districts with a dropout prevention program, by district size 262
Table 2.2.2.40c. Percentage of districts with a dropout prevention program, by district rurality 263
Table 2.2.2.41. Dropout prevention program strategies districts use to help students with and without disabilities who are at risk of dropping out 264

Table 2.2.2.42. Percentage of districts with an alternate diploma policy, standards-based and aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma, for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities 265
Table 2.2.2.42a. Percentage of districts with an alternate diploma policy, standards-based and aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma, for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities, by district type 266
Table 2.2.2.42b. Percentage of districts with an alternate diploma policy, standards-based and aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma, for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities, by district size 267
Table 2.2.2.42c. Percentage of districts with an alternate diploma policy, standards-based and aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma, for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities, by district rurality 268
Table 2.2.2.43. School entities or staff who decide whether a school-age child with disabilities is eligible for a state-defined alternate diploma 269
Table 2.2.2.44. School entities or staff who decide whether a school-age child with disabilities has met the requirements for, and should be awarded, a state-defined alternate diploma 270
Table 2.2.2.45. Percentage of districts whose requirements to earn an alternate diploma for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities exceed the requirements of the state-defined alternate diploma 271
Table 2.2.2.46. Percentage of students with significant cognitive disabilities who earned a state-defined alternate diploma in the 2018-2019 school year 272
Table 2.2.2.47. Supports districts provide to teachers using grade-level content to teach school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities working toward a state-defined alternate diploma 273
Table 2.2.2.48. Proportion of district staff working with preschool-age children who participated in professional development on standards-based Individualized Education Program development in the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school years 274
Table 2.2.2.48a. Proportion of district staff working with preschool-age children who participated in professional development on standards-based Individualized Education Program development in the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school years, by district type 275
Table 2.2.2.48b. Proportion of district staff working with preschool-age children who participated in professional development on standards-based Individualized Education Program development in the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school years, by district size 276
Table 2.2.2.48c. Proportion of district staff working with preschool-age children who participated in professional development on standards-based Individualized Education Program development in the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school years, by district rurality 277
Table 2.2.2.49. Topics covered in professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities 278
Table 2.2.2.49a. Topics covered in professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type 279
Table 2.2.2.49b. Topics covered in professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size 280
Table 2.2.2.49c. Topics covered in professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 281
Table 2.2.2.50. Topics on which districts provide written policies or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities 282
Table 2.2.2.50a. Topics on which districts provide written policies or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type 283

Table 2.2.2.50b. Topics on which districts provide written policies or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size 284
Table 2.2.2.50c. Topics on which districts provide written policies or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 285
Table 2.2.2.51. Resources districts provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities 286
Table 2.2.2.51a. Resources districts provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type 287
Table 2.2.2.51b. Resources districts provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size 288
Table 2.2.2.51c. Resources districts provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 289
Table 2.2.2.52. Methods and actions school staff take to ensure quality Individualized Education Programs 290
Table 2.2.2.52a. Methods and actions school staff take to ensure quality Individualized Education Programs, by school type 291
Table 2.2.2.52b. Methods and actions school staff take to ensure quality Individualized Education Programs, by school rurality 293
Table 2.2.2.52c. Methods and actions school staff take to ensure quality Individualized Education Programs, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 294
Table 2.2.2.53. Factors schools consider when determining an appropriately ambitious goal for a student 295
Table 2.2.2.53a. Factors schools consider when determining an appropriately ambitious goal for a student, by school type 296
Table 2.2.2.53b. Factors schools consider when determining an appropriately ambitious goal for a student, by school rurality 297
Table 2.2.2.53c. Factors schools consider when determining an appropriately ambitious goal for a student, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 298
Table 2.2.2.54. Percentage of schools with personnel who received professional development on setting or monitoring appropriately ambitious goals in Individualized Education Programs in the 2018-2019 school year 299
Table 2.2.2.54a. Percentage of schools with personnel who received professional development on setting or monitoring appropriately ambitious goals in Individualized Education Programs in the 2018-2019 school year, by school type 300
Table 2.2.2.54b. Percentage of schools with personnel who received professional development on setting or monitoring appropriately ambitious goals in Individualized Education Programs in the 2018-2019 school year, by school rurality 301
Table 2.2.2.54c. Percentage of schools with personnel who received professional development on setting or monitoring appropriately ambitious goals in Individualized Education Programs in the 2018-2019 school year, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 302
Table 2.2.2.55. Frequency with which staff from an outside agency are consulted when writing Individualized Education Programs for prekindergarten students with disabilities 303
Table 2.2.2.56. Percentage of schools that have a dropout prevention program 304
Table 2.2.2.57. Dropout prevention program strategies schools use to help students with and without disabilities who are at risk of dropping out 305
Table 2.2.2.58. Percentage of schools that require participation in dropout prevention programs from students with disabilities who are identified as at risk of dropping out 306

2.2.3. Individualized plans to meet challenging objectives: Monitoring progress 307

Table 2.2.3.1. Ways in which state agencies monitor Individualized Education Program goals established by public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district 307

Table 2.2.3.2. Ways in which state agencies monitor Individualized Education Program goals established by public charter schools that are their own school district 308

Table 2.2.3.3. Ways in which state agencies monitor Individualized Education Program goals established by public virtual schools 309

Table 2.2.3.4. Ways in which state agencies monitor local programs to ensure Individualized Education Program teams identify appropriate goals 310

Table 2.2.3.5. Ways in which state agencies monitor local programs to ensure appropriate service decisions are delivered in accordance with the Individualized Education Program 311

Table 2.2.3.6. Number of states with public charter preschools 312

Table 2.2.3.7. Methods lead agencies use to monitor local early intervention programs to ensure Individualized Family Service Plan teams appropriately identify outcomes 313

Table 2.2.3.8. Methods lead agencies use to monitor local early intervention programs to ensure service decisions are delivered in accordance with the Individualized Family Service Plan 314

Table 2.2.3.9. Percentage of districts with processes to assess Individualized Education Program quality 315

Table 2.2.3.9a. Percentage of districts with processes to assess Individualized Education Program quality, by district type 316

Table 2.2.3.9b. Percentage of districts with processes to assess Individualized Education Program quality, by district size 317

Table 2.2.3.9c. Percentage of districts with processes to assess Individualized Education Program quality, by district rurality 318

Table 2.2.3.10. Approaches districts use to assess Individualized Education Program quality 319

Table 2.2.3.11. Information schools collect to assess Individualized Education Program quality for students with disabilities 320

Table 2.2.3.11a. Information schools collect to assess Individualized Education Program quality for students with disabilities, by school type 321

Table 2.2.3.11b. Information schools collect to assess Individualized Education Program quality for students with disabilities, by school rurality 322

Table 2.2.3.11c. Information schools collect to assess Individualized Education Program quality for students with disabilities, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 323

Table 2.2.3.12. Percentage of schools that use an early warning system to identify students with disabilities who are at risk of dropping out of school 324

Table 2.2.3.13. Ways in which schools use early warning system data to help students with disabilities 325

2.3.1. Access to general education programs and supports: Environment and significant disproportionality in placement 326

Table 2.3.1.1. Actions state agencies take when a district is required to address significant disproportionality in placement (least restrictive environment) 326

Table 2.3.1.2. Actions state agencies take to ensure services are linguistically and culturally competent (school-age children) 327

Table 2.3.1.3. Challenges state agencies experience in ensuring services are linguistically and culturally competent (school-age children) 328

Table 2.3.1.4. Number of states that operated state-funded universal preschool program in the 2019–2020 school year 329
Table 2.3.1.5. Number of states in which the local district decides which age groups (3, 4, or 5) are eligible for the state-funded universal preschool program 330
Table 2.3.1.6a. State-funded universal preschool program eligibility, by age (50 states and DC) 331
Table 2.3.1.6b. State-level-funded universal preschool program eligibility, by age (entities) 332
Table 2.3.1.7. Number of states in which the local district decides which children in each age group (3, 4, or 5) are eligible for the state-funded universal preschool program 333
Table 2.3.1.8a. Groups of children, by age, who are eligible for the state-funded universal preschool program (50 states and DC) 334
Table 2.3.1.8b. Groups of children, by age, who are eligible for the state-level-funded universal preschool program (entities) 335
Table 2.3.1.9. Actions state agencies take to ensure services are linguistically and culturally competent (preschool-age children) 336
Table 2.3.1.10. Challenges state agencies experience in ensuring services are linguistically and culturally competent (preschool-age children) 337
Table 2.3.1.11. Number of lead agencies that used the Extended Part C Option, approved by the Office of Special Education Programs, in fiscal year 2020 338
Table 2.3.1.12. Issues that affected or are affecting lead agencies' decisions to use the Extended Part C Option 339
Table 2.3.1.13. Actions lead agencies take to ensure services are linguistically and culturally competent 340
Table 2.3.1.14. Challenges lead agencies experience in ensuring services are linguistically and culturally competent 341
Table 2.3.1.15. Challenges districts face in ensuring services are linguistically and culturally competent 342
Table 2.3.1.15a. Challenges districts face in ensuring services are linguistically and culturally competent, by district type 343
Table 2.3.1.15b. Challenges districts face in ensuring services are linguistically and culturally competent, by district size 344
Table 2.3.1.15c. Challenges districts face in ensuring services are linguistically and culturally competent, by district rurality 345
Table 2.3.1.16. School years in which states identified districts as having significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or least restrictive environment placement 346
Table 2.3.1.16a. School years in which states identified districts as having significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or least restrictive environment placement, by district type 347
Table 2.3.1.16b. School years in which states identified districts as having significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or least restrictive environment placement, by district size 348
Table 2.3.1.16c. School years in which states identified districts as having significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or least restrictive environment placement, by district rurality 349
Table 2.3.1.17. Actions districts took in the past five school years to address or prevent significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or least restrictive environment placement, by funding type 350
Table 2.3.1.18. Professional development districts provided in the past five school years to address or prevent significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or least restrictive environment placement, by funding type 352

Table 2.3.1.19. Descriptions of districts and charter schools that operate as part of the district (school-age children) 353
Table 2.3.1.19a. Descriptions of districts and charter schools that operate as part of the district, by district size (school-age children) 354
Table 2.3.1.19b. Descriptions of districts and charter schools that operate as part of the district, by district rurality (school-age children) 355
Table 2.3.1.20. Authorizers for charter schools that operate as part of the district (school-age children)..... 356
Table 2.3.1.21. Percentage of districts with charter schools in their geographic area that operate independently from the district..... 357
Table 2.3.1.21a. Percentage of districts with charter schools in their geographic area that operate independently from the district, by district type 358
Table 2.3.1.21b. Percentage of districts with charter schools in their geographic area that operate independently from the district, by district size 359
Table 2.3.1.21c. Percentage of districts with charter schools in their geographic area that operate independently from the district, by district rurality 360
Table 2.3.1.22. Percentage of districts with public virtual schools that operate as part of the district 361
Table 2.3.1.22a. Percentage of districts with public virtual schools that operate as part of the district, by district type 362
Table 2.3.1.22b. Percentage of districts with public virtual schools that operate as part of the district, by district size 363
Table 2.3.1.22c. Percentage of districts with public virtual schools that operate as part of the district, by district rurality..... 364
Table 2.3.1.23. Percentage of districts with students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private school 365
Table 2.3.1.23a. Percentage of districts with students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private school, by district type..... 366
Table 2.3.1.23b. Percentage of districts with students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private school, by district size..... 367
Table 2.3.1.23c. Percentage of districts with students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private school, by district rurality 368
Table 2.3.1.24. Descriptions of districts and charter schools that operate as part of the district (preschool-age children) 369
Table 2.3.1.24a. Descriptions of districts and charter schools that operate as part of the district, by district size (preschool-age children) 370
Table 2.3.1.24b. Descriptions of districts and charter schools that operate as part of the district, by district rurality (preschool-age children) 371
Table 2.3.1.25. Authorizers for charter schools that operate as part of the district (preschool-age children) 372
Table 2.3.1.26. Percentage of districts with charter schools within their geographic area that operate independently from the district..... 373
Table 2.3.1.26a. Percentage of districts with charter schools within their geographic area that operate independently from the district, by district type 374
Table 2.3.1.26b. Percentage of districts with charter schools within their geographic area that operate independently from the district, by district size 375
Table 2.3.1.26c. Percentage of districts with charter schools within their geographic area that operate independently from the district, by district rurality..... 376
Table 2.3.1.27. Percentage of districts with children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private preschool 377

Table 2.3.1.27a. Percentage of districts with children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private preschool, by district type 378
Table 2.3.1.27b. Percentage of districts with children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private preschool, by district size 379
Table 2.3.1.27c. Percentage of districts with children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private preschool, by district rurality 380
Table 2.3.1.28. Parties in districts responsible for identifying children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools 381
Table 2.3.1.28a. Parties in districts responsible for identifying children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools, by district type 382
Table 2.3.1.28b. Parties in districts responsible for identifying children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools, by district size 383
Table 2.3.1.28c. Parties in districts responsible for identifying children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools, by district rurality 384
Table 2.3.1.29. Percentage of schools that are charter schools 385
Table 2.3.1.29a. Percentage of schools that are charter schools, by school type 386
Table 2.3.1.29b. Percentage of schools that are charter schools, by school rurality 387
Table 2.3.1.29c. Percentage of schools that are charter schools, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 388

2.3.2. Access to general education programs and supports: Curriculum/activities 389

Table 2.3.2.1. Student groups for whom states modify general education standards 389
Table 2.3.2.2. Number of state agencies that provide professional development to districts and schools on engaging school-age children with disabilities in the general education curriculum 390
Table 2.3.2.3. Target audiences for state agency-provided professional development on engaging school-age children with disabilities in the general education curriculum 391
Table 2.3.2.4. Topics covered in state agency-provided professional development on engaging school-age children with disabilities in the general education curriculum 392
Table 2.3.2.5a. Topics on which state agencies provide professional development to district special education staff (50 states and DC) 393
Table 2.3.2.5b. Topics on which state-level agencies provide professional development to district special education staff (entities) 394
Table 2.3.2.6a. Topics on which state agencies provide professional development to district general education staff (50 states and DC) 395
Table 2.3.2.6b. Topics on which state-level agencies provide professional development to district general education staff (entities) 396
Table 2.3.2.7. Number of state agencies that recommend using programs, practices, or curricula to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of school-age children with disabilities 397
Table 2.3.2.8. Materials and services state agencies offer to districts or providers to promote provision of services in least restrictive environments 398
Table 2.3.2.9. Materials and services state agencies offer to support districts and schools in using Universal Design for Learning for school-age children with disabilities 399
Table 2.3.2.10. Number of states that require all state assessments, including alternate assessments, to be developed using the principles of Universal Design for Learning 400

Table 2.3.2.11. Number of state agencies that recommend using programs, practices, or curricula to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of preschool-age children with disabilities 401
Table 2.3.2.12. Materials and services state agencies offer to districts or providers to promote the provision of services in least restrictive environments 402
Table 2.3.2.13. Materials and services state agencies offer to support districts and schools in using Universal Design for Learning for preschool-age children with disabilities 403
Table 2.3.2.14. Materials and services lead agencies offered to local early intervention programs in fiscal year 2020 to promote the provision of services in natural environments 404
Table 2.3.2.15. Strategies lead agencies used in fiscal year 2020 to support local programs in developing social-emotional skills and addressing challenging behaviors or mental health concerns for infants and toddlers with disabilities 405
Table 2.3.2.16. Strategies lead agencies use to support local early intervention programs in addressing the needs of infants and toddlers who have emerging health concerns 406
Table 2.3.2.17. Groups of students for whom districts modify their general education curriculum 407
Table 2.3.2.17a. Groups of students for whom districts modify their general education curriculum, by district type 408
Table 2.3.2.17b. Groups of students for whom districts modify their general education curriculum, by district size 409
Table 2.3.2.17c. Groups of students for whom districts modify their general education curriculum, by district rurality 410
Table 2.3.2.18. Percentage of districts with adapted general education curriculum aligned with state standards 411
Table 2.3.2.19. Entities that conducted or are conducting a check for alignment of adapted general education with state standards 412
Table 2.3.2.20. Ways in which districts support teachers to help them ensure school-age children with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum 413
Table 2.3.2.21. Percentage of districts with a policy to support access to and participation in nonacademic activities for school-age children with disabilities 414
Table 2.3.2.21a. Percentage of districts with a policy to support access to and participation in nonacademic activities for school-age children with disabilities, by district type 415
Table 2.3.2.21b. Percentage of districts with a policy to support access to and participation in nonacademic activities for school-age children with disabilities, by district size 416
Table 2.3.2.21c. Percentage of districts with a policy to support access to and participation in nonacademic activities for school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 417
Table 2.3.2.22. Methods districts use to support the participation of school-age children with disabilities in the same nonacademic extracurricular activities as children without disabilities 418
Table 2.3.2.23. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reasons, and responsible parties for school-age children with disabilities who attend public charter schools that operate as part of and are authorized by the district 419
Table 2.3.2.24. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reasons, and responsible parties for school-age children with disabilities who attend public charter schools that operate as part of the district but are authorized by another entity 420
Table 2.3.2.25. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reasons, and responsible parties for school-age children with disabilities who attend public charter schools that operate independently from a district within its geographic area 421
Table 2.3.2.26. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reason, and responsible parties for school-age children with disabilities in the district 422

Table 2.3.2.27. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reasons, and responsible parties for school-age children with disabilities who attend public virtual schools that operate as part of the district 423
Table 2.3.2.28. Services districts provided in the 2018-2019 school year to support students with disabilities who were parentally placed in private schools 424
Table 2.3.2.29. Locations where districts provided services in the 2018-2019 school year (school-age children) 425
Table 2.3.2.30. Services districts provided or funded for school-age children with disabilities in the 2017-2018, 2018-2019, or 2019-2020 school years 426
Table 2.3.2.31. Among districts that provided each service for school-age children with disabilities, percentage of districts that ranked activity as their top three (based on amount of money spent) 427
Table 2.3.2.32. Services districts provided or funded for preschool-age children with disabilities in the past three years 428
Table 2.3.2.33. Among districts that provided each service for preschool-age children with disabilities, percentage of districts that ranked activity as their top three (based on amount of money spent) 429
Table 2.3.2.34. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reasons, and responsible parties for preschool-age children with disabilities who attend public charter schools that operate as part of and are authorized by the district 430
Table 2.3.2.35. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reasons, and responsible parties for preschool-age children with disabilities who attend public charter schools that operate as part of the district but are authorized by another entity 431
Table 2.3.2.36. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reasons, and responsible parties for preschool-age children with disabilities who attend public charter schools that operate independently from a district within its geographic area 432
Table 2.3.2.37. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reasons, and responsible parties for preschool-age children with disabilities in the district 433
Table 2.3.2.38. Approaches districts use to identify children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools 434
Table 2.3.2.38a. Approaches districts use to identify children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools, by district type 435
Table 2.3.2.38b. Approaches districts use to identify children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools, by district size 436
Table 2.3.2.38c. Approaches districts use to identify children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools, by district rurality 437
Table 2.3.2.39. Services districts provided in the 2018-2019 school year to support children with disabilities who were parentally placed in private preschools 438
Table 2.3.2.40. Locations where districts provided services in the 2018-2019 school year (preschool-age children) 439
Table 2.3.2.41. Services available for students with disabilities at school 440
Table 2.3.2.41a. Services available for students with disabilities at school, by school type 441
Table 2.3.2.41b. Services available for students with disabilities at school, by school rurality 442
Table 2.3.2.41c. Services available for students with disabilities at school, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 443
Table 2.3.2.42. Accommodations or modifications available to students with Individualized Education Programs when in general education classrooms 444
Table 2.3.2.43. Additional supports and assistance available to students with Individualized Education Programs when in general education classrooms 445
Table 2.3.2.44. Resources available to general education teachers in school when special education students are included in their classes 446

Table 2.3.2.44a. Resources available to general education teachers in school when special education students are included in their classes, by school type 447
Table 2.3.2.44b. Resources available to general education teachers in school when special education students are included in their classes, by school rurality 448
Table 2.3.2.44c. Resources available to general education teachers in school when special education students are included in their classes, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 449
Table 2.3.2.45. Ways in which schools help teachers ensure students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum 450
Table 2.3.2.46. Ways in which schools help teachers ensure prekindergarten students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum 451
Table 2.3.2.47. Teachers who teach core subject areas to students with disabilities who are receiving services in separate classes (i.e., special education-only settings) 452
Table 2.3.2.47a. Teachers who teach core subject areas to students with disabilities who are receiving services in separate classes (i.e., special education-only settings), by school type 453
Table 2.3.2.47b. Teachers who teach core subject areas to students with disabilities who are receiving services in separate classes (i.e., special education-only settings), by school rurality 454
Table 2.3.2.47c. Teachers who teach core subject areas to students with disabilities who are receiving services in separate classes (i.e., special education-only settings), by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 455
Table 2.3.2.48. Core subject area curricula schools use for students with disabilities who receive core-subject area instruction in self-contained classes or schools 456
Table 2.3.2.48a. Core subject area curricula schools use for students with disabilities who receive core-subject area instruction in self-contained classes or schools, by school type 457
Table 2.3.2.48b. Core subject area curricula schools use for students with disabilities who receive core-subject area instruction in self-contained classes or schools, by school rurality 458
Table 2.3.2.48c. Core subject area curricula schools use for students with disabilities who receive core-subject area instruction in self-contained classes or schools, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 459
Table 2.3.2.49. Methods schools use to support the participation of students with disabilities in the same nonacademic extracurricular activities as students without disabilities 460
Table 2.3.2.49a. Methods schools use to support the participation of students with disabilities in the same nonacademic extracurricular activities as students without disabilities, by school type 461
Table 2.3.2.49b. Methods schools use to support the participation of students with disabilities in the same nonacademic extracurricular activities as students without disabilities, by school rurality 462
Table 2.3.2.49c. Methods schools use to support the participation of students with disabilities in the same nonacademic extracurricular activities as students without disabilities, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 463
Table 2.3.2.50. Service options available for prekindergarten students with disabilities at schools 464
Table 2.3.2.51. Ways in which students with and without disabilities are brought together in schools' prekindergarten classes 465
Table 2.3.2.52. Percentage of schools that host extended-day programs that prekindergarten students with disabilities can attend 466
Table 2.3.2.53. Extended-day options available for prekindergarten students with disabilities 467
Table 2.3.2.54. Areas of responsibility and responsible parties, either for policy or contractual reasons, for students with disabilities in charter schools 468

2.3.3. Access to general education programs and supports: Assistive technology 469

Table 2.3.3.1. Ways in which state agencies support district and school use of assistive technology to serve school-age children with disabilities 469

Table 2.3.3.2. Ways in which state agencies support local agencies' or programs' use of individualized assistive technology to serve preschool-age children with disabilities 470

Table 2.3.3.3. Actions lead agencies take to support local early intervention programs' use of individualized assistive technology to serve infants and toddlers with disabilities 471

Table 2.3.3.4. Actions districts take to support school use of assistive technology for school-age children with disabilities 472

Table 2.3.3.4a. Actions districts take to support school use of assistive technology for school-age children with disabilities, by district type 473

Table 2.3.3.4b. Actions districts take to support school use of assistive technology for school-age children with disabilities, by district size 474

Table 2.3.3.4c. Actions districts take to support school use of assistive technology for school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 475

Table 2.3.3.5. Percentage of districts that allow school-age children with disabilities to use district- or school-provided assistive technology outside of district buildings and classrooms 476

Table 2.3.3.5a. Percentage of districts that allow school-age children with disabilities to use district- or school-provided assistive technology outside of district buildings and classrooms, by district type 477

Table 2.3.3.5b. Percentage of districts that allow school-age children with disabilities to use district- or school-provided assistive technology outside of district buildings and classrooms, by district size 478

Table 2.3.3.5c. Percentage of districts that allow school-age children with disabilities to use district- or school-provided assistive technology outside of district buildings and classrooms, by district rurality 479

Table 2.3.3.6. Actions districts take to support the use of assistive technology for preschool-age children with disabilities 480

Table 2.3.3.6a. Actions districts take to support the use of assistive technology for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type 481

Table 2.3.3.6b. Actions districts take to support the use of assistive technology for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size 482

Table 2.3.3.6c. Actions districts take to support the use of assistive technology for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 483

Table 2.3.3.7. Percentage of districts that allow preschool-age children with disabilities to use district- or school-provided assistive technology outside of district buildings and classrooms 484

Table 2.3.3.7a. Percentage of districts that allow preschool-age children with disabilities to use district- or school-provided assistive technology outside of district buildings and classrooms, by district type 485

Table 2.3.3.7b. Percentage of districts that allow preschool-age children with disabilities to use district- or school-provided assistive technology outside of district buildings and classrooms, by district size 486

Table 2.3.3.7c. Percentage of districts that allow preschool-age children with disabilities to use district- or school-provided assistive technology outside of district buildings and classrooms, by district rurality 487

Table 2.3.3.8. Percentage of districts that allow preschool-age children with disabilities to take district- or school-provided assistive technology devices with them when they transition into elementary school 488

Table 2.3.3.8a. Percentage of districts that allow preschool-age children with disabilities to take district- or school-provided assistive technology devices with them when they transition into elementary school, by district type 489

Table 2.3.3.8b. Percentage of districts that allow preschool-age children with disabilities to take district- or school-provided assistive technology devices with them when they transition into elementary school, by district size 490
Table 2.3.3.8c. Percentage of districts that allow preschool-age children with disabilities to take district- or school-provided assistive technology devices with them when they transition into elementary school, by district rurality 491
Table 2.3.3.9. School-provided assistive technology that students with Individualized Education Programs have access to in schools 492
Table 2.3.3.10. Actions schools take to monitor the appropriate use of assistive technology for students with disabilities 493
Table 2.3.3.10a. Actions schools take to monitor the appropriate use of assistive technology for students with disabilities, by school type 494
Table 2.3.3.10b. Actions schools take to monitor the appropriate use of assistive technology for students with disabilities, by school rurality 495
Table 2.3.3.10c. Actions schools take to monitor the appropriate use of assistive technology for students with disabilities, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 496
Table 2.3.3.11. Methods schools use to finance assistive technology 497
Table 2.3.3.11a. Methods schools use to finance assistive technology, by school type 498
Table 2.3.3.11b. Methods schools use to finance assistive technology, by school rurality 499
Table 2.3.3.11c. Methods schools use to finance assistive technology, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 500
Table 2.3.3.12. Schools' provision of professional development on the use and benefits of assistive technology, by teacher/aide type 501

2.3.4. Access to general education programs and supports: Coordination/collaboration 502

Table 2.3.4.1. Frequency of work with staff from the Part C state lead agency 502
Table 2.3.4.2. Topics state agencies regularly address when working with the state Part C coordinator 503
Table 2.3.4.3. Frequency of work with staff from the school-age special education program 504
Table 2.3.4.4. Topics state agencies regularly address when working with the state special education director 505
Table 2.3.4.5. State agencies or programs with which state agencies coordinate to engage parents/guardians of preschool-age children with disabilities in developing Individualized Education Programs 506
Table 2.3.4.6. Number of state agencies that have developed formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health and social-emotional supports to preschool-age children with disabilities 507
Table 2.3.4.7. Agencies or entities with which state agencies have developed formal agreements to provide direct mental health or social-emotional supports to preschool-age children with disabilities 508
Table 2.3.4.8. Frequency of work with staff from the state Part B 619 preschool agency 509
Table 2.3.4.9. Topics lead agencies regularly address when working with the state Part B 619 coordinator 510
Table 2.3.4.10. Ways in which lead agencies share early intervention data with the state preschool special education program 511
Table 2.3.4.11. Entities responsible for setting the approach for serving preschool-age children with disabilities 512
Table 2.3.4.11a. Entities responsible for setting the approach for serving preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type 513
Table 2.3.4.11b. Entities responsible for setting the approach for serving preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size 514

Table 2.3.4.11c. Entities responsible for setting the approach for serving preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 515
Table 2.3.4.12. Actions districts take to support collaboration among the Part B preschool-age special education program and other entities that serve preschool-age children 516
Table 2.3.4.12a. Actions districts take to support collaboration among the Part B preschool-age special education program and other entities that serve preschool-age children, by district type 517
Table 2.3.4.12b. Actions districts take to support collaboration among the Part B preschool-age special education program and other entities that serve preschool-age children, by district size 518
Table 2.3.4.12c. Actions districts take to support collaboration among the Part B preschool-age special education program and other entities that serve preschool-age children, by district rurality 519

2.4.1. Support for transitions: Coordination/collaboration (this includes interagency coordination) 520

Table 2.4.1.1. Ways in which states share and receive data from other programs or entities to support the post-high school transition for school-age children with disabilities 520
Table 2.4.1.2. Ways in which state agencies supported the transition of preschool-age children with disabilities from preschool to kindergarten/elementary school in the 2019–2020 school year (school-age children survey) 521
Table 2.4.1.3. Ways in which state agencies supported the transition out of high school for school-age children with disabilities in the 2019–2020 school year 522
Table 2.4.1.4. Ways in which state agencies ensure the quality of the Individualized Education Program transition component for school-age children with disabilities preparing to transition from high school 523
Table 2.4.1.5. Entities or programs with which state agencies have formal agreements to support the coordination of services for school-age children with disabilities transitioning out of high school 524
Table 2.4.1.6a. Programs or entities with which state agencies share resources and coordinate services to support the transition out of high school for school-age children with disabilities, by resource/service type (50 states and DC) 525
Table 2.4.1.6b. Programs or entities with which state-level agencies share resources and coordinate services to support the transition out of high school for school-age children with disabilities, by resource/service type (entities) 526
Table 2.4.1.7. Ways in which state agencies supported the transition of preschool-age children with disabilities from early intervention services to preschool in the 2019–2020 school year 527
Table 2.4.1.8. Ways in which state agencies supported the transition of preschool-age children with disabilities from preschool to kindergarten/elementary school in the 2019–2020 school year (preschool-age children survey) 528
Table 2.4.1.9a. Programs or entities with which state agencies share resources and coordinate services to support the transition from preschool to kindergarten/elementary school for preschool-age children with disabilities, by resource/service type (50 states and DC) 529
Table 2.4.1.9b. Programs or entities with which state-level agencies share resources and coordinate services to support the transition from preschool to kindergarten/elementary school for preschool-age children with disabilities, by resource/service type (entities) 530
Table 2.4.1.10. Ways in which lead agencies collaborate with the state preschool special education program to support local programs in the transition of children with disabilities from Part C to Part B 531
Table 2.4.1.11. Ways in which lead agencies ensure transition plan quality within Individualized Family Service Plans 532
Table 2.4.1.12. Ways in which lead agencies supported the transition of children with disabilities from early intervention services to preschool in fiscal year 2020 533

Table 2.4.1.13. Actions lead agencies took in fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020 to change transition policies, procedures, and practices for infants and toddlers with disabilities 534
Table 2.4.1.14. Programs or entities with which districts share resources and coordinate services to support transition out of high school for school-age children with disabilities, by resource/service type 535
Table 2.4.1.15. Organizations from which representatives are invited to attend, actually attend, and provide input at transition planning meetings for students with disabilities 536

2.4.2. Support for transitions: Family involvement 537

Table 2.4.2.1. Practices districts use to support students with disabilities and their families during transitions into preschool and elementary school 537
Table 2.4.2.2. Policies, procedures, and practices schools use to support students with disabilities and their families during transitions into prekindergarten special education programs 538
Table 2.4.2.3. Practices schools use to support students with disabilities and their families during the initial transition into elementary school 539

2.4.3. Support for transitions: Transition services/supports 540

Table 2.4.3.1. Ages by which state agencies require post-high school transition planning to begin for school-age children with disabilities 540
Table 2.4.3.2. Number of states that require Individualized Education Programs to include a transition component for children with disabilities entering elementary school 541
Table 2.4.3.3. Ways in which districts ensure the quality of Individualized Education Program transition components for school-age children with disabilities who are preparing to transition from high school 542
Table 2.4.3.3a. Ways in which districts ensure the quality of Individualized Education Program transition components for school-age children with disabilities who are preparing to transition from high school, by district type 543
Table 2.4.3.3b. Ways in which districts ensure the quality of Individualized Education Program transition components for school-age children with disabilities who are preparing to transition from high school, by district size 544
Table 2.4.3.3c. Ways in which districts ensure the quality of Individualized Education Program transition components for school-age children with disabilities who are preparing to transition from high school, by district rurality 545
Table 2.4.3.4. Programs and supports districts provide to prepare school-age children with disabilities for further education, jobs, and independent living 546
Table 2.4.3.4a. Programs and supports districts provide to prepare school-age children with disabilities for further education, jobs, and independent living, by district type 547
Table 2.4.3.4b. Programs and supports districts provide to prepare school-age children with disabilities for further education, jobs, and independent living, by district size 548
Table 2.4.3.4c. Programs and supports districts provide to prepare school-age children with disabilities for further education, jobs, and independent living, by district rurality 549
Table 2.4.3.5. Actions districts took to change transition policies, procedures, and practices for school-age children with disabilities in the 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020 school years 550
Table 2.4.3.5a. Actions districts took to change transition policies, procedures, and practices for school-age children with disabilities in the 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020 school years, by district type 551
Table 2.4.3.5b. Actions districts took to change transition policies, procedures, and practices for school-age children with disabilities in the 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020 school years, by district size 552

Table 2.4.3.5c. Actions districts took to change transition policies, procedures, and practices for school-age children with disabilities in the 2017-2018, 2018-2019, and 2019-2020 school years, by district rurality 553
Table 2.4.3.6. Programs and supports schools provide to students with disabilities to prepare them for further education, jobs, and independent living 554
Table 2.4.3.7. Percentage of schools that use a transition planning rubric or guide focused on a set of compliance and quality indicators when developing a transition plan for students with disabilities 555
Table 2.4.3.8. Individuals who participate in transition planning meetings for students with low and high incidence disabilities 556
Table 2.4.3.9. Information schools provide to parents/guardians and school-age children with the most significant cognitive disabilities regarding potential implications of taking Alternate Assessments Based on alternate academic achievement standards in place of standard assessments 557

2.4.4. Support for transitions: Follow-up after transition 558

Table 2.4.4.1. Ways in which state agencies obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes 558
Table 2.4.4.2. Post-high school outcome data state agencies collect in addition to required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14 559
Table 2.4.4.3. Number of lead agencies that examine data on children with disabilities after their transition from early intervention services 560
Table 2.4.4.4. Data lead agencies examine on children with disabilities after their transition from early intervention services 561
Table 2.4.4.5. Ways in which lead agencies obtain data on the result of the transition from early intervention services to preschool-age special education services 562
Table 2.4.4.6. Ways in which districts obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes 563
Table 2.4.4.6a. Ways in which districts obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes, by district type 564
Table 2.4.4.6b. Ways in which districts obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes, by district size 565
Table 2.4.4.6c. Ways in which districts obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes, by district rurality 566
Table 2.4.4.7. Percentage of former students for whom districts are able to obtain required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14 567
Table 2.4.4.7a. Percentage of former students for whom districts are able to obtain required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14, by district type 568
Table 2.4.4.7b. Percentage of former students for whom districts are able to obtain required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14, by district size 569
Table 2.4.4.7c. Percentage of former students for whom districts are able to obtain required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14, by district rurality 570
Table 2.4.4.8. Post-high school outcomes districts collect in addition to required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14 571
Table 2.4.4.8a. Post-high school outcomes districts collect in addition to required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14, by district type 572
Table 2.4.4.8b. Post-high school outcomes districts collect in addition to required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14, by district size 573
Table 2.4.4.8c. Post-high school outcomes districts collect in addition to required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14, by district rurality 574

2.5.1. Behavioral policies and supports: Discipline policy 575

Table 2.5.1.1. Number of state agencies that provide districts with requirements or recommended guidelines on discipline (school-age children) 575

Table 2.5.1.2. Number of state agencies that have posted their current discipline policy on the agency website (school-age children) 576

Table 2.5.1.3. Number of states with a zero-tolerance policy 577

Table 2.5.1.4. Differences in state zero-tolerance policies based on whether a student has a disability 578

Table 2.5.1.5. Number of states with a policy pertaining to suspensions (in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions 579

Table 2.5.1.6. Differences in state in-school suspension policies based on whether a student has a disability 580

Table 2.5.1.7. Differences in state out-of-school suspension policies based on whether a student has a disability 581

Table 2.5.1.8. Differences in state expulsion policies based on whether a student has a disability 582

Table 2.5.1.9. Number of states with a policy restricting the use of restraints and seclusion in schools 583

Table 2.5.1.10. Differences in state policies restricting the use of restraints and seclusion in schools based on whether a student has a disability 584

Table 2.5.1.11. Number of state agencies that collaborate with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for school-age children with disabilities 585

Table 2.5.1.12. Agencies or organizations with which state agencies work to develop or support the implementation of behavioral supports to address disciplinary issues among school-age children with disabilities 586

Table 2.5.1.13. Strategies, programs, or curricula that state agencies recommend to manage behavioral issues for school-age children with disabilities 587

Table 2.5.1.14. Number of state agencies that provide districts with requirements or recommended guidelines on discipline (preschool-age children) 588

Table 2.5.1.15. Number of state agencies that have posted their current discipline policy on the agency website (preschool-age children) 589

Table 2.5.1.16. Number of states with a policy pertaining to suspensions (in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions for preschool-age children 590

Table 2.5.1.17. Differences in state in-school suspension policies for preschool-age children based on whether a child has a disability 591

Table 2.5.1.18. Differences in state out-of-school suspension policies for preschool-age children based on whether a child has a disability 592

Table 2.5.1.19. Differences in state expulsion policies for preschool-age children based on whether a child has a disability 593

Table 2.5.1.20. Number of states with a policy restricting the use of restraints and seclusion for preschool-age children in schools 594

Table 2.5.1.21. Differences in state policies restricting the use of restraints and seclusion for preschool-age children in schools based on whether a child has a disability 595

Table 2.5.1.22. Number of state agencies that collaborate with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities 596

Table 2.5.1.23. Agencies or organizations with which state agencies work to develop or support the implementation of behavioral supports to address disciplinary issues among preschool-age children with disabilities 597

Table 2.5.1.24. Strategies, programs, or curricula that state agencies recommend to manage behavioral issues for preschool-age children with disabilities 598

Table 2.5.1.25. Percentage of districts with a zero-tolerance policy 599
Table 2.5.1.25a. Percentage of districts with a zero-tolerance policy, by district type 600
Table 2.5.1.25b. Percentage of districts with a zero-tolerance policy, by district size 601
Table 2.5.1.25c. Percentage of districts with a zero-tolerance policy, by district rurality 602
Table 2.5.1.26. Differences in district zero-tolerance policies based on whether a student has a disability 603
Table 2.5.1.27. Percentage of districts with a policy pertaining to suspensions (in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions 604
Table 2.5.1.27a. Percentage of districts with a policy pertaining to suspensions (in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions, by district type 605
Table 2.5.1.27b. Percentage of districts with a policy pertaining to suspensions (in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions, by district size 606
Table 2.5.1.27c. Percentage of districts with a policy pertaining to suspensions (in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions, by district rurality 607
Table 2.5.1.28. Differences in district in-school suspension policies based on whether a student has a disability 608
Table 2.5.1.29. Differences in district out-of-school suspension policies based on whether a student has a disability 609
Table 2.5.1.30. Differences in district expulsion policies based on whether a student has a disability 610
Table 2.5.1.31. Sources of authority to suspend or expel school-age children, by student group 611
Table 2.5.1.32. Percentage of districts with a policy restricting the use of restraints and seclusion in schools 612
Table 2.5.1.32a. Percentage of districts with a policy restricting the use of restraints and seclusion in schools, by district type 613
Table 2.5.1.32b. Percentage of districts with a policy restricting the use of restraints and seclusion in schools, by district size 614
Table 2.5.1.32c. Percentage of districts with a policy restricting the use of restraints and seclusion in schools, by district rurality 615
Table 2.5.1.33. Differences in district policies restricting the use of restraints and seclusion in schools based on whether a student has a disability 616
Table 2.5.1.34. Percentage of districts that have posted their current discipline policy on the district website 617
Table 2.5.1.34a. Percentage of districts that have posted their current discipline policy on the district website, by district type 618
Table 2.5.1.34b. Percentage of districts that have posted their current discipline policy on the district website, by district size 619
Table 2.5.1.34c. Percentage of districts that have posted their current discipline policy on the district website, by district rurality 620
Table 2.5.1.35. Percentage of districts that ever remove preschool-age children with disabilities from a preschool program for disciplinary purposes for the remainder of the school year or longer 621
Table 2.5.1.35a. Percentage of districts that ever remove preschool-age children with disabilities from a preschool program for disciplinary purposes for the remainder of the school year or longer, by district type 622
Table 2.5.1.36. Percentage of districts that collaborate with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities 623
Table 2.5.1.36a. Percentage of districts that collaborate with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type 624
Table 2.5.1.36b. Percentage of districts that collaborate with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size 625

Table 2.5.1.36c. Percentage of districts that collaborate with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 626

Table 2.5.1.37. Agencies or organizations with which districts work to support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities 627

2.5.2. Behavioral policies and supports: Significant disproportionality in discipline 628

Table 2.5.2.1. Actions state agencies take when a district is required to address significant disproportionality in discipline 628

Table 2.5.2.2. Percentage of districts, by school year over the past five years, the state has identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline 629

Table 2.5.2.2a. Percentage of districts, by school year over the past five years, the state has identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline, by district type 630

Table 2.5.2.2b. Percentage of districts, by school year over the past five years, the state has identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline, by district size 631

Table 2.5.2.2c. Percentage of districts, by school year over the past five years, the state has identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline, by district rurality 632

Table 2.5.2.3. Actions districts have taken in the past five school years to address or prevent significant disproportionality in discipline 633

Table 2.5.2.4. Professional development districts provided in the past five school years to address or prevent significant disproportionality in discipline, by funding type 634

2.5.3. Behavioral policies and supports: Supports provided 635

Table 2.5.3.1. Strategies, programs, or curricula districts recommend to support positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of school-age children with disabilities 635

Table 2.5.3.1a. Strategies, programs, or curricula districts recommend to support positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of school-age children with disabilities, by district type 636

Table 2.5.3.1b. Strategies, programs, or curricula districts recommend to support positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of school-age children with disabilities, by district size 637

Table 2.5.3.1c. Strategies, programs, or curricula districts recommend to support positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 638

Table 2.5.3.2. Supports districts provide to teachers who are using positive behavioral development or social-emotional skills curricula with school-age children with disabilities 639

Table 2.5.3.2a. Supports districts provide to teachers who are using positive behavioral development or social-emotional skills curricula with school-age children with disabilities, by district type 640

Table 2.5.3.2b. Supports districts provide to teachers who are using positive behavioral development or social-emotional skills curricula with school-age children with disabilities, by district size 641

Table 2.5.3.2c. Supports districts provide to teachers who are using positive behavioral development or social-emotional skills curricula with school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 642

Table 2.5.3.3. Percentage of districts with formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports to school-age children with disabilities 643

Table 2.5.3.3a. Percentage of districts with formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports to school-age children with disabilities, by district type 644
Table 2.5.3.3b. Percentage of districts with formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports to school-age children with disabilities, by district size 645
Table 2.5.3.3c. Percentage of districts with formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports to school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 646
Table 2.5.3.4. Agencies or entities with which districts have formal agreements to provide direct mental health or social-emotional supports to school-age children with disabilities 647
Table 2.5.3.5. Percentage of districts with formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports to preschool-age children with disabilities 648
Table 2.5.3.5a. Percentage of districts with formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports to preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type 649
Table 2.5.3.5b. Percentage of districts with formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports to preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size 650
Table 2.5.3.5c. Percentage of districts with formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports to preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 651
Table 2.5.3.6. Agencies or entities with which districts have formal agreements to provide direct mental health or social-emotional supports to preschool-age children with disabilities 652
Table 2.5.3.7. Percentage of districts that recommend programs, practices, or curricula to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of preschool-age children with disabilities 653
Table 2.5.3.7a. Percentage of districts that recommend programs, practices, or curricula to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type 654
Table 2.5.3.7b. Percentage of districts that recommend programs, practices, or curricula to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size 655
Table 2.5.3.7c. Percentage of districts that recommend programs, practices, or curricula to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 656
Table 2.5.3.8. Strategies, programs, or curricula districts recommend to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of preschool-age children with disabilities 657
Table 2.5.3.9. Supports districts provide to teachers who are using positive behavioral development or social-emotional skills curricula with preschool-age children with disabilities 658
Table 2.5.3.10. Strategies, programs, or curricula schools use to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of students with disabilities 659
Table 2.5.3.10a. Strategies, programs, or curricula schools use to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of students with disabilities, by school type 660
Table 2.5.3.10b. Strategies, programs, or curricula schools use to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of students with disabilities, by school rurality 661
Table 2.5.3.10c. Strategies, programs, or curricula schools use to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of students with disabilities, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 662
Table 2.5.3.11. Strategies, programs, or curricula schools use to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of prekindergarten students with disabilities 663

Table 2.5.3.12. Percentage of schools that collaborate with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports for students with disabilities 664
Table 2.5.3.12a. Percentage of schools that collaborate with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports for students with disabilities, by school type 665
Table 2.5.3.12b. Percentage of schools that collaborate with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports for students with disabilities, by school rurality 666
Table 2.5.3.12c. Percentage of schools that collaborate with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports for students with disabilities, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 667
Table 2.5.3.13. Agencies or entities with which schools have collaborated to provide direct mental health or social-emotional supports for students with disabilities 668

2.6.1. Evidence from research: Identifying evidence 669

Table 2.6.1.1. Outcome data state agencies examine for all school-age children with disabilities 669
Table 2.6.1.2. Ways in which states measure progress for school-age children with disabilities as part of federal accountability under the Every Student Succeeds Act 670
Table 2.6.1.3a. Sources of information state agencies use when selecting special education policies and practices, by frequency of use (50 states and DC; school-age children) 671
Table 2.6.1.3b. Sources of information state-level agencies use when selecting special education policies and practices, by frequency of use (entities; school-age children) 672
Table 2.6.1.4. Level of evidence state agencies require, as specified in the Every Student Succeeds Act, for evidence-based special education policies, procedures, and practices to be used by school districts in the state (school-age children) 673
Table 2.6.1.5. Outcome data state agencies examine for all preschool-age children with disabilities 674
Table 2.6.1.6. Number of state agencies that examine outcomes for preschool-age children with disabilities separately based on whether they are taught primarily in inclusive classrooms versus separate classrooms 675
Table 2.6.1.7. Number of states that include prekindergarten assessment data in the K-12 data system 676
Table 2.6.1.8. Ways in which state agencies share and receive data from other programs or entities, such as Part B 611, Head Start, or social services 677
Table 2.6.1.9a. Sources of information state agencies use when selecting special education policies and practices, by frequency of use (50 states and DC; preschool-age children) 678
Table 2.6.1.9b. Sources of information state-level agencies use when selecting special education policies and practices, by frequency of use (entities; preschool-age children) 679
Table 2.6.1.10. Level of evidence state agencies require, as specified in the Every Student Succeeds Act, for evidence-based special education policies, procedures, and practices to be used by school districts in the state (preschool-age children) 680
Table 2.6.1.11a. Sources of information lead agencies use when selecting early intervention policies and practices, by frequency of use (50 states and DC) 681
Table 2.6.1.11b. Sources of information lead agencies use when selecting early intervention policies and practices, by frequency of use (entities) 682
Table 2.6.1.12. Sources of information districts use when selecting special education policies and practices, by frequency of use 683
Table 2.6.1.13. Percentage of districts that collect data to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities, beyond early childhood data that states must report to the Office of Special Education Programs 684

Table 2.6.1.13a. Percentage of districts that collect data to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities, beyond early childhood data that states must report to the Office of Special Education Programs, by district type 685
Table 2.6.1.13b. Percentage of districts that collect data to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities, beyond early childhood data that states must report to the Office of Special Education Programs, by district size 686
Table 2.6.1.13c. Percentage of districts that collect data to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities, beyond early childhood data that states must report to the Office of Special Education Programs, by district rurality 687
Table 2.6.1.14. Staff who examine outcome data to inform targeted assistance districts provide to preschool-age children with disabilities 688
Table 2.6.1.15. Percentage of districts that examine outcomes for preschool-age children with disabilities separately based on whether they are taught primarily in inclusive classrooms versus separate classrooms 689
Table 2.6.1.16. Percentage of districts that provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools and early childhood programs should use to provide services to preschool-age children with disabilities 690
Table 2.6.1.16a. Percentage of districts that provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools and early childhood programs should use to provide services to preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type 691
Table 2.6.1.16b. Percentage of districts that provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools and early childhood programs should use to provide services to preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size 692
Table 2.6.1.16c. Percentage of districts that provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools and early childhood programs should use to provide services to preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 693
Table 2.6.1.17. Outcome data schools examine for students with and without disabilities 694
Table 2.6.1.18. Sources of information schools use when selecting special education policies and practices, by frequency of use 695

2.6.2. Evidence from research: Supporting use of evidence 696

Table 2.6.2.1. Actions state agencies take to support or ensure school districts use evidence-based special education policies, procedures, and practices (school-age children) 696
Table 2.6.2.2. Strategies state agencies use to implement or scale up the evidence-based practices identified in their State Systemic Improvement Plans for Part B 611 697
Table 2.6.2.3. Status of state agency efforts in implementing or scaling up evidence-based practices identified in State Systemic Improvement Plans for Part B (school-age children) 698
Table 2.6.2.4. Actions state agencies take in response to examination of outcome data for preschool-age children with disabilities 699
Table 2.6.2.5. Actions state agencies take to support or ensure school districts use evidence-based special education policies, procedures, and practices (preschool-age children) 700
Table 2.6.2.6. Strategies state agencies use to implement or scale up the evidence-based practices identified in their State Systemic Improvement Plans for the Part B 619 preschool-age special education program 701
Table 2.6.2.7. Status of state agency efforts in implementing or scaling up evidence-based practices identified in State Systemic Improvement Plans for Part B (preschool-age children) 702
Table 2.6.2.8. Factors by which lead agencies examine child outcome data collected under State Performance Plans/Annual Performance Reports Part C Indicator 3 703

Table 2.6.2.9. Actions lead agencies undertake for infants and toddlers with disabilities in response to examination of outcome data from State Performance Plans/Annual Performance Reports Part C Indicator 3 704
Table 2.6.2.10. Actions lead agencies take to support or ensure local early intervention programs use evidence-based early intervention policies, procedures, and practices 705
Table 2.6.2.11. Strategies lead agencies use to implement or scale up the evidence-based practices identified in their State Systemic Improvement Plans for Part C 706
Table 2.6.2.12. Status of lead agency efforts in implementing or scaling up evidence-based practices identified in State Systemic Improvement Plans 707
Table 2.6.2.13. Targeted assistance, based on student outcome data, districts provide to some or all schools that serve children with Individualized Education Programs 708
Table 2.6.2.13a. Targeted assistance, based on student outcome data, districts provide to some or all schools that serve children with Individualized Education Programs, by district type 709
Table 2.6.2.13b. Targeted assistance, based on student outcome data, districts provide to some or all schools that serve children with Individualized Education Programs, by district size 710
Table 2.6.2.13c. Targeted assistance, based on student outcome data, districts provide to some or all schools that serve children with Individualized Education Programs, by district rurality 711
Table 2.6.2.14. Components of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support that districts implement or have challenges implementing when serving school-age children with disabilities 712
Table 2.6.2.15. Percentage of districts that provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools should use to provide services to students with disabilities 713
Table 2.6.2.15a. Percentage of districts that provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools should use to provide services to students with disabilities, by district type 714
Table 2.6.2.15b. Percentage of districts that provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools should use to provide services to students with disabilities, by district size 715
Table 2.6.2.15c. Percentage of districts that provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools should use to provide services to students with disabilities, by district rurality 716
Table 2.6.2.16. Ways in which districts help ensure schools use evidence-based special education programs and services 717
Table 2.6.2.17. Targeted assistance, based on data collected to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities, that districts offer to some or all preschools that serve children with Individualized Education Programs 718
Table 2.6.2.18. Ways in which districts help ensure schools and early childhood programs use evidence-based special education programs and services 719
Table 2.6.2.19. Sources of information districts use when selecting early childhood special education policies and practices, by frequency of use 720
Table 2.6.2.20. Ways in which schools ensure staff are using evidence-based practices in providing special education and related services 721
Table 2.6.2.20a. Ways in which schools ensure staff are using evidence-based practices in providing special education and related services, by school type 722
Table 2.6.2.20b. Ways in which schools ensure staff are using evidence-based practices in providing special education and related services, by school rurality 723
Table 2.6.2.20c. Ways in which schools ensure staff are using evidence-based practices in providing special education and related services, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 724

2.7.1. Funding allocation: Funding sources 725

Table 2.7.1.1. State funding sources that support services for school-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs 725

Table 2.7.1.2. Among states that used each funding source to support services for school-age children with disabilities, number that listed funding source as one of their top three (by share of funding) 726

Table 2.7.1.3. State funding sources that support services for preschool-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs 727

Table 2.7.1.4. Among states that used each funding source to support services for preschool-age children with disabilities, number that listed funding source as one of their top three (by share of funding) 728

Table 2.7.1.5. Items included in state System of Payments policies 729

Table 2.7.1.6. Lead agency funding sources that support Part C early intervention services, as required by Individualized Family Service Plans 730

Table 2.7.1.7. Among states that used each funding source to support Part C early intervention services, number that listed funding source as one of their top three (by share of funding) 731

Table 2.7.1.8. Steps lead agencies have taken in past three fiscal years to help meet the cost of continued participation in the Part C program 732

Table 2.7.1.9. District funding sources for services that support school-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs 733

Table 2.7.1.9a. District funding sources for services that support school-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs, by district type 734

Table 2.7.1.9b. District funding sources for services that support school-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs, by district size 735

Table 2.7.1.9c. District funding sources for services that support school-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs, by district rurality 736

Table 2.7.1.10. Among districts that used each funding source for services that support school-age children with disabilities, percentage of districts that listed funding source as one of their top three (based on share of funding) 737

Table 2.7.1.11. Percentage of district special education funding for school-age children with disabilities provided by various sources 738

Table 2.7.1.11a. Percentage of district special education funding for school-age children with disabilities provided by various sources, by district type 739

Table 2.7.1.11b. Percentage of district special education funding for school-age children with disabilities provided by various sources, by district size 740

Table 2.7.1.11c. Percentage of district special education funding for school-age children with disabilities provided by various sources, by district rurality 741

Table 2.7.1.12. Percentage of districts with changes in the proportion of their budget provided by state special education funding in the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020) 742

Table 2.7.1.12a. Percentage of districts with changes in the proportion of their budget provided by state special education funding in the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020), by district type 743

Table 2.7.1.12b. Percentage of districts with changes in the proportion of their budget provided by state special education funding in the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020), by district size 744

Table 2.7.1.12c. Percentage of districts with changes in the proportion of their budget provided by state special education funding in the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020), by district rurality 745

Table 2.7.1.13. Percentage of districts in which the proportion of state funding for special education increased or decreased in the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020) 746

Table 2.7.1.14. District funding sources for services that support preschool-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs 747
Table 2.7.1.14a. District funding sources for services that support preschool-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs, by district type 748
Table 2.7.1.14b. District funding sources for services that support preschool-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs, by district size 749
Table 2.7.1.14c. District funding sources for services that support preschool-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs, by district rurality 750
Table 2.7.1.15. Among districts that used each funding source for services that support preschool-age children with disabilities, percentage of districts that listed funding source as one of their top three (by share of funding) 751

2.7.2. Funding allocation: Distribution of funding 752

Table 2.7.2.1. Methods states use to determine how special education funding (including federal and state) is allocated to services for school-age children 752
Table 2.7.2.2. Number of states that allocate a portion of their special education funding to another state agency or agencies responsible for serving school-age children 753
Table 2.7.2.3. Other state agencies that are allocated special education funds (school-age children) 754
Table 2.7.2.4. Number of states that maintain a high-cost fund (school-age children) 755
Table 2.7.2.5. High-cost fund mechanisms states use to fund districts with high-cost school-age children with disabilities 756
Table 2.7.2.6. Methods states use to determine how special education funding (including federal and state) is allocated to services for preschool-age children 757
Table 2.7.2.7. Number of states that allocate a portion of their special education funding to another state agency or agencies responsible for serving preschool-age children 758
Table 2.7.2.8. Other state agencies that are allocated special education funds (preschool-age children) 759
Table 2.7.2.9. Number of states that maintain a high-cost fund (preschool-age children) 760
Table 2.7.2.10. High-cost fund mechanisms states use to fund districts with high-cost preschool-age children with disabilities 761
Table 2.7.2.11. Methods lead agencies use to determine how special education funding (including federal and state) is allocated to local programs in the state that provide early intervention services to infants and toddlers 762
Table 2.7.2.12. Actions districts used to reduce the cost of special education services for school-age children in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020) 763
Table 2.7.2.12a. Actions districts used to reduce the cost of special education services for school-age children in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district type 764
Table 2.7.2.12b. Actions districts used to reduce the cost of special education services for school-age children in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district size 765
Table 2.7.2.12c. Actions districts used to reduce the cost of special education services for school-age children in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district rurality 766
Table 2.7.2.13. Methods districts use to determine how to allocate all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) to schools 767
Table 2.7.2.13a. Methods districts use to determine how to allocate all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) to schools, by district type 768
Table 2.7.2.13b. Methods districts use to determine how to allocate all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) to schools, by district size 769

Table 2.7.2.13c. Methods districts use to determine how to allocate all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) to schools, by district rurality 770
Table 2.7.2.14. Methods districts use to determine how to allocate all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) to services for preschool-age children 771
Table 2.7.2.14a. Methods districts use to determine how to allocate all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) to services for preschool-age children, by district type 772
Table 2.7.2.14b. Methods districts use to determine how to allocate all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) to services for preschool-age children, by district size 773
Table 2.7.2.14c. Methods districts use to determine how to allocate all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) to services for preschool-age children, by district rurality 774
Table 2.7.2.15. Special education supports for preschool-age children funded through collaboration or contracts with other agencies or service providers in districts 775
Table 2.7.2.15a. Special education supports for preschool-age children funded through collaboration or contracts with other agencies or service providers in districts, by district type 776
Table 2.7.2.15b. Special education supports for preschool-age children funded through collaboration or contracts with other agencies or service providers in districts, by district size 777
Table 2.7.2.15c. Special education supports for preschool-age children funded through collaboration or contracts with other agencies or service providers in districts, by district rurality 778

2.7.3. Funding allocation: Use of funds 779

Table 2.7.3.1. Activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs that can be reimbursed by Medicaid under state agency policy 779
Table 2.7.3.2. Uses of state set-aside funds from federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B grants for school-age children with disabilities 780
Table 2.7.3.3. Uses of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act state-level administration funds during the 2018–2019 school year (school-age children) 781
Table 2.7.3.4. Uses of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act other state-level activities funds during the 2018–2019 school year (school-age children) 782
Table 2.7.3.5. Number of states that used other state-level activities funds to support activities aligned with State Systemic Improvement Plans during the 2018–2019 school year (school-age children) 783
Table 2.7.3.6. Activities aligned with State Systemic Improvement Plans that were funded by other state-level activities funds during the 2018–2019 school year (school-age children) 784
Table 2.7.3.7. Bases for state agency determination of how to spend Individuals with Disabilities Education Act state-level activities funds (both administration funds and other state-level activities funds), school-age children 785
Table 2.7.3.8. Uses of state set-aside funds from federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B grants for preschool-age children with disabilities 786
Table 2.7.3.9. Uses of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act state-level administration funds during the 2018–2019 school year (preschool-age children) 787
Table 2.7.3.10. Uses of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act other state-level activities funds during the 2018–2019 school year (preschool-age children) 788
Table 2.7.3.11. Number of states that used other state-level activities funds to support activities aligned with State Systemic Improvement Plans during the 2018–2019 school year (preschool-age children) 789
Table 2.7.3.12. Activities aligned with State Systemic Improvement Plans that were funded by other state-level activities funds during the 2018–2019 school year (preschool-age children) 790

Table 2.7.3.13. Bases for state agency determination of how to spend Individuals with Disabilities Education Act state-level activities funds (both administration funds and other state-level activities funds), preschool-age children 791

Table 2.7.3.14. District funding sources blended with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B funds to support Coordinated Early Intervention Services or Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervention Services for school-age children not yet identified with disabilities 792

Table 2.7.3.15. District funding sources for training and implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention 793

Table 2.7.3.15a. District funding sources for training and implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, by district type 794

Table 2.7.3.15b. District funding sources for training and implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, by district size 795

Table 2.7.3.15c. District funding sources for training and implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, by district rurality 796

Table 2.7.3.16. Among districts that used each funding source for training and implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, percentage of districts that listed funding source as one of their top three (by share of funding) 797

Table 2.7.3.17. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by Medicaid funds 798

Table 2.7.3.17a. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by Medicaid funds, by district type 799

Table 2.7.3.17b. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by Medicaid funds, by district size 800

Table 2.7.3.17c. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by Medicaid funds, by district rurality 801

Table 2.7.3.18. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by general education funds 802

Table 2.7.3.18a. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by general education funds, by district type 803

Table 2.7.3.18b. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by general education funds, by district size 804

Table 2.7.3.18c. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by general education funds, by district rurality 805

Table 2.7.3.19. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by special education funds 806

Table 2.7.3.19a. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by special education funds, by district type 807

Table 2.7.3.19b. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by special education funds, by district size 808

Table 2.7.3.19c. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by special education funds, by district rurality 809

Table 2.7.3.20. Among districts that provided each service for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs, percentage of districts that ranked activity as their top three (by share of funding) 810

Table 2.7.3.21. District funding sources that support Individualized Education Program-specified residential placements for school-age children with disabilities 811

Table 2.7.3.21a. District funding sources that support Individualized Education Program-specified residential placements for school-age children with disabilities, by district type 812
Table 2.7.3.21b. District funding sources that support Individualized Education Program-specified residential placements for school-age children with disabilities, by district size 813
Table 2.7.3.21c. District funding sources that support Individualized Education Program-specified residential placements for school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 814
Table 2.7.3.22. District funding sources that support Individualized Education Program-specified residential placements for school-age children with disabilities in separate, non-public day schools 815
Table 2.7.3.22a. District funding sources that support Individualized Education Program-specified residential placements for school-age children with disabilities in separate, non-public day schools, by district type 816
Table 2.7.3.22b. District funding sources that support Individualized Education Program-specified residential placements for school-age children with disabilities in separate, non-public day schools, by district size 817
Table 2.7.3.22c. District funding sources that support Individualized Education Program-specified residential placements for school-age children with disabilities in separate, non-public day schools, by district rurality 818
Table 2.7.3.23. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support direct service personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities 819
Table 2.7.3.23a. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support direct service personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities, by district type 820
Table 2.7.3.23b. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support direct service personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities, by district size 821
Table 2.7.3.23c. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support direct service personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 822
Table 2.7.3.24. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support administrators and administrative support staff who serve school-age children with disabilities 823
Table 2.7.3.24a. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support administrators and administrative support staff who serve school-age children with disabilities, by district type 824
Table 2.7.3.24b. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support administrators and administrative support staff who serve school-age children with disabilities, by district size 825
Table 2.7.3.24c. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support administrators and administrative support staff who serve school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 826
Table 2.7.3.25. Personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities and whose salaries, benefits, or contracts are supported by Part B special education program funds 827
Table 2.7.3.25a. Personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities and whose salaries, benefits, or contracts are supported by Part B special education program funds, by district type 828
Table 2.7.3.25b. Personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities and whose salaries, benefits, or contracts are supported by Part B special education program funds, by district size 829
Table 2.7.3.25c. Personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities and whose salaries, benefits, or contracts are supported by Part B special education program funds, by district rurality 830
Table 2.7.3.26. Direct services for school-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts 831
Table 2.7.3.26a. Direct services for school-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district type 832

Table 2.7.3.26b. Direct services for school-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district size 833
Table 2.7.3.26c. Direct services for school-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district rurality 834
Table 2.7.3.27. Supplies, equipment, or facility modifications for school-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts 835
Table 2.7.3.27a. Supplies, equipment, or facility modifications for school-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district type 836
Table 2.7.3.27b. Supplies, equipment, or facility modifications for school-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district size 837
Table 2.7.3.27c. Supplies, equipment, or facility modifications for school-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district rurality 838
Table 2.7.3.28. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support direct service personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities 839
Table 2.7.3.28a. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support direct service personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type 840
Table 2.7.3.28b. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support direct service personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size 841
Table 2.7.3.28c. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support direct service personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 842
Table 2.7.3.29. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support administrators and administrative support staff who serve preschool-age children with disabilities 843
Table 2.7.3.29a. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support administrators and administrative support staff who serve preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type 844
Table 2.7.3.29b. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support administrators and administrative support staff who serve preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size 845
Table 2.7.3.29c. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support administrators and administrative support staff who serve preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality 846
Table 2.7.3.30. Personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities in districts and whose salaries, benefits, or contracts are supported by Part B special education program funds 847
Table 2.7.3.30a. Personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities in districts and whose salaries, benefits, or contracts are supported by Part B special education program funds, by district type 848
Table 2.7.3.30b. Personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities in districts and whose salaries, benefits, or contracts are supported by Part B special education program funds, by district size 849
Table 2.7.3.30c. Personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities in districts and whose salaries, benefits, or contracts are supported by Part B special education program funds, by district rurality 850
Table 2.7.3.31. Direct services for preschool-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts 851
Table 2.7.3.31a. Direct services for preschool-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district type 852
Table 2.7.3.31b. Direct services for preschool-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district size 853
Table 2.7.3.31c. Direct services for preschool-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district rurality 854
Table 2.7.3.32. Supplies, equipment, or facility modifications for preschool-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts 855

Table 2.7.3.32a. Supplies, equipment, or facility modifications for preschool-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district type 856
Table 2.7.3.32b. Supplies, equipment, or facility modifications for preschool-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district size 857
Table 2.7.3.32c. Supplies, equipment, or facility modifications for preschool-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district rurality 858
Table 2.7.3.33. Percentage of districts with regional cooperative, intermediate, or service centers that provide services to preschool-age children with special education needs 859
Table 2.7.3.33a. Percentage of districts with regional cooperative, intermediate, or service centers that provide services to preschool-age children with special education needs, by district type 860
Table 2.7.3.33b. Percentage of districts with regional cooperative, intermediate, or service centers that provide services to preschool-age children with special education needs, by district size 861
Table 2.7.3.33c. Percentage of districts with regional cooperative, intermediate, or service centers that provide services to preschool-age children with special education needs, by district rurality 862
Table 2.7.3.34. Percentage of districts in which Part B special education funding supports regional cooperative, intermediate, or service centers for preschool-age children with special education needs 863
Table 2.7.3.35. Special education supports districts provide to preschool-age children through regional cooperative, intermediate, or service centers 864
Table 2.7.3.36. Ages of preschool-age children with disabilities served by regional cooperative, intermediate, or service centers 865

2.8.1. Personnel allocation: Qualification standards 866

Table 2.8.1.1. State agencies responsible for licensing and certification of special education classroom teachers 866
Table 2.8.1.2a. Ways in which special education classroom teachers can qualify for traditional certification (50 states and DC) 867
Table 2.8.1.2b. Ways in which special education classroom teachers can qualify for traditional certification (entities) 868
Table 2.8.1.3a. Ways in which special education classroom teachers can qualify for certification through alternative routes (50 states and DC) 869
Table 2.8.1.3b. Ways in which special education classroom teachers can qualify for certification through alternative routes (entities) 870
Table 2.8.1.4. Number of states that allow special education classroom teachers to transfer certification from a reciprocating state 871
Table 2.8.1.5a. Ways (required or optional) in which states measure subject matter knowledge for special education teachers at the elementary school level (50 states and DC) 872
Table 2.8.1.5b. Ways (required or optional) in which entities measure subject matter knowledge for special education teachers at the elementary school level (entities) 873
Table 2.8.1.6a. Ways (required or optional) in which states measure subject matter knowledge for special education teachers at the middle school level (50 states and DC) 874
Table 2.8.1.6b. Ways (required or optional) in which entities measure subject matter knowledge for special education teachers at the middle school level (entities) 875
Table 2.8.1.7a. Ways (required or optional) in which states measure subject matter knowledge for special education teachers at the high school level (50 states and DC) 876
Table 2.8.1.7b. Ways (required or optional) in which entities measure subject matter knowledge for special education teachers at the high school level (entities) 877
Table 2.8.1.8. State agencies responsible for licensing and certification of preschool special education teachers 878

Table 2.8.1.9. Credentials required for preschool special educators in states 879
Table 2.8.1.10a. Ways in which preschool special education classroom teachers can qualify for traditional certification (50 states and DC) 880
Table 2.8.1.10b. Ways in which preschool special education classroom teachers can qualify for traditional certification (entities) 881
Table 2.8.1.11a. Ways in which preschool special education classroom teachers can qualify for certification through alternative routes (50 states and DC) 882
Table 2.8.1.11b. Ways in which preschool special education classroom teachers can qualify for certification through alternative routes (entities) 883
Table 2.8.1.12. Number of states that allow preschool special education classroom teachers to transfer certification from a reciprocating state 884
Table 2.8.1.13. State or lead agencies responsible for licensing and certification of early intervention service providers 885
Table 2.8.1.14. Ways in which early intervention service providers qualify for licensing or certification 886
Table 2.8.1.15. Age ranges for which special educator (early intervention service provider) certification or credential is applicable in states 887
Table 2.8.1.16. Frequency of training schools offer for general education teachers that focuses on working with students with disabilities 888
Table 2.8.1.16a. Frequency of training schools offer for general education teachers that focuses on working with students with disabilities, by school type 889
Table 2.8.1.16b. Frequency of training schools offer for general education teachers that focuses on working with students with disabilities, by school rurality 890
Table 2.8.1.16c. Frequency of training schools offer for general education teachers that focuses on working with students with disabilities, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 891
Table 2.8.1.17. Typical lengths of schools' training sessions for general education teachers that focus on working with students with disabilities 892
Table 2.8.1.18. Topics included in schools' training sessions for general education teachers focused on working with students with disabilities during the 2018-2019 school year (including summer 2018) 893

2.8.2. Personnel allocation: Staffing shortages and initiatives 894

Table 2.8.2.1. Disciplines for which statewide early intervention systems had difficulty finding qualified Part C early intervention professionals during the 2018, 2019, or 2020 fiscal years 894
Table 2.8.2.2. Disciplines for which statewide early intervention systems had difficulty retaining qualified Part C early intervention professionals during the 2018, 2019, or 2020 fiscal years 895
Table 2.8.2.3. Types of effective special education personnel who work with school-age children that districts had difficulty finding and retaining during the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020) 896
Table 2.8.2.4. Types of effective special education personnel who work with preschool-age children that districts had difficulty finding and retaining during the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020) 898
Table 2.8.2.5. Percentage of schools with unfilled position for special education teacher or other specialized instructional support personnel in the 2019-2020 school year 899
Table 2.8.2.6. Types of effective special education personnel whom schools had difficulty finding or retaining during the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020) 900
Table 2.8.2.7. Types of effective special education personnel who work with preschool-age children that schools had difficulty finding or retaining during the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020) 901

Table 2.8.2.8. Special education teacher positions for which schools had difficulty finding effective applicants during the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020) 902
Table 2.8.2.8a. Special education teacher positions for which schools had difficulty finding effective applicants during the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020), by school type 903
Table 2.8.2.8b. Special education teacher positions for which schools had difficulty finding effective applicants during the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020), by school rurality 904
Table 2.8.2.8c. Special education teacher positions for which schools had difficulty finding effective applicants during the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020), by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 905
Table 2.8.2.9. Secondary school special education teacher positions for which schools had difficulty finding effective applicants during the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020) 906
Table 2.8.2.10. Number of special education teachers who served students with disabilities ages 3-21 in schools during the 2018-2019 school year 907
Table 2.8.2.10a. Number of special education teachers who served students with disabilities ages 3-21 in schools during the 2018-2019 school year, by school type 908
Table 2.8.2.10b. Number of special education teachers who served students with disabilities ages 3-21 in schools during the 2018-2019 school year, by school rurality 909
Table 2.8.2.10c. Number of special education teachers who served students with disabilities ages 3-21 in schools during the 2018-2019 school year, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 910
Table 2.8.2.11. Number of special education teachers serving students with disabilities ages 3-21 who left schools for any reason after the 2018-2019 school year 911
Table 2.8.2.11a. Number of special education teachers serving students with disabilities ages 3-21 who left schools for any reason after the 2018-2019 school year, by school type 912
Table 2.8.2.11b. Number of special education teachers serving students with disabilities ages 3-21 who left schools for any reason after the 2018-2019 school year, by school rurality 913
Table 2.8.2.11c. Number of special education teachers serving students with disabilities ages 3-21 who left schools for any reason after the 2018-2019 school year, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status) 914

2.8.3. Personnel allocation: Staff retention and initiatives to address retention challenges 915

Table 2.8.3.1. Strategies state agencies used to increase the number of effective special education teachers during the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020) 915
Table 2.8.3.2. Initiatives or incentives states used to retain effective special education teachers during the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school years 916
Table 2.8.3.3. Strategies state agencies used to increase the number of effective preschool special education teachers during the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020) 917
Table 2.8.3.4. Initiatives or incentives state agencies used to retain effective preschool special education teachers during the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020) 918
Table 2.8.3.5. Strategies lead agencies used to increase the number of qualified Part C early intervention professionals in the 2019 and 2020 fiscal years 919
Table 2.8.3.6. Initiatives or incentives lead agencies used to retain qualified Part C professionals during the 2019 and 2020 fiscal years 920
Table 2.8.3.7. Factors districts consider when assigning specialized instructional support personnel, or non-teaching staff, to schools to work with students with disabilities 921

Table 2.8.3.7a. Factors districts consider when assigning specialized instructional support personnel, or non-teaching staff, to schools to work with students with disabilities, by district type 922
Table 2.8.3.7b. Factors districts consider when assigning specialized instructional support personnel, or non-teaching staff, to schools to work with students with disabilities, by district size 923
Table 2.8.3.7c. Factors districts consider when assigning specialized instructional support personnel, or non-teaching staff, to schools to work with students with disabilities, by district rurality 924
Table 2.8.3.8. Personnel who work with school-age children with disabilities, employed either directly by districts or through contracts with independent providers 925
Table 2.8.3.9. Strategies districts used to increase the number of effective special education teachers during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020) 926
Table 2.8.3.9a. Strategies districts used to increase the number of effective special education teachers during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district type 927
Table 2.8.3.9b. Strategies districts used to increase the number of effective special education teachers during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district size 928
Table 2.8.3.9c. Strategies districts used to increase the number of effective special education teachers during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district rurality 929
Table 2.8.3.10. Supports or incentives districts used to recruit new special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year 930
Table 2.8.3.10a. Supports or incentives districts used to recruit new special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year, by district type 931
Table 2.8.3.10b. Supports or incentives districts used to recruit new special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year, by district size 932
Table 2.8.3.10c. Supports or incentives districts used to recruit new special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year, by district rurality 933
Table 2.8.3.11. Initiatives or incentives districts used to retain effective special education teachers in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020) 934
Table 2.8.3.12. Strategies districts used to increase the number of effective preschool special education teachers in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020) 935
Table 2.8.3.12a. Strategies districts used to increase the number of effective preschool special education teachers in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district type 936
Table 2.8.3.12b. Strategies districts used to increase the number of effective preschool special education teachers in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district size 937
Table 2.8.3.12c. Strategies districts used to increase the number of effective preschool special education teachers in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district rurality 938
Table 2.8.3.13. Supports or incentives districts used to recruit new preschool special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year 939
Table 2.8.3.13a. Supports or incentives districts used to recruit new preschool special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year, by district type 940
Table 2.8.3.13b. Supports or incentives districts used to recruit new preschool special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year, by district size 941
Table 2.8.3.13c. Supports or incentives districts used to recruit new preschool special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year, by district rurality 942
Table 2.8.3.14. Initiatives or incentives districts used to retain effective preschool special education teachers in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020) 943

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Chapter 1. Methodology

The IDEA State and Local Implementation Study 2019 focuses on core aspects of IDEA implementation at the state and local levels. The study examines both how children are identified for services and the policies, practices, and procedures in place to support these children. Specifically, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. What are the state and local policies and practices related to identifying children with disabilities, promoting access to the general education curriculum, and providing services?
2. What key resource decisions do states and districts make to support children with disabilities, including funding for various activities and the hiring and retention of personnel?
3. How have key policies and practices changed over time?

The study is descriptive and therefore not designed to produce causal inferences or support claims about the effects of policies. This methodology chapter describes data sources and statistical tests used for the descriptive analyses presented in this document and in study reports.

Data sources

The analyses conducted for the study primarily used data collected through six surveys administered from fall 2019 through fall 2020. Three state surveys focused on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (birth through age 2), preschool-age children (ages 3 through 5), and school-age children (in kindergarten or ages 6 through 21). The study administered the state surveys to all states and entities that receive IDEA funding. Two district surveys, administered to a nationally representative sample of districts, focused on IDEA programs for preschool-age children and school-age children. The study used multiple state and district surveys because different staff typically coordinate the program for each age range. Finally, the study administered a school survey to a nationally representative sample of schools within sampled districts.

Some analyses used other data submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, such as ED*Facts*, the Common Core of Data (CCD), and state and district surveys administered for the IDEA National Assessment and Implementation Study 2009 (Bradley et al. 2011). The results from analyses using these extant data are not included in this document but are provided in the applicable study reports.

Surveys

This section describes the survey development process, the district and school sample designs, survey response rates, and weighting procedures.

Survey development

The purpose of the surveys was to obtain updated information since the last national data collection on IDEA's implementation during the 2008-09 school year. This information can inform a future reauthorization of IDEA as well as federal regulations and state and local policies to help ensure that all children with disabilities receive appropriate services and supports. The major content areas for the surveys focused on identification of children with disabilities, development of individualized plans, available supports, discipline policies, transition supports into elementary school and out of high school, family engagement, staffing, and allocation of resources. The study's research questions, input from Department staff and technical working group members, review of previous Department studies on IDEA, and feedback from survey pre-tests guided survey development.

Survey pre-tests. Department staff and technical working group members reviewed the survey instruments and pre-tested them with a convenience sample of state education agency, school district, and school staff based on connections with either the IDEA study team or technical working group members. The study team recruited

two or three pre-test respondents for each of the six surveys and each of the two rounds of pre-testing. Pre-test respondents for the state and district surveys were current and former state and district special education administrators. Pre-test respondents for the school surveys were school staff who were most knowledgeable about their school's special education program. These respondents were similar to the population that would complete the survey. Each pre-test respondent completed the survey and participated in a debriefing interview. The study team developed protocols to guide debriefing sessions with pre-test respondents. Following the pre-tests, the study team revised the surveys to decrease the overall burden of the survey by clarifying text that was unclear, adding response options that were missing, reordering questions to ensure the surveys were logically organized, and removing survey items that were too difficult to answer or would not provide useful information. The study team conducted a second round of pre-tests to retest the revisions that resulted from the first round of pre-tests.

State sample design

The state surveys were administered to 60 states and entities that receive IDEA funding, including all 50 states, the District of Columbia, eight outlying areas, freely associated States (the Republic of the Marshall Islands, Palau, and the Federated States of Micronesia), and the Bureau of Indian Education. We did not administer the survey to the Department of Defense Education Activity and so do not include this entity in our response rate calculations.[1]

District sample design

The study selected a single sample of districts so that both district surveys could be fielded in the same districts where applicable. The district sample frame was derived from the list of public school districts provided by the CCD.[2] The study team used the CCD district files for the 2015-16 school year, which were the latest available files that included all the data necessary for sample selection. The sample frame for the IDEA district surveys was the subset of the full list of school districts, based on the following criteria:

1. Districts must have reported student enrollment greater than zero.
2. Districts must have had both low and high grades anywhere within the span of pre-kindergarten through grade 12.
3. Districts must have been categorized as regular local school districts, local school districts that are part of a supervisory union, supervisory unions, or charter education agencies.
4. Districts must have had at least one school that was eligible for selection into the study sample.
5. Charter districts must have been considered a local education agency for the purposes of IDEA funding.

The study used a stratified sampling approach to select an original sample frame of 688 nationally representative districts. After this initial selection, the study team learned that 23 districts were ineligible for IDEA. Correspondingly, 665 districts were involved in survey administration. To select the district sample, the study team selected districts from 25 strata. The study team created the first 24 strata based on combinations of census region (Northeast, South, Midwest, West), urbanicity (urban, suburban, town/rural area), and total enrollment (above/below median enrollment for each urbanicity type). These 24 strata included only districts with no charter schools. The team created the 25th stratum for districts with at least one charter school. Districts in this stratum were either independent charter school districts or traditional districts that operated at least one charter

[1] We excluded the Department of Defense Education Activity from the state sample due to its unique organizational and funding structure.

[2] The school district CCD are available at https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/pubagency.asp.

school. To ensure a sufficient sample of traditional public schools, the team oversampled larger urban and suburban districts from the first 24 strata. Similarly, to ensure a sufficient sample of charter schools, the team oversampled districts with at least one charter school (those in the 25th stratum).[3] Larger districts were oversampled by a ratio of approximately 1.4 to 1.

Districts were selected with probability proportional to size, with a transformation of the number of schools as the measure of size. For districts in the first 24 strata, this measure was capped at 200 schools, and then the square root taken to reduce design effects for the district survey.[4] In the 25th stratum, the square root of the number of charter schools was used as the measure of size for regular school districts, and the raw number of charter schools was used for the charter school districts. This approach was used in the 25th stratum to increase the number of charter schools within the selected districts and ensure an adequate supply of charter schools for the school sample. Exhibit 1.1 presents the strata details for the district sample frame and the selected sample.

Exhibit 1.1. District strata

	Stratum	Sampling rate	Number of districts selected
1	Midwest, low student enrollment, urban	2.6%	<10
2	Midwest, high student enrollment, urban	3.7%	<10
3	Midwest, low student enrollment, suburban	3.4%	11
4	Midwest, high student enrollment, suburban	4.6%	13
5	Midwest, low student enrollment, town/rural	3.3%	69
6	Midwest, high student enrollment, town/rural	3.3%	60
7	Northeast, low student enrollment, urban	5.6%	<10
8	Northeast, high student enrollment, urban	7.4%	<10
9	Northeast, low student enrollment, suburban	3.4%	19
10	Northeast, high student enrollment, suburban	4.5%	19
11	Northeast, low student enrollment, town/rural	3.3%	27
12	Northeast, high student enrollment, town/rural	3.2%	29
13	South, low student enrollment, urban	7.4%	<10
14	South, high student enrollment, urban	4.8%	<10
15	South, low student enrollment, suburban	5.9%	<10
16	South, high student enrollment, suburban	4.6%	<10
17	South, low student enrollment, town/rural	3.2%	32
18	South, high student enrollment, town/rural	3.3%	58
19	West, low student enrollment, urban	3.3%	<10
20	West, high student enrollment, urban	3.5%	<10
21	West, low student enrollment, suburban	4.8%	<10
22	West, high student enrollment, suburban	4.3%	<10
23	West, low student enrollment, town/rural	3.3%	41
24	West, high student enrollment, town/rural	3.3%	21
25	One or more charter schools	7.4%	234
Total			665

Note: The sampling rate is the number of districts to be selected within the stratum divided by the total number of districts in that stratum.

[3] To determine the sample size of charter school districts, the study team selected a sample, determined the number of charter schools in the selected districts, adjusted the number of districts to select based on the results, and repeated this process until the selected samples provided sufficient counts of charter schools for selection.

[4] The design effect due to weighting is the increase in the variance of the outcome due to the complex sample design, compared to the variance of the same outcome if a simple random sample had been drawn. The study team tested various caps on the number of schools in a district. The number 200 was selected because it produced the smallest design effects.

The study team sent materials to the 665 districts to inform them of the study and identify respondents. During this outreach, 12 additional districts were determined to be ineligible (for example, due to district closing or merging with another district), reducing the number of eligible districts to 653. This outreach also confirmed whether districts operated pre-kindergarten programs.[5] Of the 653 eligible districts, 139 did not operate pre-kindergarten programs and, consequently, were not eligible for the survey that focused on the IDEA program for preschool-age children. The eligible district sample size for the preschool-age children survey is 514.

School sample design

The study used a nested stratified sampling approach to randomly select 2,750 schools from the 665 districts that were administered surveys. The sample frame for the IDEA school survey was derived from the list of public schools provided by the CCD files for the 2015-16 school year. Within each sampled district, there were up to six school strata for sampling purposes: (1) traditional elementary with pre-kindergarten, (2) traditional elementary without pre-kindergarten, (3) traditional secondary (middle and high schools), (4) charter elementary with pre-kindergarten, (5) charter elementary without pre-kindergarten, and (6) charter secondary. The study team chose these six strata to ensure an adequate sample not only to provide nationally representative estimates for schools overall but also to separately examine several analytic subgroups of schools. These subgroups included charter schools, traditional public schools, elementary schools, secondary schools, and elementary schools that offered pre-kindergarten. The strata are used only for sampling purposes and must be mutually exclusive. The subgroups are used for analytic purposes and can overlap. For example, the three charter sampling strata contribute schools to all of the school subgroups.

Charter schools and elementary schools with pre-kindergarten classes were oversampled to maximize precision for those subgroups. For the school selection, strata were defined as the combination of the sampled district and the six school-level strata, described above. Therefore, each district could have a minimum of one school stratum and a maximum of six school strata, depending on the mix of eligible schools located within each district. About 95 percent of districts had three or fewer school strata, and about 1 percent had the maximum of six school strata.

The aim of this school sample design was to achieve precision targets for all school subgroup analyses. The study aimed to achieve 95 percent confidence intervals of +/- 5 percentage points for estimates from charter schools, elementary schools with pre-kindergarten, middle/high schools, and all schools combined. For estimates from all elementary schools, the study targeted a confidence interval of +/- 4 percentage points. The study team began with a series of simulations to estimate the precision based on different sample sizes, response rates, and school subgroups. These simulations produced target numbers of schools for each school type. To further increase precision, the study team nested school samples across a larger number of districts. The number of schools selected from each district was determined separately for each school type. For each school stratum, the study team began by selecting one school from each district that had that school type. Then, if more schools were needed to hit the target number, the study team sampled schools in proportion to the size of the school stratum for each school type in each district. For example, if a given district had 5 percent of the elementary with pre-kindergarten schools, 5 percent of the remaining target sample was allocated to these schools. In the sample selected for survey administration, a total of 1,433 schools were allocated to select a minimum of 1 school per stratum, with the remaining 1,317 schools proportionally allocated to the strata. Schools were selected with equal probability within each district-school stratum combination.

Exhibit 1.2 presents the strata details for the school sample frame and the selected sample.

[5] During recruitment the study team identified the districts that did not have preschool-age student enrollment and excluded these districts from the IDEA survey focused on programs for preschool-age children with disabilities.

Exhibit 1.2. School strata within district sample

Stratum	Sampling rate	Number of schools selected across selected districts
Traditional elementary without pre-K	15.2%	323
Traditional elementary with pre-K	30.4%	812
Traditional middle and high school	25.8%	790
Charter elementary without pre-K	65.2%	377
Charter elementary with pre-K	100.0%	125
Charter middle and high school	55.5%	323
Total		2,750

Note: The sampling rate is the number of districts to be selected within the stratum divided by the total number of districts in that stratum.

The study team sent materials to the 2,750 schools to inform them of the study and identify respondents. During this outreach, 131 schools were deemed ineligible (for example, school belonged to an ineligible district, school no longer in operation), reducing the number of eligible schools to 2,619.

Survey administration and response rates

Survey administration began in fall 2019 with the intent to finish data collection before the start of the 2020-21 school year. Due to the extenuating circumstances caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, the study team paused outreach efforts in March 2020. As of March 18, 2020, response rates for each survey ranged from 39 to 84 percent.[6] However, the surveys remained open during this time, and the team continued to respond to participant questions. The study team resumed outreach efforts in summer 2020 and continued through fall 2020. Although data collection extended into the 2020-21 school year, the survey still asked respondents to reference their experiences for the 2019-20 school year (pre-pandemic).

The study team requested that the staff person most knowledgeable about early intervention or special education policies and practices in the state, district, and school complete the surveys. At the state level, state lead agency coordinators for early intervention services were the primary respondents for the state survey on infants and toddlers with disabilities. Lead agencies included state departments of health or human services (36 states), education (10 states), or another state agency (5 states). State education agency staff who coordinated IDEA programs for preschool-age children with disabilities were the primary respondents for the survey about preschool-age IDEA programs. State special education directors were the primary respondents for the survey about school-age IDEA programs. The primary respondents for the two district surveys were district preschool special education coordinators and, for school-age children with disabilities, district special education directors. Finally, surveys were administered to school staff who were most knowledgeable about preschool-age and school-age special education programs (typically either the school's principal or the lead special education staff).

The study team sent an email with a link to the electronic survey and instructions for completing it. Recognizing that survey respondents may need to consult others in order to complete the survey, they were also provided, for reference, a hard-copy survey they could share with people with whom they needed to consult. Additionally, survey respondents could fill out their responses on the hard copy and mail it back to the study team.

[6] As of the March 18, 2020, at the state level survey completion rates were as follows: 84 percent for the survey on infants and toddlers, 70 percent for the survey on preschool-age children, and 62 percent for the survey on school-age children. At the district and school levels, survey completion rates were as follows: 52 percent for the survey on preschool-age children, 52 percent for the survey on school-age children survey, and 39 percent for the school survey.

At the close of data collection, all eligible states and entities completed the state surveys (100 percent response rate for each survey).[7] At the district level, the study team collected data from 438 of the 653 eligible districts serving school-age children, a response rate of 67 percent. Additionally, the study team collected data from 320 of the 514 eligible districts that had a preschool program, a response rate of 62 percent. For the school survey, the study team collected data from 1,366 of the 2,619 eligible schools, a response rate of 52 percent. Exhibits 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5 provide the responding counts and response rates by district or school sampling strata.

Exhibit 1.3. District response counts and response rates by sampling strata, school-age IDEA survey

	Stratum	Number of districts responding	Number of eligible districts	Unweighted response rate	Weighted response rate
1	Midwest, low student enrollment, urban	‡	‡	100%	100%
2	Midwest, high student enrollment, urban	‡	‡	100%	100%
3	Midwest, low student enrollment, suburban	8	11	73%	76%
4	Midwest, high student enrollment, suburban	9	13	69%	73%
5	Midwest, low student enrollment, town/rural	52	69	75%	76%
6	Midwest, high student enrollment, town/rural	39	60	65%	66%
7	Northeast, low student enrollment, urban	‡	‡	100%	100%
8	Northeast, high student enrollment, urban	‡	‡	100%	100%
9	Northeast, low student enrollment, suburban	12	19	63%	63%
10	Northeast, high student enrollment, suburban	13	19	68%	70%
11	Northeast, low student enrollment, town/rural	22	27	81%	82%
12	Northeast, high student enrollment, town/rural	24	29	83%	82%
13	South, low student enrollment, urban	‡	‡	50%	71%
14	South, high student enrollment, urban	‡	‡	67%	63%
15	South, low student enrollment, suburban	‡	‡	50%	56%
16	South, high student enrollment, suburban	‡	5	60%	61%
17	South, low student enrollment, town/rural	18	32	56%	55%
18	South, high student enrollment, town/rural	47	58	81%	80%
19	West, low student enrollment, urban	‡	‡	50%	49%
20	West, high student enrollment, urban	0	‡	0%	0%
21	West, low student enrollment, suburban	0	‡	0%	0%
22	West, high student enrollment, suburban	‡	6	‡	‡
23	West, low student enrollment, town/rural	24	40	60%	60%
24	West, high student enrollment, town/rural	11	21	52%	55%
25	One or more charter schools	142	223	64%	63%
Total		438	653	67%	68%

‡ Reporting standards not met.

[7] We did not administer a survey to the Department of Defense Education Activity. We received completed surveys from the 60 eligible states and entities from which we requested surveys.

Exhibit 1.4. District response counts and response rates by sampling strata, preschool-age IDEA survey

	Stratum	Number of districts responding	Number of eligible districts	Unweighted response rate	Weighted response rate
1	Midwest, low student enrollment, urban	‡	‡	100%	100%
2	Midwest, high student enrollment, urban	‡	‡	100%	100%
3	Midwest, low student enrollment, suburban	7	10	70%	71%
4	Midwest, high student enrollment, suburban	6	12	50%	50%
5	Midwest, low student enrollment, town/rural	38	65	58%	59%
6	Midwest, high student enrollment, town/rural	34	60	57%	59%
7	Northeast, low student enrollment, urban	‡	‡	100%	100%
8	Northeast, high student enrollment, urban	‡	‡	100%	100%
9	Northeast, low student enrollment, suburban	14	18	78%	79%
10	Northeast, high student enrollment, suburban	9	16	56%	55%
11	Northeast, low student enrollment, town/rural	19	25	76%	78%
12	Northeast, high student enrollment, town/rural	21	27	78%	78%
13	South, low student enrollment, urban	0	‡	0%	0%
14	South, high student enrollment, urban	‡	‡	67%	63%
15	South, low student enrollment, suburban	‡	‡	50%	56%
16	South, high student enrollment, suburban	‡	5	80%	79%
17	South, low student enrollment, town/rural	21	32	66%	64%
18	South, high student enrollment, town/rural	50	58	86%	87%
19	West, low student enrollment, urban	0	‡	0%	0%
20	West, high student enrollment, urban	‡	‡	50%	44%
21	West, low student enrollment, suburban	0	‡	0%	0%
22	West, high student enrollment, suburban	‡	6	‡	‡
23	West, low student enrollment, town/rural	13	28	46%	43%
24	West, high student enrollment, town/rural	11	17	65%	61%
25	One or more charter schools	61	116	53%	49%
Total		320	514	62%	64%

‡ Reporting standards not met.

Exhibit 1.5. School response counts and response rates by sampling strata

Stratum	Number of responding schools	Number of eligible schools	Unweighted response rate	Weighted response rate
Traditional elementary without pre-K	155	303	51%	47%
Traditional elementary with pre-K	415	770	54%	52%
Traditional middle and high school	407	763	53%	54%
Charter elementary without pre-K	197	370	53%	60%
Charter elementary with pre-K	67	127	53%	56%
Charter middle and high school	125	286	44%	49%
Total	1,366	2,619	52%	52%

Sampling weights

The study did not use weights for the state surveys because all state-level coordinators completed those surveys.

The study team created a set of weights for each of the two district surveys and the school survey. The weights provide nationally representative estimates of mean values for the school districts and public schools in the sample frame. The weight for each responding district or school is based on the inverse of the probability it was selected into the sample (the sampling weight) and adjusted to account for survey nonresponse.

Sampling weights. The sampling weight for each selected district was the inverse of the probability that it was selected into the sample. This probability varied across strata. The districts were grouped into 25 strata for selection, as discussed above, and were selected with probability proportional to the number of students enrolled in the districts. The sum of the sampling weights across selected districts is approximately equal to the total district size (selected and unselected) within each stratum.

The sampling weight for each selected school is the inverse of the school's *cumulative selection probability*, defined as the product of its district selection probability and the probability of school selection within each school stratum. The school sampling weights approximately sum to the total number of schools of each type for districts in their district stratum.

Nonresponse adjustments. The study team adjusted the sampling weights using a two-step approach to reduce the potential for nonresponse bias. The first step involved adjusting the sample weights to account for differential nonresponse patterns. The team examined relationships between response and a set of characteristics from the CCD district and school files that were available for both the respondents and nonrespondents.[8] Specifically, the team estimated logistic regression models with survey response as the outcome variable and the characteristics as the predictors. Individual characteristics were iteratively removed from the models to improve the model fit, thereby keeping just the characteristics with the strongest relationships with the probability of responding. The study team used the following characteristics in the final nonresponse adjustment models for each survey:

- **For the district survey on school-age children:** census region, K-12 enrollment in the district (quartiles), special education enrollment in the district (quartiles)
- **For the district survey on preschool-age children:** census region, K-12 enrollment in the district (quartiles)
- **For the school survey:** census region, K-12 enrollment in the district (quartiles), school enrollment (quartiles)

Using the final logistic regression models, the second step was to obtain estimated response propensities for the responding districts and schools. Response propensities are the estimated likelihood that districts or schools with similar characteristics responded to the survey. The nonresponse adjustments were calculated as the inverse of the estimated response propensity for each survey. The nonresponse-adjusted weights were, in turn, calculated as the product of the sampling weight and the inverse of the estimated response propensity for each respondent. Because a school's district did not need to respond for the school to respond, all the aspects of the nonresponse adjustment for schools were independent of both their district's response and the nonresponse adjustment applied to their district.

After the nonresponse adjustments were applied, the study team ran a raking procedure, otherwise known as iterative proportional fitting, to align the totals of the nonresponse-adjusted weights with the totals for a set of known population characteristics. This method repeatedly makes small adjustments to the weights to shift the totals to match the population counts as closely as possible and further reduces the potential for nonresponse bias. Finally, the study team examined the distribution of the raking-adjusted nonresponse district and school weights to assess the need for weight trimming to reduce variation in the weights and avoid one or a few respondents having too much influence in the analysis. Only the school weights required any trimming adjustments.

[8] The study team used the 2015-16 CCD data for sampling and to construct post-stratification weights.

The study team conducted a nonresponse bias analysis to assess the performance of the weight adjustments. This analysis compared the weighted characteristics of responding districts and schools before and after nonresponse weighting adjustments to population totals, using data from the CCD. Differences between the population and the respondents before weighting adjustments indicate potential sources of nonresponse bias, whereas differences between the population and the respondents after weighting adjustments show the remaining potential for bias based on unobserved characteristics after adjusting for nonresponse. The results showed the nonresponse adjustments to the weights were very successful in reducing the potential for nonresponse bias. In nearly all cases, the difference between the mean characteristic for respondents and the population was not statistically significant ($p < .05$) and its magnitude small (< .10 standard deviations). The final analysis weights allow the survey estimates to be generalized to the population of districts or schools estimated to be eligible for IDEA and should correctly estimate the variance around those estimates when the appropriate sample design information is used in the estimation.

Extant data on states and districts from ED*Facts*, Common Core of Data, and the IDEA National Assessment and Implementation Study 2009

The study team obtained state- and district-level data from the 2009-10 through 2019-20 IDEA data files maintained by the Department's ED*Facts* initiative and 2015-16 district-level data from the Department's CCD Elementary/Secondary Information System, and the IDEA National Assessment and Implementation Study 2009.

State EDFacts data

The study team obtained publicly available data on factors such as the number of children with disabilities in each state by age, disability category, gender, race/ethnicity, and language proficiency status. It also obtained information on state definitions of significant disproportionality in identification, placement, and discipline for students with disabilities based on race and ethnicity. Finally, the study obtained data on the number of districts that were required to use Coordinated Early Intervening Services funds due to significant disproportionality. These data are generally used to provide context for the findings from survey data.

CCD data

The study team also obtained publicly available CCD data. At the district level, CCD data include the number of students in each district by grade, race/ethnicity, language proficiency status, special education status, eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch, district charter status, and district urbanicity. At the school level, CCD data include the grade range, charter status, free or reduced-price lunch counts, school type (that is, elementary or secondary), and school enrollment. The data also include district and school identifiers and geographic information. The study used these data to construct variables for subgroup analysis.

IDEA National Assessment and Implementation Study 2009 data

The study team obtained restricted-use IDEA National Assessment and Implementation Study 2009 data from the Department's National Center for Education Statistics to document how various facets of IDEA implementation have or have not changed over time. For example, the team examined how state definitions of racial and ethnic disparities in identifying a disability have changed from 2009 to 2019.

Analysis and statistical tests

The study team conducted statistical tests to examine differences between subgroups of districts and schools, which provided a fuller understanding of how IDEA implementation varies across types of districts and schools. The sampling strategy permitted the study to document (and statistically test for) differences between different subgroups, such as charter schools and traditional schools, in various topics such as how they identify and

support children with disabilities. Statistical tests showed whether an observed difference in means could be due to chance alone. Statistical testing was not used to examine state data because those data are drawn from all state-level entities.[9] The tests used study weights that accounted for the complex sample design and nonresponse adjustments.

The statistical tests of differences between subgroups evaluated the null hypothesis of no difference in means between the subgroups by using a two-sided t-test. The report notes where statistical differences between subgroups were statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level.

Reference

Bradley, M.C., Daley, T., Levin, M., O'Reilly, R., Parsad, A., Robertson, A., and Werner, A. (2011). *IDEA National Assessment Implementation Study* (NCEE 2011-4027). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

[9] While sampling error is not a concern for state-level responses, we acknowledge that there may be other non-sampling errors that exist in these estimates that are not formally accounted for.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Chapter 2. Compendium of Data Tables

Overview

This chapter summarizes data from the 2019 surveys of state agencies, districts, and schools. Where appropriate, the data are disaggregated by characteristics such as whether a district is a traditional public school district or a charter school network, district size, or district urbanicity. In some cases, the chapter includes variations of the same tables. These variations share the same table number but are distinguished by the suffix a, b, or c. For example, Table 2.1.1.2a shows the professional development state agencies provide to district or school staff to ensure children are appropriately referred for evaluation and identified within the sample of 50 states and DC, while Table 2.1.1.2b presents the same information for U.S. territories.

Because of the large number of exhibits, the chapter groups exhibits by major content area: identification for services, individualized plans to meet challenging objectives, access to general education programs and supports, support for transitions (into elementary school and out of high school), behavioral policies and supports, evidence from research, funding allocation (for example, funding sources and how funding is used), and personnel allocation (for example, qualification standards, staffing shortages) and by subtopic. The subtopics for each major content area are identified on the page headers. Readers are encouraged to review the table of contents and list of exhibits for this chapter to quickly identify the page number of exhibits related to particular subtopics of interest.

2.0.1. Background context: Populations served

Table 2.0.1.1. Student populations for whom designated state special education directors are responsible (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
School-age children with disabilities	51	9
Preschool-age children with disabilities	48	8
Children, birth through age 2, with disabilities	9	1
School-age children without disabilities	3	0
Preschool-age children without disabilities	4	0
Children, birth through age 2, without disabilities	0	0
Other	1	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question A1).

Table 2.0.1.2. Student populations for whom designated state special education directors are responsible (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Preschool-age children with disabilities	50	8
School-age children with disabilities	17	7
Children, birth through age 2, with disabilities	7	1
Preschool-age children without disabilities	9	1
School-age children without disabilities	2	0
Children, birth through age 2, without disabilities	1	1
Other	5	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question A1).

Table 2.0.1.3. Populations for whom designated early intervention coordinators are responsible

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Children, birth through age 2, with disabilities	51	6
Preschool-age children with disabilities	7	2
School-age children with disabilities	1	0
Children, birth through age 2, without disabilities	1	2
Preschool-age children without disabilities	1	1
School-age children without disabilities	0	0
Other	10	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to indicate any other responsibilities or obligations in the 'other' response option.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question A2).

Table 2.0.1.4. Student populations for whom designated district special education coordinators are responsible (school-age children)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
School-age children with disabilities	97	1.0
Preschool-age children with disabilities	61	2.7
School-age children without disabilities	27	2.5
Preschool-age children without disabilities	17	2.2
Other	11	1.9
Number of district responses	**438**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Respondents were asked to indicate any other responsibilities or obligations in the 'other' response option. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question A1).

Table 2.0.1.5. Student populations for whom designated district special education coordinators are responsible (preschool-age children)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Preschool-age children with disabilities	91	1.8
School-age children with disabilities	84	2.5
Children, birth through age 2, with disabilities	15	2.4
Preschool-age children without disabilities	33	3.1
School-age children without disabilities	23	2.9
Children, birth through age 2, without disabilities	2!	0.9
Other	4	1.3
Number of district responses	**320**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question A1).

Table 2.0.1.6. Roles held by school-level staff with knowledge about school special education policies and practices

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Special education coordinator	21	2.0
Special education teacher	8	0.9
Principal	50	2.6
Assistant principal	3	0.7
Other	18	1.8
Number of school responses	**1,366**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question A1).

Table 2.0.1.7. Grade levels offered by schools

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Prekindergarten	37	2.2
Kindergarten	58	2.4
1st grade	59	2.3
2nd grade	59	2.3
3rd grade	59	2.3
4th grade	60	2.3
5th grade	57	2.3
6th grade	42	2.1
7th grade	38	2.1
8th grade	39	2.1
9th grade	32	2.1
10th grade	32	2.1
11th grade	32	2.1
12th grade	32	2.1
Number of school responses	**1,366**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question A2).

2.1.1. Identification for services: Child find

Table 2.1.1.1. Number of state agencies that have posted their current eligibility criteria for special education and related services on the agency website

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Information not available on a website	3	3
Information available on a website	48	6
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B1).

Table 2.1.1.2. Number of states with public charter schools

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Have charter schools that are part of traditional school districts	30	2
Have charter schools that are their own school district	32	0
Do not have public charter schools	7	7
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B2).

Table 2.1.1.3. Number of states with public virtual schools

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	13	9
Yes	38	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B3).

Table 2.1.1.4a. Professional development state agencies provide to district or school staff to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children, by school types (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of state agencies that provide this professional development to traditional public schools	Number of state agencies that provide this professional development to public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district	Number of state agencies that provide this professional development to public charter schools that are their own school district	Number of state agencies that provide this professional development to public virtual schools	Number of state agencies that provide this professional development to private schools	Number of state agencies that responded not applicable
Professional development on referrals	47	26	29	29	16	4
Professional development on identification	47	27	29	28	15	3
Professional development on using data from research-based intervention strategies to inform referrals or identification	46	27	27	24	12	5
Number of state responses	**51**	**30**	**32**	**38**	**51**	**51**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia. Only respondents who indicated that their state has public charter schools that are part of traditional school districts (n=30), public charter schools that are their own school district (n=32), or public virtual schools (n=38) were asked to address these respective school types for this question.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B4).

Table 2.1.1.4b. Professional development state-level agencies provide to district or school staff to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children, by school types (entities)

Response category	Number of state level agencies that provide this professional development to traditional public schools	Number of state level agencies that provide this professional development to public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district	Number of state level agencies that provide this professional development to public charter schools that are their own school district	Number of state level agencies that provide this professional development to public virtual schools	Number of state level agencies that provide this professional development to private schools	Number of state level agencies that responded not applicable
Professional development on referrals	8	2	0	0	7	1
Professional development on identification	8	2	0	0	7	1
Professional development on using data from research-based intervention strategies to inform referrals or identification	7	1	0	0	3	2
Number of entity responses	**9**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Only respondents who indicated that their entity has public charter schools that are part of traditional school districts (n=2), public charter schools that are their own school district (n=0), or public virtual schools (n=0) were asked to address these respective school types for this question.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B4).

Table 2.1.1.5a. Written materials and resources state agencies provide to district or school staff to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children, across school types (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of state agencies that provide these resources to traditional public schools	Number of state agencies that provide these resources to public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district	Number of state agencies that provide these resources to public charter schools that are their own school district	Number of state agencies that provide these resources to public virtual schools	Number of state agencies that provide these resources to private schools	Number of state agencies that responded not applicable
Written materials and resources on referrals to district and/or school staff	51	27	31	31	25	0
Written materials and resources on identification to district and/or school staff	51	27	31	31	24	0
Written materials and resources on using data from research-based intervention strategies to inform referrals or identification	48	27	31	29	20	3
Number of state responses	**51**	**30**	**32**	**38**	**51**	**51**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia. Only respondents who indicated that their state has public charter schools that are part of traditional school districts (n=30), public charter schools that are their own school district (n=32), or public virtual schools (n=38) were asked to address these respective school types for this question.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B5).

Table 2.1.1.5b. Written materials and resources state-level agencies provide to district or school staff to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children, across school types (entities)

Response category	Number of state level agencies that provide these resources to traditional public schools	Number of state level agencies that provide these resources to public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district	Number of state level agencies that provide these resources to public charter schools that are their own school district	Number of state level agencies that provide these resources to public virtual schools	Number of state level agencies that provide these resources to private schools	Number of state level agencies that responded not applicable
Written materials and resources on referrals to district and/or school staff	8	2	0	0	8	1
Written materials and resources on identification to district and/or school staff	8	2	0	0	7	1
Written materials and resources on using data from research-based intervention strategies to inform referrals or identification	7	1	0	0	3	2
Number of entity responses	**9**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Only respondents who indicated that their entity has public charter schools that are part of traditional school districts (n=2), public charter schools that are their own school district (n=0), or public virtual schools (n=0) were asked to address these respective school types for this question.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B5).

Table 2.1.1.6. Number of state agencies that provide written materials and resources on referrals or identification to parents/guardians of school-age children, by school type

Response category	Number of yes responses	Total number of state responses	Number of yes responses	Total number of entity responses
For parents/guardians of students who attend traditional public schools	49	51	8	**9**
For parents/guardians of students who attend public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district	29	30	2	**2**
For parents/guardians of students who attend public charter schools that are their own school district	31	32	0	**0**
For parents/guardians of students who attend public virtual schools	30	38	0	**0**
For parents/guardians of students who attend private schools	33	51	6	**9**
Do not provide written materials and resources on referrals or identification to parents/guardians of school-age children	2	51	1	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Only respondents who indicated that their state has public charter schools that are part of traditional school districts (states: n=30; entities: n=2), public charter schools that are their own school district (states: n=32; entities: n=0), or public virtual schools (states: n=38; entities: n=0) were asked to address these respective school types for this question.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B6).

Table 2.1.1.7a. Number of state agencies that monitor and provide targeted assistance to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children, across school types (50 states and DC)

Response category	Traditional public schools	Public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district	Public charter schools that are their own school district	Public virtual schools	Private schools	State agencies that responded not applicable
State monitors data related to the referral process and provides targeted assistance	41	23	27	25	10	10
State monitors the length of time between referral and eligibility determination and provides targeted assistance	46	24	29	28	13	5
State monitors the number of students identified as eligible for services and provides targeted assistance	45	24	28	28	11	5
Number of state responses	**51**	**30**	**32**	**38**	**51**	**51**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia. Only respondents who indicated that their state has public charter schools that are part of traditional school districts (n=30), public charter schools that are their own school district (n=32), or public virtual schools (n=38) were asked to address these respective school types for this question.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B8).

Table 2.1.1.7b. Number of state-level agencies that monitor and provide targeted assistance to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children, across school types (entities)

Response category	Traditional public schools	Public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district	Public charter schools that are their own school district	Public virtual schools	Private schools	State agencies that responded not applicable
Entity monitors data related to the referral process and provides targeted assistance	8	2	0	0	3	1
Entity monitors the length of time between referral and eligibility determination and provides targeted assistance	8	2	0	0	3	1
Entity monitors the number of students identified as eligible for services and provides targeted assistance	8	2	0	0	4	1
Number of entity responses	**9**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Only respondents who indicated that their entity has public charter schools that are part of traditional school districts (n=2), public charter schools that are their own school district (n=0), or public virtual schools (n=0) were asked to address these respective school types for this question.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B8).

Table 2.1.1.8. Number of state agencies that have a system in place for schools to notify the state if they identify a school-age child with a disability, by school type

Response category	Number of yes responses	Total number of state responses	Number of yes responses	Total number of entity responses
Have a system in place for traditional public schools	49	51	7	**9**
Have a system in place for public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district	28	30	1	**2**
Have a system in place for public charter schools that are their own school district	31	32	0	**0**
Have a system in place for public virtual schools	30	38	0	**0**
Have a system in place for private schools	16	51	4	**9**
Do not have a system in place	2	51	1	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Only respondents who indicated that their state has public charter schools that are part of traditional school districts (states: n=30; entities: n=2), public charter schools that are their own school district (states: n=32; entities: n=0), or public virtual schools (states: n=38; entities: n=0) were asked to address these respective school types for this question.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B9).

Table 2.1.1.9. Number of state agencies that take some type of additional action to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children with disabilities in traditional public schools

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	19	4
Yes	32	5
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B10).

Table 2.1.1.10. Number of state agencies that take some type of additional action to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children with disabilities in public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	13	0
Yes	17	2
Number of responses	**30**	**2**

Note: The sample for this table includes all states with public charter schools that are part of traditional school districts (states: n=30; entities: n=2). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B11).

Table 2.1.1.11. Number of state agencies that take some type of additional action to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children with disabilities in public charter schools that are their own school district

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	15	0
Yes	17	0
Number of responses	**32**	**0**

Note: The sample for this table includes all states with public charter schools that are their own school district (states: n=32; entities: n=0). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B12).

Table 2.1.1.12. Number of state agencies that take some type of additional action to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children with disabilities in public virtual schools

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	21	0
Yes	17	0
Number of responses	**38**	**0**

Note: The sample for this table includes all states with public virtual schools (states: n=38; entities: n=0). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B13).

Table 2.1.1.13. Number of state agencies that take further action to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children with disabilities in private schools

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	26	5
Yes	25	4
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B14).

Table 2.1.1.14. Supports state agencies provide to help districts apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination period (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Develop procedures for application of exclusionary criteria	19	2
Provide professional development for school staff	31	2
Provide written materials to school staff	35	2
Provide guidelines for staff to follow before screening children who are English learners	29	6
Other	8	1
Number of responses	**48**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The purpose of this exclusionary clause is to help prevent the improper determination of eligibility of children for special education services, especially those from distinct cultures who have acquired learning styles, language, or behaviors that are not compatible with academic requirements of schools in the dominant culture.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B15).

Table 2.1.1.15a. Actions state agencies take with other state and local agencies and programs to identify or determine eligibility of school-age children who have experienced emerging health concerns (50 states and DC)

Response	Number of state agencies that have occasional or regular conversations	Number of state agencies that jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	Number of state agencies that hold joint professional development for personnel	Number of state agencies that share identification and screening data	Number of state agencies that establish interagency agreements	Number of state agencies that don t work with other agencies/programs on this condition
Adverse Childhood Experiences	34	24	23	9	19	6
Fetal alcohol spectrum disorders	30	6	5	3	5	17
Lead or other heavy metal poisoning	19	7	2	1	4	26
Neonatal abstinence syndrome	18	4	3	2	3	31
Opioid addiction	28	13	10	6	6	15
Perinatal substance use	24	6	5	2	4	22
Zika virus	15	2	1	0	3	32
Number of state responses	**50**					

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia. State and local agencies and programs include public health, substance abuse treatment, mental health, and social services.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B16).

Table 2.1.1.15b. Actions state-level agencies take with other state and local agencies and programs to identify or determine eligibility of school-age children who have experienced emerging health concerns (entities)

Response category	Number of state level agencies that have occasional or regular conversations	Number of state level agencies that jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	Number of state level agencies that hold joint professional development for personnel	Number of state level agencies that share identification and screening data	Number of state level agencies that establish interagency agreements	Number of state level agencies that don t work with other agencies/programs on this condition
Adverse Childhood Experiences	5	2	3	5	6	1
Fetal alcohol spectrum disorders	4	3	1	3	3	3
Lead or other heavy metal poisoning	1	0	0	1	2	6
Neonatal abstinence syndrome	4	2	2	4	4	3
Opioid addiction	5	1	1	2	3	3
Perinatal substance use	3	1	1	4	3	4
Zika virus	4	2	2	4	4	3
Number of entity responses	**9**					

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. State and local agencies and programs include public health, substance abuse treatment, mental health, and social services.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B16).

Table 2.1.1.16. Number of state agencies with policies and practices for identifying students with specific learning disabilities that differ by grade level (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	48	7
Yes	3	1
Number of responses	**51**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C9).

Table 2.1.1.17. Activities or services state agencies offer to ensure non-English-speaking parents/guardians understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes for school-age children

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Parents/guardians are asked to state their primary language as part of standard procedure at intake	38	8
An interpreter is provided for parents/guardians as needed	39	7
Parents/guardians are encouraged to bring someone who can interpret for them	10	7
Parents/guardians are provided with translated written resources	42	6
A toll-free phone number staffed by multilingual staff is provided for non-English-speaking parents/guardians	10	0
A toll-free vendor interpreter service is used as needed	9	0
Other	6	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to select anything the state does or requires local school districts or providers to do. They were asked not to include activities initiated at the district or school level.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L1).

Table 2.1.1.18. Activities state agencies perform to ensure referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Provide professional development on culturally competent practices	29	4
Include parents/guardians on state advisory committees, task forces, or work groups representing diverse populations	40	8
Solicit periodic feedback from stakeholders and families representing diverse populations	31	4
Monitor how interpreters and translators are used	11	2
Monitor the use of culturally competent practices	6	2
Provide guidance specifically designed to support the use of linguistically and culturally competent practices (for example, written guidance or webinars)	24	5
Work with the state's Parent Training and Information Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate	37	4
Number of responses	**50**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Linguistically and culturally competent practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L2).

Table 2.1.1.19. Challenges state agencies experience in ensuring referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Addressing family reluctance to engage with schools around special education	22	4
Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status	22	0
Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals	40	3
Having an insufficient number of interpreters	33	3
Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes	28	2
Having assessments for evaluation that are not normed for other languages	29	5
Difficulty determining if eligibility for services is due to lack of skills in native language, rather than a disability	34	4
Other	1	0
None of the above	3	1
Number of responses	**50**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L4).

Table 2.1.1.20. Number of state agencies that have posted their current eligibility criteria for the preschool-age special education program and related services on the agency website

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Information not available on a website	4	4
Information available on a website	46	5
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B1).

Table 2.1.1.21. Activities state agencies conduct to support the identification of preschool-age children in need of special education services

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Child Find screenings	15	6
Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to pediatricians and other health care providers	14	4
Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities	17	4
Workshops for pediatricians and other health care providers	5	2
Workshops for staff from child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities	17	6
Outreach to referral sources	15	6
Web-based information and other electronic materials	41	5
Outreach through radio, TV, newspapers, and other print media to promote awareness of disabilities and services for young children	12	6
Outreach through community events, such as health fairs	13	7
Other	13	0
None of the above	2	0
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B2).

Table 2.1.1.22a. Actions state agencies take with other state or local agencies to identify and determine eligibility of preschool-age children suspected of having a disability (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of state agencies that take this action with home visiting agencies	Number of state agencies that take this action with Head Start	Number of state agencies that take this action with pre K schools	Number of state agencies that take this action with social service agencies	Number of state agencies that take this action with public health agencies	Number not applicable
Have occasional or regular conversations about identification and screening	21	41	45	18	25	4
Jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	17	33	38	14	19	10
Hold joint professional development for personnel	13	31	36	10	12	8
Share identification and screening data	10	24	25	12	16	19
Establish interagency agreements	17	31	25	12	18	11
Other	9	11	14	7	9	34
Number of state responses	**51**					

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B3).

Table 2.1.1.22b. Actions state-level agencies take with other state-level or local agencies to identify and determine eligibility of preschool-age children suspected of having a disability (entities)

Response category	Number of state level agencies that take this action with home visiting agencies	Number of state level agencies that take this action with Head Start	Number of state level agencies that take this action with pre K schools	Number of state level agencies that take this action with social service agencies	Number of state level agencies that take this action with public health agencies	Number not applicable
Have occasional or regular conversations about identification and screening	3	7	3	5	7	0
Jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	3	5	3	4	4	1
Hold joint professional development for personnel	2	6	3	5	5	0
Share identification and screening data	3	7	4	5	7	0
Establish interagency agreements	2	6	2	4	8	1
Other	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of entity responses	**9**					

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B3).

Table 2.1.1.23. Supports state agencies provide to parents/guardians of infants and toddlers who received early intervention services and who are not determined eligible for preschool special education services

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Information about preschool programs in the local area	23	6
Information about other agencies in the local area	19	6
Referrals to other agencies and programs	14	5
Referrals to specialists who can assess the child's developmental and learning needs	8	2
The opportunity to continue current services, paid for by parents/guardians	3	1
Other	6	1
None of the above	21	2
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B4).

Table 2.1.1.24. Supports state agencies provide to help districts apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination period (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Develop procedures for application of exclusionary criteria	14	0
Provide professional development for school staff	25	4
Provide written materials to school staff	24	2
Provide guidelines for staff to follow before screening children who are English learners	28	2
Other	8	2
Number of responses	**47**	**7**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The purpose of this exclusionary clause is to help prevent the improper determination of eligibility of children for special education services, especially those from distinct cultures who have acquired learning styles, language, or behaviors that are not compatible with academic requirements of schools in the dominant culture.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B5).

Table 2.1.1.25a. Actions state agencies take with other agencies and programs to identify and determine eligibility of preschool-age children who have experienced emerging health concerns (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of state agencies that have occasional or regular conversations	Number of state agencies that jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	Number of state agencies that hold joint professional development for personnel	Number of state agencies that share identification and screening data	Number of state agencies that establish interagency agreements	Number of state agencies that don t work with other agencies/programs on this condition
Adverse Childhood Experiences	36	13	28	5	5	9
Fetal alcohol spectrum disorders	25	9	7	7	5	20
Lead or other heavy metal poisoning	22	8	5	8	5	26
Neonatal abstinence syndrome	21	5	5	5	4	26
Opioid addiction	28	5	10	4	4	20
Prenatal substance use	26	6	8	4	6	21
Zika virus	11	1	1	0	1	40
Number of state responses	**51**					

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia. Agencies and programs include home visiting, Head Start, public health, substance abuse treatment, mental health, and social services.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B6).

Table 2.1.1.25b. Actions state-level agencies take with other agencies and programs to identify and determine eligibility of preschool-age children who have experienced emerging health concerns (entities)

Response category	Number of state level agencies that have occasional or regular conversations	Number of state level agencies that jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	Number of state level agencies that hold joint professional development for personnel	Number of state level agencies that share identification and screening data	Number of state level agencies that establish interagency agreements	Number of state level agencies that don t work with other agencies/programs on this condition
Adverse Childhood Experiences	2	0	0	3	3	4
Fetal alcohol spectrum disorders	4	2	1	3	2	3
Lead or other heavy metal poisoning	3	1	1	3	2	5
Neonatal abstinence syndrome	1	1	1	1	2	7
Opioid addiction	2	1	1	1	1	6
Prenatal substance use	4	3	3	3	1	3
Zika virus	4	1	2	4	2	4
Number of entity responses	**9**					

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Agencies and programs include home visiting, Head Start, public health, substance abuse treatment, mental health, and social services.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B6).

Table 2.1.1.26. Number of state agencies with policies and practices for identifying students with specific learning disabilities that differ by grade level (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	40	8
Yes	9	0
Number of responses	**49**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C9).

Table 2.1.1.27. Activities or services state agencies offer to ensure non-English-speaking parents/guardians understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes for preschool-age children

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Parents/guardians are asked to state their primary language as part of standard procedure at intake	39	7
An interpreter is provided for parents/guardians as needed	38	5
Parents/guardians are encouraged to bring someone who can interpret for them	15	5
Parents/guardians are provided with translated written resources	32	6
A toll-free phone number staffed by early intervention multilingual staff is provided for non-English-speaking parents/guardians	5	0
A toll-free vendor interpreter service is used as needed	11	0
Other	7	1
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to select anything their state does or requires local school districts or providers to do. They were asked not to include activities initiated at the district or school level.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question J1).

Table 2.1.1.28. Activities state agencies perform to ensure referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Provide professional development on culturally competent practices	28	3
Include parents/guardians on state advisory committees, task forces, or work groups representing diverse populations	39	7
Solicit periodic feedback from stakeholders and families representing diverse populations	26	5
Monitor how interpreters and translators are used	5	1
Monitor the use of culturally competent practices	4	3
Provide guidance specifically designed to support the use of linguistically and culturally competent practices (for example, written guidance or webinars)	28	4
Work with the state's Parent Training and Information Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate	29	2
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Linguistically and culturally competent practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question J2).

Table 2.1.1.29. Challenges state agencies experience in ensuring referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Addressing family reluctance to engage with preschools around special education	16	5
Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status	16	0
Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals	37	5
Having an insufficient number of interpreters	37	3
Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes	23	4
Having assessments for evaluation that are not normed for other languages	29	4
Difficulty determining if eligibility for services is due to lack of skills in native language, rather than a disability	26	3
Other	1	1
None of the above	3	1
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Linguistically and culturally competent practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question J3).

Table 2.1.1.30. Number of lead agencies that have posted their current eligibility criteria for Part C early intervention services on the agency website

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Information not available on a website	2	2
Information available on a website	49	4
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question B1).

Table 2.1.1.31a. Actions lead agencies take with other state or local agencies to identify and determine eligibility of infants and toddlers suspected of having a disability (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of lead agencies that take this action with home visiting agencies	Number of lead agencies that take this action with child care providers	Number of lead agencies that take this action with Early Head Start	Number of lead agencies that take this action with pre K schools	Number of lead agencies that take this action with social service agencies	Number of lead agencies that take this action with public health agencies	Number not applicable
Have occasional or regular conversations about identification and screening	49	44	43	23	44	47	0
Jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	25	20	19	20	26	25	13
Hold joint professional development for personnel	26	24	17	18	17	24	14
Share identification and screening data	21	12	14	17	21	33	13
Establish interagency agreements	23	5	28	29	30	32	4
Other	10	11	11	9	14	15	35
Number of state responses	**51**						

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question B2).

Table 2.1.1.31b. Actions lead agencies take with other state-level or local agencies to identify and determine eligibility of infants and toddlers suspected of having a disability (entities)

Response category	Number of lead agencies that take this action with home visiting agencies	Number of lead agencies that take this action with child care providers	Number of lead agencies that take this action with Early Head Start	Number of lead agencies that take this action with pre K schools	Number of lead agencies that take this action with social service agencies	Number of lead agencies that take this action with public health agencies	Number not applicable
Have occasional or regular conversations about identification and screening	6	5	3	0	4	4	0
Jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	5	3	2	0	2	3	1
Hold joint professional development for personnel	4	2	1	0	2	3	1
Share identification and screening data	5	1	2	0	2	4	0
Establish interagency agreements	3	1	2	2	2	4	0
Other	3	3	2	0	2	2	3
Number of entity responses	**6**						

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (n=6). Surveys were sent to six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question B2).

Table 2.1.1.32. Status of lead agencies' adoption of the screening procedures option made available in the 2011 Part C regulations

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Require ALL local early intervention programs to screen ALL children referred	5	5
Require ALL local early intervention programs to screen, but ONLY for certain referral sources or populations of children	4	0
Give local early intervention programs discretion around BOTH whether to use the option AND which referral sources or populations of children are screened	17	0
Give local early intervention programs discretion ONLY as to whether they use the option or not	4	0
Give local early intervention programs discretion ONLY as to which referral sources or populations of children are screened	0	0
Did not adopt the screening policy option	21	1
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The screening procedures option refers to § 303.320 of the 2011 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part C Rules and Regulations and specifies that lead agencies may adopt procedures to screen children under age 3 who have been referred to the Part C program to determine whether they are suspected of having a disability.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question B3).

Table 2.1.1.33. Lead agencies' experiences in using the screening procedure option made available in the 2011 Part C regulations

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state's data suggest that using the screening policy is cost-effective	10	1
The state's data suggest that using the screening policy is appropriate for children	13	4
The state has experienced challenges with identifying appropriate screening tools	4	0
The state has experienced challenges with having enough personnel qualified in the use of appropriate screening tools	4	0
The state has found many parents/guardians want an evaluation conducted even when screening results suggest it is not necessary	3	0
The state is considering eliminating this policy based on its experiences	0	0
Other	6	0
The state has not yet evaluated the impact of this policy	8	1
Number of responses	**30**	**5**

Note: The sample for this table includes all lead agencies that reported adopting the screening procedures option made available in the 2011 Part C regulations (states: n=30; entities: n=5). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The screening procedures option refers to § 303.320 of the 2011 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part C Rules and Regulations and specifies that lead agencies may adopt procedures to screen children under age 3 who have been referred to the Part C program to determine whether they are suspected of having a disability.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question B4).

Table 2.1.1.34. Primary reasons lead agencies are not adopting the screening procedures option made available in the 2011 Part C regulations

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Concern with being able to meet the 45-day timeline requirement if screening is added	0	0
Limited usefulness because evaluation is required if requested by the parent/guardian	6	0
Limited resources and capacity for establishing screening tools	0	0
Limited resources and capacity for having qualified staff to conduct screenings	3	0
Limited usefulness because all infants and toddlers who are referred should receive a comprehensive evaluation	9	0
Other	3	1
Number of responses	**21**	**1**

Note: The sample for this table includes all lead agencies that reported not adopting the screening policy option made available in the 2011 Part C regulations (states: n=21; entities: n=1). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question B5).

Table 2.1.1.35. Activities lead agencies conduct to support the identification of infants and toddlers in need of early intervention services

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Child Find screenings	15	6
Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to pediatricians and other health care providers	40	4
Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities	35	4
Workshops for pediatricians and other health care providers	19	3
Workshops for staff from child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities	21	2
Outreach to referral sources	36	4
Web-based information and other electronic materials	44	1
Outreach through radio, TV, newspapers, and other print media to promote awareness of disabilities and services for young children	11	2
Outreach through community events, such as health fairs	33	6
Other	13	0
None of the above	1	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked not to include activities initiated at the local level.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question B6).

Table 2.1.1.36. Referral sources lead agencies listed as their top three largest for Part C early intervention services

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Local school district	2	1
Health department	4	3
Social service agencies (for example, child welfare, mental health)	33	1
Parents/guardians	47	4
Health care providers or hospitals	48	4
Child care	4	1
Early Head Start	1	1
Early Hearing Detection and Intervention systems	1	3
Other	5	0
Number of responses	**49**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question B7).

Table 2.1.1.37a. Actions lead agencies take with other state or local agencies and programs to identify and determine eligibility of infants and toddlers who have experienced emerging health concerns (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of lead agencies that have occasional or regular conversations	Number of lead agencies that jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	Number of lead agencies that hold joint professional development for personnel	Number of lead agencies that share identification and screening data	Number of lead agencies that establish interagency agreements	Number of lead agencies that don t work with other agencies/programs on this condition
Adverse Childhood Experiences	47	14	26	8	5	1
Fetal alcohol spectrum disorders	43	17	18	13	8	6
Lead or other heavy metal poisoning	38	15	7	14	8	9
Neonatal abstinence syndrome	43	18	19	16	11	6
Opioid addiction	45	15	14	9	10	4
Prenatal substance use	46	13	18	11	10	3
Zika virus	22	5	3	10	4	29
Number of state responses	**51**					

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia. State and local agencies and programs include home visiting, Early Head Start, public health, substance abuse treatment, mental health, and social services.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question B8).

Table 2.1.1.37b. Actions lead agencies take with other state-level or local agencies and programs to identify and determine eligibility of infants and toddlers who have experienced emerging health concerns (entities)

Response category	Number of lead agencies that have occasional or regular conversations	Number of lead agencies that jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	Number of lead agencies that hold joint professional development for personnel	Number of lead agencies that share identification and screening data	Number of lead agencies that establish interagency agreements	Number of lead agencies that don t work with other agencies/programs on this condition
Adverse Childhood Experiences	3	1	1	1	2	3
Fetal alcohol spectrum disorders	4	1	1	2	2	0
Lead or other heavy metal poisoning	2	1	0	1	1	3
Neonatal abstinence syndrome	2	1	1	2	1	2
Opioid addiction	4	1	1	1	1	2
Prenatal substance use	3	1	1	1	2	1
Zika virus	5	1	0	2	3	0
Number of entity responses	**6**					

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (n=6). Surveys were sent to six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. State and local agencies and programs include home visiting, Early Head Start, public health, substance abuse treatment, mental health, and social services.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question B8).

Table 2.1.1.38. Activities or services lead agencies offer to ensure non-English-speaking parents/guardians understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes and in early intervention services

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Parents/guardians are asked to state their primary language as part of standard procedure at intake	49	4
An interpreter is provided for parents/guardians as needed	47	5
Parents/guardians are encouraged to bring someone who can interpret for them	17	3
Parents/guardians are provided with translated written resources	43	2
A toll-free phone number staffed by early intervention multilingual staff is provided for non-English-speaking parents/guardians	10	0
A toll-free vendor interpreter service is used as needed	29	0
Other	4	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to select anything their state does or requires local early intervention providers to do. They were asked not to include activities initiated at the local level.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question E1).

Table 2.1.1.39. Activities lead agencies perform to help ensure referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Provide professional development on culturally competent practices	33	5
Include parents/guardians on state advisory committees, task forces, or work groups representing diverse populations	41	3
Solicit periodic feedback from stakeholders and families representing diverse populations	26	1
Monitor how interpreters and translators are used	16	1
Monitor the use of culturally competent practices	6	1
Provide guidance specifically designed to support the use of linguistically and culturally competent practices (for example, written guidance or webinars)	19	2
Work with the state's Parent Training and Information Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate	19	1
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Linguistically and culturally competent practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question E2).

Table 2.1.1.40. Challenges states experience in ensuring referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals around early intervention services	19	3
Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status	28	1
Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals	39	3
Having an insufficient number of interpreters	33	1
Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes	18	1
Having assessments for evaluation that are not normed for other languages	32	0
Difficulty determining if eligibility for services is due to lack of skills in native language, rather than a disability	18	2
Other	1	0
None of the above	1	1
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Linguistically and culturally competent practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question E3).

Table 2.1.1.41. Actions districts take with other agencies and programs to identify or determine eligibility of school-age children who have experienced emerging health concerns

Response category	Percentage of districts that have occasional or regular conversations	Percentage of districts that jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	Percentage of districts that hold joint professional development for personnel	Percentage of districts that share identification and screening data	Percentage of districts that establish interagency agreements	Percentage of districts that don t work with other agencies/programs on this condition
Adverse Childhood Experiences (SE)	67 (2.8)	28 (2.7)	29 (2.6)	37 (2.8)	37 (2.8)	11 (1.9)
Fetal alcohol spectrum disorders (SE)	39 (2.9)	10 (1.7)	8 (1.5)	21 (2.3)	12 (1.9)	46 (2.9)
Lead or other heavy metal poisoning (SE)	28 (2.7)	7 (1.3)	6 (1.4)	14 (1.9)	8 (1.6)	62 (2.8)
Neonatal abstinence syndrome (SE)	25 (2.5)	7 (1.4)	5 (1.2)	12 (1.9)	7 (1.5)	65 (2.7)
Opioid addiction (SE)	44 (2.9)	17 (2.1)	14 (2.0)	20 (2.3)	17 (2.2)	40 (2.9)
Prenatal substance use (SE)	39 (2.9)	11 (1.8)	9 (1.6)	18 (2.2)	11 (1.8)	48 (3.0)
Zika virus (SE)	13 (1.9)	4 (1.1)	3! (1.0)	6 (1.4)	5 (1.2)	80 (2.3)
Number of district responses	**438**					

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Agencies and programs include public health, substance abuse treatment, mental health, and social services. Adverse Childhood Experiences is the term used to describe all types of abuse, neglect, and other potentially traumatic experiences that occur to people under age 18. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B1).

Table 2.1.1.42. Percentage of districts that administer a kindergarten readiness screener

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A commercial screener	32	2.7
A district-developed screener	29	2.6
A state-developed screener	15	2.1
A state-recommended screener	19	2.3
Currently do not administer a kindergarten readiness screener	19	2.4
Number of district responses	**436**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B2).

Table 2.1.1.42a. Percentage of districts that administer a kindergarten readiness screener, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A commercial screener	32	2.7	35	3.1	15*	4.4
A district-developed screener	29	2.6	29	2.9	25	5.2
A state-developed screener	15	2.1	15	2.3	15	4.1
A state-recommended screener	19	2.3	20	2.6	13	4.0
Currently do not administer a kindergarten readiness screener	19	2.4	16	2.6	39*	5.9
Number of district responses	**436**		**332**		**104**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B2).

Table 2.1.1.42b. Percentage of districts that administer a kindergarten readiness screener, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A commercial screener	32	2.7	37	4.2	28	3.5
A district-developed screener	29	2.6	30	3.8	27	3.5
A state-developed screener	15	2.1	16	3.3	14	2.6
A state-recommended screener	19	2.3	20	3.4	18	3.2
Currently do not administer a kindergarten readiness screener	19	2.4	12	2.9	25*	3.5
Number of district responses	**436**		**214**		**222**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B2).

Table 2.1.1.42c. Percentage of districts that administer a kindergarten readiness screener, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A commercial screener	32	2.7	30	4.8	33	3.3
A district-developed screener	29	2.6	28	4.5	29	3.1
A state-developed screener	15	2.1	13	3.1	16	2.6
A state-recommended screener	19	2.3	10	3.1	22*	3.0
Currently do not administer a kindergarten readiness screener	19	2.4	27	5.3	16	2.6
Number of district responses	**436**		**155**		**281**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B2).

Table 2.1.1.43. Skills districts measure with their kindergarten readiness screener

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Self-care or self-help skills	54	3.3
Language skills	88	2.1
Cognitive skills, including pre-academic skills	98	0.8
Gross motor skills	67	3.1
Fine motor skills	72	2.9
Social-emotional skills	62	3.2
Number of district responses	**346**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported administering a kindergarten readiness screener (n=348). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B3).

Table 2.1.1.44. Percentage of districts that use the results of their kindergarten readiness screener to inform student evaluation for special education services

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Students are referred for evaluation for special education services based on the screener results	19	2.7
Screener results are used to initiate a monitoring process which may then indicate the student should receive special education services	50	3.3
Screener results are used to assign targeted or supplemental supports within the context of a multi-tiered system	56	3.3
They are not used to inform further evaluation	18	2.6
Number of district responses	**347**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported administering a kindergarten readiness screener (n=348). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B4).

Table 2.1.1.45. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having dyslexia

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Currently do not require or recommend a special type of assessment	52	2.9
Require a special type of assessment	25	2.6
Recommend a special type of assessment, but do not require it	22	2.4
Number of district responses	**438**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B6).

Table 2.1.1.45a. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having dyslexia, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Currently do not require or recommend a special type of assessment	52	2.9	51	3.3	60	5.9
Require a special type of assessment	25	2.6	25	2.9	24	5.1
Recommend a special type of assessment, but do not require it	22	2.4	23	2.7	17	4.5
Number of district responses	**438**		**334**		**104**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B6).

Table 2.1.1.45b. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having dyslexia, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Currently do not require or recommend a special type of assessment	52	2.9	48	4.3	56	4.0
Require a special type of assessment	25	2.6	24	3.6	27	3.6
Recommend a special type of assessment, but do not require it	22	2.4	28	4.0	18*	3.0
Number of district responses	**438**		**216**		**222**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B6).

Table 2.1.1.45c. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having dyslexia, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Currently do not require or recommend a special type of assessment	52	2.9	49	5.4	54	3.5
Require a special type of assessment	25	2.6	24	5.2	26	3.0
Recommend a special type of assessment, but do not require it	22	2.4	28	4.6	21	2.9
Number of district responses	**438**		**155**		**283**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B6).

Table 2.1.1.46. Special assessments districts require or recommend to determine eligibility for special education for school-age children with dyslexia

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Auditory processing assessments	48	4.3
Developmental vision assessments, in addition to routine vision screenings	28	3.8
Nonverbal cognitive assessments	43	4.2
Phonological assessments, including measurement of awareness, memory, phones, and decoding	85	3.2
Psychomotor assessments	25	3.8
Rapid automatic naming assessments	55	4.1
Reading fluency assessments	85	2.9
Reading comprehension assessments	75	3.7
Spelling assessments	66	4.0
Verbal cognitive assessments	55	4.3
Visual memory assessments	51	4.3
Visual perception assessments	51	4.3
Vocabulary assessments	56	4.3
Writing assessments	66	4.0
Other	10	2.6
Number of district responses	**209**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported requiring or recommending a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having dyslexia (n=210). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B7).

Table 2.1.1.47. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having autism spectrum disorder

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Currently do not require or recommend a special type of assessment	17	2.2
Require a special type of assessment	52	2.8
Recommend a special type of assessment, but do not require it	31	2.7
Number of district responses	**438**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B8).

Table 2.1.1.47a. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having autism spectrum disorder, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Currently do not require or recommend a special type of assessment	17	2.2	17	2.4	13!	4.1
Require a special type of assessment	52	2.8	50	3.1	65*	5.7
Recommend a special type of assessment, but do not require it	31	2.7	33	3.0	21*	4.9
Number of district responses	**438**		**334**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B8).

Table 2.1.1.47b. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having autism spectrum disorder, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Currently do not require or recommend a special type of assessment	17	2.2	12	2.8	21*	3.2
Require a special type of assessment	52	2.8	53	4.0	51	4.0
Recommend a special type of assessment, but do not require it	31	2.7	35	3.9	28	3.6
Number of district responses	**438**		**216**		**222**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B8).

Table 2.1.1.47c. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having autism spectrum disorder, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Currently do not require or recommend a special type of assessment	17	2.2	14	3.2	18	2.7
Require a special type of assessment	52	2.8	53	5.2	51	3.4
Recommend a special type of assessment, but do not require it	31	2.7	34	5.1	31	3.1
Number of district responses	**438**		**155**		**283**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B8).

Table 2.1.1.48. Special assessments districts require or recommend to determine eligibility for special education for school-age children with autism spectrum disorder

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Nonverbal cognitive assessments	70	2.9
Verbal cognitive assessments	72	2.9
Systematic observations of students in the classroom by a specialist, such as a psychologist, occupational therapist, etc.	85	2.4
Teacher ratings of students' communication, behavior, and functioning in the classroom	92	1.9
Parent/guardian ratings of students' communication, behavior, and functioning at home	92	1.9
Collection of information directly from students about their communication, social interactions, and functioning	69	3.0
Collection of pediatrician referrals and/or medical information	79	2.6
Other	14	2.3
Number of district responses	**363**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported requiring or recommending a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children suspected of having dyslexia (n=363). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B9).

Table 2.1.1.49. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children who are English learners

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Currently do not require or recommend a special type of assessment	37	2.9
Require a special type of assessment	39	2.8
Recommend a special type of assessment, but do not require it	24	2.5
Number of district responses	**438**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B10).

Table 2.1.1.49a. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children who are English learners, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Currently do not require or recommend a special type of assessment	37	2.9	39	3.2	25*	5.2
Require a special type of assessment	39	2.8	36	3.1	59*	5.9
Recommend a special type of assessment, but do not require it	24	2.5	25	2.8	17	4.4
Number of district responses	**438**		**334**		**104**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B10).

Table 2.1.1.49b. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children who are English learners, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Currently do not require or recommend a special type of assessment	37	2.9	32	4.1	41	3.9
Require a special type of assessment	39	2.8	38	4.1	40	3.8
Recommend a special type of assessment, but do not require it	24	2.5	30	4.0	19*	3.1
Number of district responses	**438**		**216**		**222**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B10).

Table 2.1.1.49c. Percentage of districts that require or recommend a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children who are English learners, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Currently do not require or recommend a special type of assessment	37	2.9	24	5.0	41*	3.5
Require a special type of assessment	39	2.8	52	5.5	34*	3.3
Recommend a special type of assessment, but do not require it	24	2.5	24	4.5	24	2.9
Number of district responses	**438**		**155**		**283**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B10).

Table 2.1.1.50. Special assessments districts require or recommend to determine eligibility for special education for school-age children who are English learners

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Systematic observations of students in the classroom by a specialist, such as a psychologist, occupational therapist, etc.	62	3.7
Use classroom performance assessments and/or observations	80	3.0
Use nonverbal cognitive assessments such as the Leiter, TONI-4, Raven's Progressive Matrices	41	3.6
Gather information from families through interviews or forms in the family's primary language	82	2.9
Gather information from teachers of ELs	77	3.2
Use an English-language screener	67	3.4
Use screening instruments that have been translated to EL's first language	42	3.7
Use assessments that have evidence of validity with students speaking EL's first language	56	3.6
Use the same assessments used with students whose primary language is English, but with a bilingual assessor or interpreter	50	3.7
Other	9	2.1
Number of district responses	**289**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported requiring or recommending a special type of assessment when determining eligibility for special education for school-age children who are English learners (n=290). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

EL = English learner; TONI-4 = Test of Nonverbal Intelligence, Fourth Edition.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B11).

Table 2.1.1.51. Activities or services districts offer to ensure non-English-speaking parents/guardians understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes for school-age children

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Parents/guardians are asked to state their primary language as part of standard procedure at intake	83	2.3
An interpreter is provided for parents/guardians as needed	89	1.7
Parents/guardians are encouraged to bring someone who can interpret for them	33	2.6
Parents/guardians are provided with translated written resources	71	2.7
A toll-free phone number staffed by multilingual special education staff is provided for non-English-speaking parents/guardians	6	1.4
A toll-free vendor interpreter service is used as needed	14	1.9
Other	4	1.1
Number of district responses	**437**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B12).

Table 2.1.1.51a. Activities or services districts offer to ensure non-English-speaking parents/guardians understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes for school-age children, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Parents/guardians are asked to state their primary language as part of standard procedure at intake	83	2.3	83	2.5	86	4.1
An interpreter is provided for parents/guardians as needed	89	1.7	90	1.9	84	4.5
Parents/guardians are encouraged to bring someone who can interpret for them	33	2.6	32	2.9	37	5.7
Parents/guardians are provided with translated written resources	71	2.7	71	3.0	74	5.4
A toll-free phone number staffed by multilingual special education staff is provided for non-English-speaking parents/guardians	6	1.4	6	1.5	.	.
A toll-free vendor interpreter service is used as needed	14	1.9	14	2.2	11!	3.7
Other	4	1.1	4!	1.3	.	.
Number of district responses	**437**		**333**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B12).

Table 2.1.1.51b. Activities or services districts offer to ensure non-English-speaking parents/guardians understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes for school-age children, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Parents/guardians are asked to state their primary language as part of standard procedure at intake	83	2.3	88	2.8	79	3.4
An interpreter is provided for parents/guardians as needed	89	1.7	99	1.0	81*	3.1
Parents/guardians are encouraged to bring someone who can interpret for them	33	2.6	31	3.8	35	3.8
Parents/guardians are provided with translated written resources	71	2.7	79	3.4	64*	3.9
A toll-free phone number staffed by multilingual special education staff is provided for non-English-speaking parents/guardians	6	1.4	6!	1.9	6!	1.9
A toll-free vendor interpreter service is used as needed	14	1.9	20	3.3	9*	2.2
Other	4	1.1	.	.	5!	1.8
Number of district responses	**437**		**216**		**221**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B12).

Table 2.1.1.51c. Activities or services districts offer to ensure non-English-speaking parents/guardians understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes for school-age children, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Parents/guardians are asked to state their primary language as part of standard procedure at intake	83	2.3	89	4.0	81	2.7
An interpreter is provided for parents/guardians as needed	89	1.7	95	1.7	87*	2.3
Parents/guardians are encouraged to bring someone who can interpret for them	33	2.6	33	4.4	33	3.2
Parents/guardians are provided with translated written resources	71	2.7	76	5.2	69	3.2
A toll-free phone number staffed by multilingual special education staff is provided for non-English-speaking parents/guardians	6	1.4	7!	2.6	6	1.6
A toll-free vendor interpreter service is used as needed	14	1.9	17	3.8	13	2.3
Other	4	1.1	.	.	5!	1.5
Number of district responses	**437**		**155**		**282**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B12).

Table 2.1.1.52. Challenges districts experience in ensuring referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Addressing family reluctance to engage with schools around special education	38	2.8
Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status	22	2.3
Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals	44	2.9
Having an insufficient number of interpreters	35	2.8
Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes	30	2.6
Having assessments for evaluation that are not normed for other languages	37	2.7
Difficulty determining if eligibility for services is due to lack of skills in native language, rather than a disability	51	2.9
Other	3!	1.2
None of the above	20	2.2
Number of district responses	**437**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Linguistically and culturally competent practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B13).

Table 2.1.1.52a. Challenges districts experience in ensuring referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Addressing family reluctance to engage with schools around special education	38	2.8	36	3.1	48	6.0
Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status	22	2.3	21	2.5	26	5.1
Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals	44	2.9	46	3.2	33*	5.6
Having an insufficient number of interpreters	35	2.8	37	3.1	23*	5.0
Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes	30	2.6	30	2.9	26	5.2
Having assessments for evaluation that are not normed for other languages	37	2.7	37	3.0	31	5.6
Difficulty determining if eligibility for services is due to lack of skills in native language, rather than a disability	51	2.9	53	3.2	38*	5.8
Other	3!	1.2	3!	1.4	.	.
None of the above	20	2.2	21	2.5	19	5.0
Number of district responses	**437**		**333**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Linguistically and culturally competent practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B13).

Table 2.1.1.52b. Challenges districts experience in ensuring referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Addressing family reluctance to engage with schools around special education	38	2.8	48	4.2	29*	3.6
Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status	22	2.3	33	4.0	12*	2.3
Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals	44	2.9	60	4.2	31*	3.7
Having an insufficient number of interpreters	35	2.8	47	4.4	25*	3.4
Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes	30	2.6	35	4.1	25	3.4
Having assessments for evaluation that are not normed for other languages	37	2.7	50	4.2	25*	3.4
Difficulty determining if eligibility for services is due to lack of skills in native language, rather than a disability	51	2.9	70	4.0	35*	3.8
Other	3!	1.2	.	.	.	.
None of the above	20	2.2	5!	1.9	33*	3.8
Number of district responses	**437**		**216**		**221**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Linguistically and culturally competent practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B13).

Table 2.1.1.52c. Challenges districts experience in ensuring referrals and evaluations are linguistically and culturally competent, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Addressing family reluctance to engage with schools around special education	38	2.8	56	5.4	31*	3.1
Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status	22	2.3	32	4.8	18*	2.5
Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals	44	2.9	51	5.5	42	3.4
Having an insufficient number of interpreters	35	2.8	32	5.3	37	3.3
Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes	30	2.6	29	4.7	30	3.1
Having assessments for evaluation that are not normed for other languages	37	2.7	48	4.8	33*	3.3
Difficulty determining if eligibility for services is due to lack of skills in native language, rather than a disability	51	2.9	50	5.7	51	3.4
Other	3!	1.2	.	.	4!	1.6
None of the above	20	2.2	10!	3.2	24*	2.8
Number of district responses	**437**		**155**		**282**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Linguistically and culturally competent practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B13).

Table 2.1.1.53. Average number of students newly evaluated for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B and found eligible for special education services during the 2018–2019 school year, by grade

Grade	Number of students evaluated	Number of students found eligible
Kindergarten (SE)	7 (0.8)	6 (0.7)
1st grade (SE)	6 (0.8)	5 (0.6)
2nd grade (SE)	7 (0.8)	5 (0.7)
3rd grade (SE)	6 (0.8)	5 (0.6)
4th grade (SE)	5 (0.6)	3 (0.4)
5th grade (SE)	4 (0.5)	3 (0.4)
6th grade (SE)	3 (0.4)	2 (0.3)
7th grade (SE)	3! (1.4)	1 (0.2)
8th grade (SE)	2 (0.3)	1 (0.2)
9th grade (SE)	2 (0.3)	1 (0.2)
10th grade (SE)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)
11th grade (SE)	1! (0.3)	1 (0.2)
12th grade (SE)	1! (0.3)	1! (0.2)
Number of district responses	**303**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Respondents were asked not to include children who transferred into their district already eligible for special education. They were asked to include children who received early intervention services under Part C Option and are not being evaluated under Part B. The intention of this question was to obtain the number of students newly evaluated and those found eligible for special education or related services under all disability categories. We aimed to count all children who were evaluated for the possibility of receiving an Individualized Education Program (IEP), including those who might end up with a speech-only IEP. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Readers should interpret findings from this table with caution. Differences in some of the characteristics of responding districts and the full population of districts suggest the potential for nonresponse bias.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B17).

Table 2.1.1.54. Supports districts provide to help staff apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination process (school-age children)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Develop procedures for application of exclusionary criteria	37	2.8
Provide professional development for school staff	52	2.9
Provide written materials to school staff	36	2.8
Provide guidelines for staff to follow before screening children who are English learners	50	2.8
Other	8	1.5
Number of district responses	**437**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). The purpose of this exclusionary clause is to help prevent the improper determination of eligibility of children for special education services, especially those from distinct cultures who have acquired learning styles, language, or behaviors that are not compatible with academic requirements of schools in the dominant culture. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B18).

Table 2.1.1.54a. Supports districts provide to help staff apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination process, by district type (school-age children)

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Develop procedures for application of exclusionary criteria	37	2.8	38	3.1	33	5.7
Provide professional development for school staff	52	2.9	51	3.2	59	5.9
Provide written materials to school staff	36	2.8	36	3.1	31	5.5
Provide guidelines for staff to follow before screening children who are English learners	50	2.8	49	3.1	55	6.0
Other	8	1.5	7	1.6	10!	3.9
Number of district responses	**437**		**334**		**103**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). The purpose of this exclusionary clause is to help prevent the improper determination of eligibility of children for special education services, especially those from distinct cultures who have acquired learning styles, language, or behaviors that are not compatible with academic requirements of schools in the dominant culture. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B18).

Table 2.1.1.54b. Supports districts provide to help staff apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination process, by district size (school-age children)

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Develop procedures for application of exclusionary criteria	37	2.8	44	4.3	32*	3.7
Provide professional development for school staff	52	2.9	55	4.1	49	4.0
Provide written materials to school staff	36	2.8	40	4.1	32	3.7
Provide guidelines for staff to follow before screening children who are English learners	50	2.8	60	4.2	41*	3.9
Other	8	1.5	6!	2.0	10	2.3
Number of district responses	**437**		**216**		**221**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). The purpose of this exclusionary clause is to help prevent the improper determination of eligibility of children for special education services, especially those from distinct cultures who have acquired learning styles, language, or behaviors that are not compatible with academic requirements of schools in the dominant culture. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B18).

Table 2.1.1.54c. Supports districts provide to help staff apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination process, by district rurality (school-age children)

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Develop procedures for application of exclusionary criteria	37	2.8	42	5.1	36	3.3
Provide professional development for school staff	52	2.9	66	4.8	47*	3.5
Provide written materials to school staff	36	2.8	37	4.9	35	3.4
Provide guidelines for staff to follow before screening children who are English learners	50	2.8	60	4.9	46*	3.4
Other	8	1.5	5!	1.9	9	1.9
Number of district responses	**437**		**154**		**283**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). The purpose of this exclusionary clause is to help prevent the improper determination of eligibility of children for special education services, especially those from distinct cultures who have acquired learning styles, language, or behaviors that are not compatible with academic requirements of schools in the dominant culture. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B18).

Table 2.1.1.55. Parties in districts responsible for identifying students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district assumes responsibility for identifying these students	88	1.9
The district contracts with another public agency to identify these students	12	1.9
The district contracts with a third party other than a public agency to identify these students	5	1.3
Number of district responses	**394**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Respondents were asked to exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H17).

Table 2.1.1.55a. Parties in districts responsible for identifying students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district assumes responsibility for identifying these students	88	1.9	90	2.0	68*	6.6
The district contracts with another public agency to identify these students	12	1.9	11	2.1	15!	5.0
The district contracts with a third party other than a public agency to identify these students	5	1.3	3!	1.3	16!*	5.3
Number of district responses	**394**		**320**		**74**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Respondents were asked to exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H17).

Table 2.1.1.55b. Parties in districts responsible for identifying students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district assumes responsibility for identifying these students	88	1.9	94	1.9	82*	3.3
The district contracts with another public agency to identify these students	12	1.9	8	2.3	16*	3.0
The district contracts with a third party other than a public agency to identify these students	5	1.3	.	.	8	2.3
Number of district responses	**394**		**208**		**186**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Respondents were asked to exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H17).

Table 2.1.1.55c. Parties in districts responsible for identifying students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district assumes responsibility for identifying these students	88	1.9	82	3.9	90	2.2
The district contracts with another public agency to identify these students	12	1.9	14	3.9	11	2.2
The district contracts with a third party other than a public agency to identify these students	5	1.3	7!	2.7	4!	1.4
Number of district responses	**394**		**130**		**264**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Respondents were asked to exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H17).

Table 2.1.1.56. Approaches districts use to identify students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Distribute materials to parents/guardians to help in the identification of these students	46	3.0
Work with representatives from private schools to identify these students	58	2.9
Provide staff with guidance specifically designed to support referrals and identification of school-age children in private schools (for example, written guidance or webinars)	25	2.6
Work with the state's Parent Training and Information Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate for school-age children in private schools	7	1.6
Other	12	2.0
Number of district responses	**399**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Respondents were asked to exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H18).

Table 2.1.1.56a. Approaches districts use to identify students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Distribute materials to parents/guardians to help in the identification of these students	46	3.0	47	3.2	33	6.8
Work with representatives from private schools to identify these students	58	2.9	64	3.2	14!*	4.8
Provide staff with guidance specifically designed to support referrals and identification of school-age children in private schools (for example, written guidance or webinars)	25	2.6	27	2.9	9!*	4.2
Work with the state's Parent Training and Information Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate for school-age children in private schools	7	1.6	7	1.8	.	.
Other	12	2.0	11	2.1	24*	5.9
Number of district responses	**399**		**317**		**82**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Respondents were asked to exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H18).

Table 2.1.1.56b. Approaches districts use to identify students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Distribute materials to parents/guardians to help in the identification of these students	46	3.0	54	4.3	38*	4.1
Work with representatives from private schools to identify these students	58	2.9	76	3.9	42*	4.3
Provide staff with guidance specifically designed to support referrals and identification of school-age children in private schools (for example, written guidance or webinars)	25	2.6	33	4.1	18*	3.4
Work with the state's Parent Training and Information Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate for school-age children in private schools	7	1.6	7!	2.2	7!	2.3
Other	12	2.0	6!	1.7	18*	3.4
Number of district responses	**399**		**208**		**191**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Respondents were asked to exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H18).

Table 2.1.1.56c. Approaches districts use to identify students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Distribute materials to parents/guardians to help in the identification of these students	46	3.0	52	5.4	44	3.5
Work with representatives from private schools to identify these students	58	2.9	48	5.1	62*	3.5
Provide staff with guidance specifically designed to support referrals and identification of school-age children in private schools (for example, written guidance or webinars)	25	2.6	27	5.1	25	3.1
Work with the state's Parent Training and Information Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate for school-age children in private schools	7	1.6	7!	2.6	7	2.0
Other	12	2.0	18	4.3	10	2.2
Number of district responses	**399**		**134**		**265**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Respondents were asked to exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H18).

Table 2.1.1.57. Average number of students with disabilities and parentally placed in private schools that districts evaluated for special education services in the 2018–2019 school year

Response category	Mean	Standard error
Number of students with disabilities and parentally placed in private schools who were evaluated for special education services	8	1.7
Number of district responses	**138**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported currently having students with disabilities in the district who have been parentally placed in a private school, excluding private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools (n=169). Respondents were asked to exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Differences in the characteristics of responders and the full population of districts do not show evidence of potential nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H19).

Table 2.1.1.58. Average number of students with disabilities and parentally placed in private schools that were found eligible for special education services in the 2018–2019 school year

Response category	Mean	Standard error
Number of students with disabilities and parentally placed in private schools who were found eligible for special education services	7	1.9
Number of district responses	**141**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported currently having students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private school, excluding private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools (n=169). Respondents were asked to exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Differences in the characteristics of responders and the full population of districts do not show evidence of potential nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H20).

Table 2.1.1.59. Activities districts conduct to support the identification of preschool-age children in need of special education services

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child Find screenings	78	2.8
Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to pediatricians and other health care providers	36	3.0
Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities	49	3.2
Workshops for pediatricians and other health care providers	2!	0.9
Workshops for staff from child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities	20	2.6
Outreach to referral sources	54	3.3
Web-based information and other electronic materials	51	3.3
Outreach through radio, TV, newspapers, and other print media to promote awareness of disabilities and services for young children	43	3.3
Outreach through community events, such as health fairs	33	3.1
Other	7	1.5
None of the above	4!	1.4
Number of district responses	**320**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B1).

Table 2.1.1.59a. Activities districts conduct to support the identification of preschool-age children in need of special education services, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child Find screenings	78	2.8	79	2.8	43!*	15.2
Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to pediatricians and other health care providers	36	3.0	37	3.1	.	.
Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities	49	3.2	50	3.3	.	.
Workshops for pediatricians and other health care providers	2!	0.9	2!	1.0	0*	.
Workshops for staff from child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities	20	2.6	21	2.6	.	.
Outreach to referral sources	54	3.3	56	3.4	.	.
Web-based information and other electronic materials	51	3.3	52	3.4	.	.
Outreach through radio, TV, newspapers, and other print media to promote awareness of disabilities and services for young children	43	3.3	44	3.4	.	.
Outreach through community events, such as health fairs	33	3.1	34	3.2	.	.
Other	7	1.5	7	1.5	.	.
None of the above	4!	1.4	4!	1.3	34!*	15.0
Number of district responses	**320**		**296**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B1).

Table 2.1.1.59b. Activities districts conduct to support the identification of preschool-age children in need of special education services, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child Find screenings	78	2.8	81	3.4	74	4.4
Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to pediatricians and other health care providers	36	3.0	43	4.1	28*	4.6
Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities	49	3.2	62	4.2	34*	4.8
Workshops for pediatricians and other health care providers	2!	0.9	.	.	.	.
Workshops for staff from child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities	20	2.6	24	3.5	16	3.8
Outreach to referral sources	54	3.3	65	4.2	42*	5.1
Web-based information and other electronic materials	51	3.3	59	4.4	42*	5.0
Outreach through radio, TV, newspapers, and other print media to promote awareness of disabilities and services for young children	43	3.3	50	4.3	36*	5.0
Outreach through community events, such as health fairs	33	3.1	37	4.4	28	4.5
Other	7	1.5	8	2.2	5!	2.0
None of the above	4!	1.4	.	.	8!	2.7
Number of district responses	**320**		**192**		**128**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B1).

Table 2.1.1.59c. Activities districts conduct to support the identification of preschool-age children in need of special education services, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child Find screenings	78	2.8	69	6.1	80	3.1
Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to pediatricians and other health care providers	36	3.0	28	5.3	38	3.5
Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities	49	3.2	50	6.4	49	3.6
Workshops for pediatricians and other health care providers	2!	0.9	.	.	3!	1.2
Workshops for staff from child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities	20	2.6	24	5.2	19	2.9
Outreach to referral sources	54	3.3	61	6.2	53	3.8
Web-based information and other electronic materials	51	3.3	57	6.4	50	3.8
Outreach through radio, TV, newspapers, and other print media to promote awareness of disabilities and services for young children	43	3.3	33	6.0	46	3.8
Outreach through community events, such as health fairs	33	3.1	26	5.7	35	3.7
Other	7	1.5	15	4.4	5!*	1.5
None of the above	4!	1.4	8!	3.9	4!	1.5
Number of district responses	**320**		**89**		**231**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B1).

Table 2.1.1.60. Supports districts provide to parents/guardians of infants and toddlers who received early intervention services and who are not determined eligible for preschool special education services

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Information about preschool programs in the local area	70	3.0
Information about other agencies in the local area	58	3.3
Referrals to other agencies and programs	37	3.2
Referrals to specialists who can assess the child's developmental and learning needs	23	2.8
The opportunity to continue current services, paid for by parents/guardians	16	2.5
Other	7	1.7
None of the above	12	2.3
Number of district responses	**320**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B2).

Table 2.1.1.60a. Supports districts provide to parents/guardians of infants and toddlers who received early intervention services and who are not determined eligible for preschool special education services, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Information about preschool programs in the local area	70	3.0	72	3.1	.	.
Information about other agencies in the local area	58	3.3	60	3.4	.	.
Referrals to other agencies and programs	37	3.2	36	3.3	45!	15.4
Referrals to specialists who can assess the child's developmental and learning needs	23	2.8	23	2.9	.	.
The opportunity to continue current services, paid for by parents/guardians	16	2.5	16	2.5	.	.
Other	7	1.7	7	1.8	.	.
None of the above	12	2.3	11	2.3	35!	14.6
Number of district responses	**320**		**296**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B2).

Table 2.1.1.60b. Supports districts provide to parents/guardians of infants and toddlers who received early intervention services and who are not determined eligible for preschool special education services, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Information about preschool programs in the local area	70	3.0	74	3.8	66	4.8
Information about other agencies in the local area	58	3.3	65	4.3	51*	5.2
Referrals to other agencies and programs	37	3.2	37	4.2	37	4.9
Referrals to specialists who can assess the child's developmental and learning needs	23	2.8	20	3.6	26	4.4
The opportunity to continue current services, paid for by parents/guardians	16	2.5	16	3.3	16	3.7
Other	7	1.7	6!	2.1	9!	2.9
None of the above	12	2.3	11	2.8	13	3.6
Number of district responses	**320**		**192**		**128**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B2).

Table 2.1.1.60c. Supports districts provide to parents/guardians of infants and toddlers who received early intervention services and who are not determined eligible for preschool special education services, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Information about preschool programs in the local area	70	3.0	69	6.2	71	3.5
Information about other agencies in the local area	58	3.3	54	6.7	60	3.8
Referrals to other agencies and programs	37	3.2	42	6.4	35	3.7
Referrals to specialists who can assess the child's developmental and learning needs	23	2.8	27	5.7	22	3.2
The opportunity to continue current services, paid for by parents/guardians	16	2.5	17	4.5	16	2.9
Other	7	1.7	12!	4.6	6	1.8
None of the above	12	2.3	11!	4.3	12	2.6
Number of district responses	**320**		**89**		**231**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B2).

Table 2.1.1.61. Average number of preschool-age and prekindergarten children districts newly evaluated for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B and found eligible for special education during the 2018–2019 school year

Response category	Mean	Standard error
Number of preschool and prekindergarten students evaluated	40	6.0
Number of preschool and prekindergarten students found eligible	32	6.7
Number of district responses	**260**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Respondents were asked not to include children who transferred into their district already eligible for special education. They were asked to include children who received early intervention services under Part C Option and are not being evaluated under Part B. The intention of this question was to obtain the number of preschool-age and prekindergarten children newly evaluated and those found eligible for special education or related services under all disability categories. We aimed to count all children who were evaluated for the possibility of receiving an Individualized Education Program (IEP), including those who might end up with a speech-only IEP. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Readers should interpret findings from this table with caution. Differences in some of the characteristics of responding districts and the full population of districts suggest the potential for nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B3).

Table 2.1.1.61a. Average number of preschool-age and prekindergarten children districts newly evaluated for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B and found eligible for special education during the 2018–2019 school year, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error
Number of preschool and prekindergarten students evaluated	40	6.0	42	6.1	4!*	1.3
Number of preschool and prekindergarten students found eligible	32	6.7	33	7.0	4!*	1.2
Number of district responses	**260**		**237**		**23**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Respondents were asked not to include children who transferred into their district already eligible for special education. They were asked to include children who received early intervention services under Part C Option and are not being evaluated under Part B. The intention of this question was to obtain the number of preschool-age and prekindergarten children newly evaluated and those found eligible for special education or related services under all disability categories. We aimed to count all children who were evaluated for the possibility of receiving an Individualized Education Program (IEP), including those who might end up with a speech-only IEP. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Readers should interpret findings from this table with caution. Differences in some of the characteristics of responding districts and the full population of districts suggest the potential for nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B3).

Table 2.1.1.61b. Average number of preschool-age and prekindergarten children districts newly evaluated for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B and found eligible for special education during the 2018–2019 school year, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error
Number of preschool and prekindergarten students evaluated	40	6.0	65	9.7	17!*	7.5
Number of preschool and prekindergarten students found eligible	32	6.7	48	6.8	.	.
Number of district responses	**260**		**145**		**115**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Respondents were asked not to include children who transferred into their district already eligible for special education. They were asked to include children who received early intervention services under Part C Option and are not being evaluated under Part B. The intention of this question was to obtain the number of preschool-age and prekindergarten children newly evaluated and those found eligible for special education or related services under all disability categories. We aimed to count all children who were evaluated for the possibility of receiving an Individualized Education Program (IEP), including those who might end up with a speech-only IEP. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Readers should interpret findings from this table with caution. Differences in some of the characteristics of responding districts and the full population of districts suggest the potential for nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B3).

Table 2.1.1.61c. Average number of preschool-age and prekindergarten children districts newly evaluated for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B and found eligible for special education during the 2018–2019 school year, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error
Number of preschool and prekindergarten students evaluated	40	6.0	70	12.5	33*	6.8
Number of preschool and prekindergarten students found eligible	32	6.7	52	10.2	27	8.1
Number of district responses	**260**		**72**		**188**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Respondents were asked not to include children who transferred into their district already eligible for special education. They were asked to include children who received early intervention services under Part C Option and are not being evaluated under Part B. The intention of this question was to obtain the number of preschool-age and prekindergarten children newly evaluated and those found eligible for special education or related services under all disability categories. We aimed to count all children who were evaluated for the possibility of receiving an Individualized Education Program (IEP), including those who might end up with a speech-only IEP. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Readers should interpret findings from this table with caution. Differences in some of the characteristics of responding districts and the full population of districts suggest the potential for nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B3).

Table 2.1.1.62. Supports districts provide to help staff apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination process (preschool-age children)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Develop procedures for application of exclusionary criteria	35	3.1
Provide professional development for school staff	58	3.3
Provide written materials to school staff	43	3.3
Provide guidelines for staff to follow before screening children who are English learners	50	3.2
Other	12	2.2
Number of district responses	**320**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). The purpose of this exclusionary clause is to help prevent the improper determination of eligibility of children for special education services, especially those from distinct cultures who have acquired learning styles, language, or behaviors that are not compatible with academic requirements of schools in the dominant culture. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B4).

Table 2.1.1.62a. Supports districts provide to help staff apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination process, by district type (preschool-age children)

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Develop procedures for application of exclusionary criteria	35	3.1	35	3.1	31!	13.7
Provide professional development for school staff	58	3.3	58	3.4	67	14.9
Provide written materials to school staff	43	3.3	43	3.4	41!	15.3
Provide guidelines for staff to follow before screening children who are English learners	50	3.2	51	3.3	35!	14.3
Other	12	2.2	12	2.3	.	.
Number of district responses	**320**		**296**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). The purpose of this exclusionary clause is to help prevent the improper determination of eligibility of children for special education services, especially those from distinct cultures who have acquired learning styles, language, or behaviors that are not compatible with academic requirements of schools in the dominant culture. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B4).

Table 2.1.1.62b. Supports districts provide to help staff apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination process, by district size (preschool-age children)

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Develop procedures for application of exclusionary criteria	35	3.1	45	4.2	24*	4.5
Provide professional development for school staff	58	3.3	59	4.3	57	5.1
Provide written materials to school staff	43	3.3	46	4.4	38	5.0
Provide guidelines for staff to follow before screening children who are English learners	50	3.2	59	4.2	40*	5.0
Other	12	2.2	9	2.6	15	3.7
Number of district responses	**320**		**192**		**128**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). The purpose of this exclusionary clause is to help prevent the improper determination of eligibility of children for special education services, especially those from distinct cultures who have acquired learning styles, language, or behaviors that are not compatible with academic requirements of schools in the dominant culture. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B4).

Table 2.1.1.62c. Supports districts provide to help staff apply exclusionary criteria during the eligibility determination process, by district rurality (preschool-age children)

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Develop procedures for application of exclusionary criteria	35	3.1	36	5.6	35	3.5
Provide professional development for school staff	58	3.3	62	6.0	57	3.9
Provide written materials to school staff	43	3.3	39	5.6	44	3.9
Provide guidelines for staff to follow before screening children who are English learners	50	3.2	69	5.8	45*	3.8
Other	12	2.2	.	.	13	2.6
Number of district responses	**320**		**89**		**231**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). The purpose of this exclusionary clause is to help prevent the improper determination of eligibility of children for special education services, especially those from distinct cultures who have acquired learning styles, language, or behaviors that are not compatible with academic requirements of schools in the dominant culture. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question B4).

Table 2.1.1.63. Average number of children with disabilities and parentally placed in private preschools that districts evaluated for special education services in the 2018–2019 school year

Response category	Mean	Standard error
Number of students with disabilities and parentally placed in private preschools who were evaluated for special education services	10	2.1
Number of district responses	**114**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private preschool, excluding private preschools that only serve children with disabilities (n=143). Respondents were asked to exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Readers should interpret findings from this table with caution. Differences in some of the characteristics of responding districts and the full population of districts suggest the potential for nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F15).

Table 2.1.1.64. Average number of students with disabilities and parentally placed in private preschools that were found eligible for special education services in the 2018–2019 school year

Response category	Mean	Standard error
Number of students with disabilities and parentally placed in private preschools who were found eligible for special education services	8	1.8
Number of district responses	**115**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private preschool, excluding private preschools that only serve children with disabilities (n=143). Respondents were asked to exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Readers should interpret findings from this table with caution. Differences in some of the characteristics of responding districts and the full population of districts suggest the potential for nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F16).

2.1.2. Identification for services: Eligibility determination and MTSS

Table 2.1.2.1a. Number of state agencies requiring Multi-Tiered Systems of Support to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children, across school types (50 states and DC)

Response category	Traditional public schools	Public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district	Public charter schools that are their own school district	Public virtual schools	Private schools	State agencies that responded not applicable
State requires MTSS be used for referral purposes	14	8	10	8	6	37
State requires MTSS be used for identification purposes	17	9	11	10	7	34
Number of state responses	**51**	**30**	**32**	**38**	**51**	**51**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia. Only respondents who indicated that their state has public charter schools that are part of traditional school districts (n=30), public charter schools that are their own school district (n=32), or public virtual schools (n=38) were asked to address these respective school types for this question.

MTSS = Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B7).

Table 2.1.2.1b. Number of state-level agencies requiring Multi-Tiered Systems of Support to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children, across school types (entities)

Response category	Traditional public schools	Public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district	Public charter schools that are their own school district	Public virtual schools	Private schools	State agencies that responded not applicable
Entity requires MTSS be used for referral purposes	2	0	0	0	0	7
Entity requires MTSS be used for identification purposes	2	0	0	0	0	7
Number of entity responses	**9**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Only respondents who indicated that their entity has public charter schools that are part of traditional school districts (n=2), public charter schools that are their own school district (n=0), or public virtual schools (n=0) were asked to address these respective school types for this question.

MTSS = Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B7).

Table 2.1.2.2. Activities state agencies perform related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state has a state-level MTSS task force, commission, or internal working group	31	1
The state agency has a dedicated full-time position related to MTSS	25	0
The state agency has an outside advisory group related to MTSS	15	1
The state agency has provided resources to school districts (for example, issued grants or RFPs) to explore the use of MTSS (for example, to identify or try to model MTSS programs; to plan or begin implementation)	38	1
The state agency has issued guidelines on MTSS	35	2
The state agency has organized trainings on MTSS that were conducted by consultants or contractors	32	2
State agency staff conduct trainings on MTSS	33	3
State agency staff provide technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) to LEAs and schools that are investigating or implementing MTSS	36	5
The state agency arranges technical assistance from consultants or contractors for districts and schools that are investigating or implementing MTSS	33	4
MTSS information is available on the state agency's website	40	1
Other	9	3
None of the above	2	2
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

LEA = local education agency; MTSS = Multi-Tiered Systems of Support; RFP = request for proposal.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C1).

Table 2.1.2.3. State agency initiatives related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, in reading (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state agency has no current initiatives related to implementation of MTSS	7	5
The state agency has a pilot initiative to implement MTSS in a limited number of districts or schools	4	3
The state agency has an initiative to expand the use of MTSS more broadly within the state	23	1
The state agency has an initiative to implement MTSS statewide	16	0
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

MTSS = Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C2).

Table 2.1.2.4. State agency initiatives related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, in math (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state agency has no current initiatives related to implementation of MTSS	11	7
The state agency has a pilot initiative to implement MTSS in a limited number of districts or schools	4	1
The state agency has an initiative to expand the use of MTSS more broadly within the state	19	1
The state agency has an initiative to implement MTSS statewide	16	0
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

MTSS = Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C2a).

Table 2.1.2.5. State agency initiatives related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, in behavior (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state agency has no current initiatives related to implementation of MTSS	7	6
The state agency has a pilot initiative to implement MTSS in a limited number of districts or schools	3	0
The state agency has an initiative to expand the use of MTSS more broadly within the state	21	3
The state agency has an initiative to implement MTSS statewide	19	0
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

MTSS = Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C2b).

Table 2.1.2.6a. Aspects of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support implementation as part of state agencies' pilot or statewide initiatives that promote Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention in elementary schools, across decision levels (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of states in which state agency staff make decisions about this aspect	Number of states in which district staff make decisions about this aspect	Number of states in which school staff make decisions about this aspect	Number of states that don t implement this aspect	Number of states where this information is not available
The research-based curricula to use in general education	8	37	20	0	1
The cut scores for determining risk status	4	36	22	0	7
The criteria for determining a student's responsiveness to intervention	3	35	27	1	2
The frequency and duration of progress monitoring	9	40	29	1	0
The choice of interventions to use for students determined to be at risk	3	41	30	0	0
The number of intervention sessions required prior to referral for special education	6	32	20	6	2
The decision rules for a referral for a special education evaluation	13	31	18	2	1
How to document intervention fidelity	8	38	26	0	4
Number of state responses	**44**				

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having a current initiative related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, in reading or math (n=44). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C3).

Table 2.1.2.6b. Aspects of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support implementation as part of state-level agencies' pilot or statewide initiatives that promote Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention in elementary schools, across decision levels (entities)

Response category	Number of entities in which state agency staff make decisions about this aspect	Number of entities in which district staff make decisions about this aspect	Number of entities in which school staff make decisions about this aspect	Number of entities that don t implement this aspect	Number of states where this information is not available
The research-based curricula to use in general education	3	1	4	0	0
The cut scores for determining risk status	4	1	3	0	0
The criteria for determining a student's responsiveness to intervention	2	1	4	1	0
The frequency and duration of progress monitoring	2	1	4	0	0
The choice of interventions to use for students determined to be at risk	3	1	3	0	0
The number of intervention sessions required prior to referral for special education	3	1	2	0	1
The decision rules for a referral for a special education evaluation	3	1	3	0	0
How to document intervention fidelity	2	1	4	1	0
Number of entity responses	**5**				

Note: The sample for this table includes all state-level agencies that reported having a current initiative related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, in reading or math (n=5). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C3).

Table 2.1.2.7. State policies related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, state agencies follow for determining eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility	5	0
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) is used to determine eligibility	6	1
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility	1	0
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data may be used in determining eligibility	14	1
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) may be used to determine eligibility	14	3
Other	8	1
None of the above	3	3
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

MTSS = Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C4).

Table 2.1.2.8. State policies state agencies follow if permitted to use a discrepancy method in determining specific learning disabilities (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state agency has operationalized discrepancy criteria and any district using a discrepancy method must adhere to these criteria	17	2
Districts have discretion to choose the specific discrepancy criteria used	19	4
Number of responses	**36**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having a state policy that permits the use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model to determine eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities (states: n=40; entities: n=8). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C5).

Table 2.1.2.9. Number of state agencies that have a plan to stop using an IQ-achievement discrepancy model for determining of eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities by the 2020–2021 school year (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	35	7
Yes	4	1
Number of responses	**39**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having a state policy that permits the use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model to determine eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities (states: n=40; entities: n=8). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C6).

Table 2.1.2.10. Number of state agencies that allow an approach other than Multi-Tiered Systems of Support or IQ-achievement discrepancy to determine the presence of specific learning disabilities (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	29	6
Yes	22	2
Number of responses	**51**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C7).

Table 2.1.2.11. Activities state agencies perform related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state has a state-level MTSS task force, commission, or internal working group	31	1
The state agency has a dedicated full-time position related to MTSS	20	0
The state agency has an outside advisory group related to MTSS	13	0
The state agency has provided resources to school districts (for example, issued grants or RFPs) to explore the use of MTSS (for example, to identify or try to model MTSS programs; to plan or begin implementation)	37	3
The state agency has issued guidelines on MTSS	26	2
The state agency has organized trainings on MTSS that were conducted by consultants or contractors	31	3
State agency staff conduct trainings on MTSS	27	2
State agency staff provide technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) to LEAs and schools that are investigating or implementing MTSS	38	1
The state agency arranges technical assistance from consultants or contractors for districts and schools that are investigating or implementing MTSS	27	2
MTSS information is available on the state agency's website	31	1
Other	7	3
None of the above	2	2
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

LEA = local education agency; MTSS = Multi-Tiered Systems of Support; RFP = request for proposal.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C1).

Table 2.1.2.12. State agency initiatives related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, in reading (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state agency has no current initiatives related to implementation of MTSS	12	4
The state agency has a pilot initiative to implement MTSS in a limited number of districts or schools	10	1
The state agency has an initiative to expand the use of MTSS more broadly within the state	15	3
The state agency has an initiative to implement MTSS statewide	12	1
Number of responses	**49**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

MTSS = Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C2).

Table 2.1.2.13. State agency initiatives related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, in math (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state agency has no current initiatives related to implementation of MTSS	22	6
The state agency has a pilot initiative to implement MTSS in a limited number of districts or schools	6	1
The state agency has an initiative to expand the use of MTSS more broadly within the state	10	1
The state agency has an initiative to implement MTSS statewide	10	1
Number of responses	**48**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

MTSS = Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C2a).

Table 2.1.2.14. State agency initiatives related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, in behavior (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state agency has no current initiatives related to implementation of MTSS	7	6
The state agency has a pilot initiative to implement MTSS in a limited number of districts or schools	8	2
The state agency has an initiative to expand the use of MTSS more broadly within the state	18	1
The state agency has an initiative to implement MTSS statewide	15	0
Number of responses	**48**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

MTSS = Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C2b).

Table 2.1.2.15a. Aspects of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support implementation as part of state agencies' pilot or statewide initiatives that promote Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention in preschools, across decision levels (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of states in which state agency staff make decisions about this aspect	Number of states in which district staff make decisions about this aspect	Number of states in which school staff make decisions about this aspect	Number of states that don t implement this aspect	Number of states where this information is not available
The research-based curricula to use in general education	10	32	16	4	4
The cut scores for determining risk status	5	19	12	9	9
The criteria for determining a student's responsiveness to intervention	5	24	19	4	5
The frequency and duration of progress monitoring	7	25	20	4	5
The choice of interventions to use for students determined to be at risk	5	28	23	4	4
The number of intervention sessions required prior to referral for special education	2	23	18	11	6
The decision rules for a referral for a special education evaluation	8	25	21	5	3
How to document intervention fidelity	12	26	16	4	3
Number of state responses	**44**				

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having a current initiative related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, in reading or math (n=44). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C3).

Table 2.1.2.15b. Aspects of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support implementation as part of state-level agencies' pilot or statewide initiatives that promote Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention in preschools, across decision levels (entities)

Response category	Number of entities in which state agency staff make decisions about this aspect	Number of entities in which district staff make decisions about this aspect	Number of entities in which school staff make decisions about this aspect	Number of entities that don t implement this aspect	Number of states where this information is not available
The research-based curricula to use in general education	2	1	1	1	2
The cut scores for determining risk status	1	2	3	1	1
The criteria for determining a student's responsiveness to intervention	3	2	2	1	0
The frequency and duration of progress monitoring	3	2	2	0	1
The choice of interventions to use for students determined to be at risk	2	2	2	1	1
The number of intervention sessions required prior to referral for special education	0	3	2	1	0
The decision rules for a referral for a special education evaluation	2	2	3	0	0
How to document intervention fidelity	2	3	3	1	0
Number of entity responses	**5**				

Note: The sample for this table includes all state-level agencies that reported having a current initiative related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, in reading or math (n=5). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C3).

Table 2.1.2.16. State policies related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, state agencies follow for determining eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility	6	0
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) is used to determine eligibility	3	0
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility	2	0
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data may be used in determining eligibility	13	2
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) may be used to determine eligibility	9	2
Other	7	1
None of the above	8	4
Number of responses	**48**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

MTSS = Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C4).

Table 2.1.2.17. State policies state agencies follow if permitted to use a discrepancy method in determining specific learning disabilities (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state agency has operationalized discrepancy criteria and any district using a discrepancy method must adhere to these criteria	19	4
Districts have discretion to choose the specific discrepancy criteria used	17	3
Number of responses	**36**	**7**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having a state policy that permits the use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model to determine eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities (states: n=40; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C5).

Table 2.1.2.18. Number of state agencies that have a plan to stop using an IQ-achievement discrepancy model for determining of eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities by the 2020–2021 school year (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	30	6
Yes	6	1
Number of responses	**36**	**7**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having a state policy that permits the use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model to determine eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities (states: n=40; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C6).

Table 2.1.2.19. Number of state agencies that allow an approach other than Multi-Tiered Systems of Support or IQ-achievement discrepancy to determine the presence of specific learning disabilities (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	26	5
Yes	20	3
Number of responses	**46**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C7).

Table 2.1.2.20. Percentage of districts that use progress monitoring data from a tiered intervention system to inform aspects of special education services

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To determine if students are eligible for special education services	34	2.8
To refer students for evaluation for special education services	79	2.5
To assign targeted or supplemental supports for students with disabilities	65	2.8
Do not use progress monitoring data from a tiered intervention system to inform any aspect of special education services	9	1.8
Number of district responses	**438**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B5).

Table 2.1.2.20a. Percentage of districts that use progress monitoring data from a tiered intervention system to inform aspects of special education services, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To determine if students are eligible for special education services	34	2.8	33	3.1	39	5.9
To refer students for evaluation for special education services	79	2.5	77	2.8	88*	3.7
To assign targeted or supplemental supports for students with disabilities	65	2.8	66	3.1	62	5.9
Do not use progress monitoring data from a tiered intervention system to inform any aspect of special education services	9	1.8	10	2.0	.	.
Number of district responses	**438**		**334**		**104**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B5).

Table 2.1.2.20b. Percentage of districts that use progress monitoring data from a tiered intervention system to inform aspects of special education services, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To determine if students are eligible for special education services	34	2.8	33	4.0	35	3.8
To refer students for evaluation for special education services	79	2.5	77	3.8	81	3.2
To assign targeted or supplemental supports for students with disabilities	65	2.8	66	4.1	65	3.8
Do not use progress monitoring data from a tiered intervention system to inform any aspect of special education services	9	1.8	11	2.9	8	2.2
Number of district responses	**438**		**216**		**222**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B5).

Table 2.1.2.20c. Percentage of districts that use progress monitoring data from a tiered intervention system to inform aspects of special education services, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To determine if students are eligible for special education services	34	2.8	36	5.5	33	3.2
To refer students for evaluation for special education services	79	2.5	87	3.4	76*	3.1
To assign targeted or supplemental supports for students with disabilities	65	2.8	63	4.8	66	3.4
Do not use progress monitoring data from a tiered intervention system to inform any aspect of special education services	9	1.8	6!	2.4	10	2.3
Number of district responses	**438**		**155**		**283**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B5).

Table 2.1.2.21. Data districts use for determining special education eligibility for elementary students with specific learning disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Data and other information from the Response to Intervention process	80	2.3
Data based on cognitive and academic assessments that demonstrate a discrepancy between expected and actual performance (such as an IQ-achievement discrepancy)	81	2.1
Data from other research-based procedures	63	2.8
The district does not serve elementary students	5	1.5
Number of district responses	**438**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B15).

Table 2.1.2.21a. Data districts use for determining special education eligibility for elementary students with specific learning disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Data and other information from the Response to Intervention process	80	2.3	82	2.5	72	5.5
Data based on cognitive and academic assessments that demonstrate a discrepancy between expected and actual performance (such as an IQ-achievement discrepancy)	81	2.1	82	2.3	72	5.4
Data from other research-based procedures	63	2.8	63	3.1	60	6.0
The district does not serve elementary students	5	1.5	.	.	21	5.1
Number of district responses	**438**		**334**		**104**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B15).

Table 2.1.2.21b. Data districts use for determining special education eligibility for elementary students with specific learning disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Data and other information from the Response to Intervention process	80	2.3	87	3.0	74*	3.6
Data based on cognitive and academic assessments that demonstrate a discrepancy between expected and actual performance (such as an IQ-achievement discrepancy)	81	2.1	80	3.3	82	3.1
Data from other research-based procedures	63	2.8	67	4.0	59	3.9
The district does not serve elementary students	5	1.5	.	.	8	2.4
Number of district responses	**438**		**216**		**222**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B15).

Table 2.1.2.21c. Data districts use for determining special education eligibility for elementary students with specific learning disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Data and other information from the Response to Intervention process	80	2.3	73	4.6	83	2.6
Data based on cognitive and academic assessments that demonstrate a discrepancy between expected and actual performance (such as an IQ-achievement discrepancy)	81	2.1	71	4.6	85*	2.3
Data from other research-based procedures	63	2.8	55	5.4	66	3.3
The district does not serve elementary students	5	1.5	16!	5.0	.	.
Number of district responses	**438**		**155**		**283**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B15).

Table 2.1.2.22. State policies related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, districts follow for determining eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility	10	1.7
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) is used to determine eligibility	5	1.2
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility	19	2.3
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data may be used in determining eligibility	38	2.9
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) may be used to determine eligibility	21	2.4
Other	4	1.1
None of the above	3	1.0
Number of district responses	**434**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

MTSS = Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B16).

Table 2.1.2.22a. State policies related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, districts follow for determining eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility	10	1.7	11	1.9	7!	2.9
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) is used to determine eligibility	5	1.2	5	1.4	6!	2.8
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility	19	2.3	19	2.5	19	4.6
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data may be used in determining eligibility	38	2.9	39	3.2	36	5.8
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) may be used to determine eligibility	21	2.4	21	2.6	18	4.5
Other	4	1.1	4!	1.2	.	.
None of the above	3	1.0	2!	0.9	10!*	3.6
Number of district responses	**434**		**330**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

MTSS = Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B16).

Table 2.1.2.22b. State policies related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, districts follow for determining eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility	10	1.7	12	2.6	8	2.1
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) is used to determine eligibility	5	1.2	7!	2.2	4!	1.3
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility	19	2.3	16	3.2	21	3.3
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data may be used in determining eligibility	38	2.9	39	4.2	38	3.9
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) may be used to determine eligibility	21	2.4	18	3.3	23	3.4
Other	4	1.1	5!	1.9	3!	1.2
None of the above	3	1.0	.	.	4!	1.5
Number of district responses	**434**		**214**		**220**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

MTSS = Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B16).

Table 2.1.2.22c. State policies related to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, districts follow for determining eligibility for special education under specific learning disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility	10	1.7	6!	2.3	12	2.1
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) is used to determine eligibility	5	1.2	8!	2.9	4!	1.3
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility	19	2.3	19	3.8	19	2.8
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data may be used in determining eligibility	38	2.9	39	5.5	38	3.4
The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) may be used to determine eligibility	21	2.4	18	3.4	22	3.0
Other	4	1.1	.	.	4!	1.4
None of the above	3	1.0	7!	2.3	.	.
Number of district responses	**434**		**155**		**279**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

MTSS = Multi-Tiered Systems of Support.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B16).

2.1.3. Identification for services: Significant disproportionality in identification

Table 2.1.3.1. Status of progress state agencies report in defining significant disproportionality for 2019–2020

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state's definition of significant disproportionality is finalized and no changes are anticipated in the coming year	39	6
The state's definition of significant disproportionality is finalized, but the state is planning modifications or revisions in the coming year	8	0
The state's definition of significant disproportionality is in the process of being revised	4	2
Number of responses	**51**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. According to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 and the accompanying regulations, a local education agency (LEA) may choose to use up to 15% of its Part B funds for Coordinated Early Intervening Services. If an LEA is identified as having significant disproportionality in identification, placement, or discipline, it is required to reserve 15% of its Part B funds to provide Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services to students in the LEA. Each state develops a definition of significant disproportionality for making this determination.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D1).

Table 2.1.3.2. Number of state agencies that have published their current definition of significant disproportionality on the agency website

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Information not available on a website	15	9
Information available on a website	35	0
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D2).

Table 2.1.3.3. Actions state agencies take when a district is required to address significant disproportionality in identification

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Develops or works with district to develop a specific plan for the district to address significant proportionality in identification	40	0
Reviews and approves a district-developed plan	44	1
Reviews or revises (if appropriate) policies, practices, and procedures	42	2
Provides or arranges training for the district	42	1
Provides or arranges technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for the district	42	2
Provides additional (beyond the 15% required by Part B) targeted monetary or staff resources to the district	5	0
Recommends focusing funds on elementary schools	6	0
Recommends focusing funds on middle schools	4	0
Recommends focusing funds on high schools	3	0
Recommends focusing funds on specific interventions	9	1
Recommends focusing funds on specific areas, such as literacy or comprehensive behavioral supports	11	2
Other	5	1
None of the above	3	6
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Significant disproportionality in identification occurs when districts identify children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district. Respondents were asked to include all actions that are used in the state, even if they are not used in all situations.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D3).

Table 2.1.3.4. Percentage of districts the state has identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years, by school year

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
2014-2015	1!	0.6
2015-2016	3!	0.9
2016-2017	5	1.3
2017-2018	5	1.2
2018-2019	4	1.2
The district has not been identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years	74	2.6
Don't know if the district has been identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years	17	2.1
Number of district responses	**438**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Significant disproportionality in identification occurs when districts identify children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C1).

Table 2.1.3.4a. Percentage of districts the state has identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years, by school year and district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
2014-2015	1!	0.6	.	.	.	.
2015-2016	3!	0.9	3!	1.0	.	.
2016-2017	5	1.3	5!	1.4	.	.
2017-2018	5	1.2	5	1.4	.	.
2018-2019	4	1.2	4!	1.3	5!	2.4
The district has not been identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years	74	2.6	74	2.8	74	5.2
Don't know if the district has been identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years	17	2.1	17	2.4	19	4.6
Number of district responses	**438**		**334**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Significant disproportionality in identification occurs when districts identify children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C1).

Table 2.1.3.4b. Percentage of districts the state has identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years, by school year and district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
2014-2015	1!	0.6	.	.	.	.
2015-2016	3!	0.9	5!	1.9	.	.
2016-2017	5	1.3	9	2.7	.	.
2017-2018	5	1.2	9	2.4	2!*	1.0
2018-2019	4	1.2	5!	1.9	4!	1.5
The district has not been identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years	74	2.6	72	3.9	76	3.4
Don't know if the district has been identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years	17	2.1	14	2.8	20	3.1
Number of district responses	**438**		**216**		**222**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Significant disproportionality in identification occurs when districts identify children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C1).

Table 2.1.3.4c. Percentage of districts the state has identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years, by school year and district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
2014-2015	1!	0.6	.	.	.	.
2015-2016	3!	0.9	.	.	3!	1.2
2016-2017	5	1.3	6!	2.6	4!	1.5
2017-2018	5	1.2	5!	1.7	5	1.6
2018-2019	4	1.2	7!	2.9	4!	1.3
The district has not been identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years	74	2.6	75	4.6	74	3.1
Don't know if the district has been identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years	17	2.1	14	3.3	18	2.7
Number of district responses	**438**		**155**		**283**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Significant disproportionality in identification occurs when districts identify children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C1).

Table 2.1.3.5. Actions districts took to address or prevent significant disproportionality in identification of children with disabilities in the past five school years, across funding sources

Response category	Percentage of districts that funded this action through CCEIS (mandatory) funds	Percentage of districts that funded this action through voluntary CEIS funds	Percentage of districts that funded this action through other funds	Percentage of districts that did not do this
Reviewed and/or changed assessment/evaluation instruments (SE)	29! (11.4)	.	28! (12.1)	37 (9.1)
Reviewed and/or changed screening procedures (SE)	33! (11.5)	.	36! (12.4)	33! (12.8)
Increased monitoring and analysis of school referral or assessment data (SE)	31! (11.7)	.	40! (13.1)	23! (9.1)
Hired additional staff, such as reading specialists or mental health specialists (SE)	32! (12.1)	.	25! (11.3)	40 (11.5)
Reduced class size (SE)	.	.	13! (4.1)	73 (9.9)
Required progress monitoring (SE)	28! (12.4)	.	31! (12.5)	37! (12.3)
Reviewed administrative and classroom staff effectiveness (SE)	.	.	37 (11.1)	41! (13.2)
Developed a specific plan for school staff to address significant disproportionality in identification (SE)	35! (11.9)	.	.	42 (12.5)
Provided targeted supports to all schools (SE)	33! (13.0)	.	19! (8.5)	47 (13.1)
Provided targeted supports only to schools with evidence of significant disproportionality, or near-significant disproportionality (SE)	39! (11.6)	.	20! (9.6)	36 (9.2)
Provided targeted supports for elementary schools (SE)	39! (12.4)	.	29! (10.7)	29! (9.1)
Provided targeted supports for middle schools (SE)	27! (12.6)	.	26 (7.2)	46 (13.8)
Provided targeted supports for high schools (SE)	.	.	24! (9.3)	59 (12.9)
Provided or supported interventions to address issues in literacy (SE)	31! (13.1)	.	47 (13.2)	17! (8.0)
Provided or supported interventions to address issues in math (SE)	.	.	35! (11.2)	46 (12.9)
Provided or supported interventions to address issues in science (SE)	2! (0.8)	7 (0.7)	22! (10.2)	71 (10.2)
Provided or supported behavioral supports (SE)	.	.	38 (10.3)	31! (13.4)
Initiated Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (SE)	.	.	57 (12.3)	35! (12.3)
Initiated other specific interventions (SE)	0 (.)	.	.	85 (8.6)
Other (SE)	3! (1.2)	.	19! (9.0)	80 (9.1)
Number of district responses	**42**			

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years (2014-2015, 2015-2016, 2017-2018, and/or 2018-2019) (n=42). Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) are services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services, but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment. CEIS can be mandatory (Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services, or CCEIS) or voluntary. Respondents were asked to include all actions that were used in the district, even if they were not used in all situations. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C2).

Table 2.1.3.6. Professional development districts provided to address or prevent significant disproportionality in identification of children with disabilities in the past five school years, across funding sources

Response category	Percentage of districts that provided this professional development through CCEIS (mandatory) funds	Percentage of districts that provided this professional development through voluntary CEIS funds	Percentage of districts that provided this professional development through other funds	Percentage of districts that did not provide this professional development
Training to help general education teachers identify students who should be referred for evaluation (SE)	.	.	73 (9.9)	.
Training to help special education teachers identify students who should be referred for evaluation (SE)	4 (0.9)	.	68 (11.2)	23! (10.5)
Training to help school administrative staff identify students who should be referred for evaluation (SE)	4 (0.5)	.	77 (9.1)	.
Training to help other school staff identify students who should be referred for evaluation (SE)	4 (0.9)	.	58 (12.9)	35! (12.9)
Training about instructional strategies for meeting the diverse needs of students in a classroom (SE)	.	.	73 (12.1)	.
Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for general education teachers (SE)	.	.	71 (12.2)	20! (9.4)
Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for special education teachers (SE)	4 (0.9)	.	73 (11.8)	23! (11.3)
Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for school administrative staff (SE)	.	.	68 (12.5)	25! (10.6)
Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for other school staff (SE)	4 (0.9)	0 (.)	56 (13.8)	42! (13.7)
Other (SE)	.	.	.	79 (9.9)
Number of district responses	**42**			

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years (2014-2015, 2015-2016, 2017-2018, and/or 2018-2019) (n=42). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

CCEIS = Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services; CEIS = Coordinated Early Intervening Services; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C3).

Table 2.1.3.7. Average amounts districts spent on State Part B and Coordinated Early Intervening Services activities for school-age children with disabilities in the 2018–2019 school year

Funding type	Mean	Standard error
State Part B allocation	704,952!	220,376
Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS	97,549!	43,623
Number of district responses	**64**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts identified as having significant disproportionality in the past five school years (2014–2015, 2015–2016, 2017–2018, and/or 2018–2019) in identification of school-age children with disabilities; the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or least restrictive environment placement; or discipline (n=82). Respondents were asked to provide their best estimate. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Differences in the characteristics of responders and the full population of districts do not show evidence of potential nonresponse bias.

CEIS = Coordinated Early Intervening Services.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C10).

2.2.1. Individualized plans to meet challenging objectives: Engagement in IEP/IFSP development

Table 2.2.1.1. Number of states that require districts or schools to provide parents/guardians with information about the Parent Training and Information Center when a referral is made (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	29	6
Yes	22	3
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question M1).

Table 2.2.1.2. Supports state agencies offered to districts in the 2019–2020 school year to promote the involvement of parents/guardians of children with Individualized Education Programs

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Funds to districts to help parents/guardians participate in IEP meetings (for example, funds for transportation, child care, translators)	10	3
Training on increasing parent/guardian involvement	33	4
Technical assistance related to promoting parent/guardian involvement	40	4
Written guidelines related to parent/guardian involvement	26	3
Other	6	1
None of the above	3	2
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question M2).

Table 2.2.1.3. Ways in which state agency staff collaborated with the Parent Training and Information Center in the 2019–2020 school year (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Development or delivery of trainings	38	6
Delivery of technical assistance	37	2
Dissemination of information regarding each other's services	41	4
Development of training/guidance materials	40	1
Family outreach efforts (for example, parents/guardians and siblings)	31	3
Promotion of alternative dispute resolution models	32	0
Involvement in the development of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report	33	3
Implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan	30	4
Assisting with conducting the required parent survey	19	1
Other	5	1
None of the above	1	3
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question M3).

Table 2.2.1.4. Ways in which state agencies supported the Parent Training and Information Center in the 2019–2020 school year (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Staff from the state agency meet with PTI staff on a regular basis	42	3
State agency and PTI have joint planning sessions to coordinate services provided	25	3
State agency and PTI offer joint professional development	32	5
State agency provides financial support for events or services	38	1
Other	5	1
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

PTI = Parent Training and Information.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question M4).

Table 2.2.1.5. Number of states that require districts or schools to provide parents/guardians with information about the Parent Training and Information Center when a referral is made (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	31	4
Yes	20	4
Number of responses	**51**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question K1).

Table 2.2.1.6. Resources and services state agencies offered to preschool providers in the 2019–2020 school year to promote the involvement of parents/guardians of children with Individualized Education Programs

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Funds to districts to help parents/guardians participate in IEP meetings (for example, funds for transportation, child care, translators)	4	3
Training on increasing parent/guardian involvement	26	6
Technical assistance related to promoting parent/guardian involvement	27	4
Written guidelines related to parent/guardian involvement	19	2
Other	2	0
None of the above	14	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question K2).

Table 2.2.1.7. Ways in which state agency staff collaborated with the Parent Training and Information Center in the 2019–2020 school year (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Development or delivery of trainings	28	5
Delivery of technical assistance	26	0
Dissemination of information regarding each other's services	34	3
Development of training/guidance materials	29	2
Family outreach efforts (for example, parents/guardians and siblings)	18	3
Promotion of alternative dispute resolution models	14	0
Involvement in the development of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report	13	2
Implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan	15	1
Assisting with conducting the required parent survey	12	2
Other	2	1
None of the above	6	2
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question K3).

Table 2.2.1.8. Ways in which state agencies supported the Parent Training and Information Center in the 2019–2020 school year (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Staff from the state agency meet with PTI staff on a regular basis	26	3
State agency and PTI have joint planning sessions to coordinate services provided	13	1
State agency and PTI offer joint professional development	21	4
State agency provides financial support for events or services	27	0
Other	2	1
None of the above	9	2
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

PTI = Parent Training and Information.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question K4).

Table 2.2.1.9a. Ways in and levels at which families are involved in the Part C system (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of lead agencies that involve families at the state level	Number of lead agencies that involve families at the regional level	Number of lead agencies that involve families at the local level	Number of lead agencies that do not have this information available
Providing training to other families	24	15	23	14
Providing training to Part C early intervention personnel	26	13	19	19
Employed as Part C early intervention personnel (for example, service coordinator)	19	16	35	11
Participating on committees/task forces (other than interagency coordinating councils)	44	18	36	2
State monitoring (for example, participate on monitoring teams)	12	3	8	29
Developing policies and procedures	41	9	12	9
Involved in procedural safeguard system	26	7	17	17
Other activity	21	8	13	26
Number of state responses	**51**			

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question I1).

Table 2.2.1.9b. Ways in and levels at which families are involved in the Part C system (entities)

Response category	Number of lead agencies that involve families at the entity level	Number of lead agencies that involve families at the regional level	Number of lead agencies that involve families at the local level	Number of lead agencies that do not have this information available
Providing training to other families	3	0	4	1
Providing training to Part C early intervention personnel	1	0	4	1
Employed as Part C early intervention personnel (for example, service coordinator)	1	0	3	2
Participating on committees/task forces (other than interagency coordinating councils)	4	0	3	0
State-level monitoring (for example, participate on monitoring teams)	2	0	4	1
Developing policies and procedures	2	0	4	1
Involved in procedural safeguard system	2	1	4	0
Other activity	1	0	0	5
Number of entity responses	**6**			

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (n=6). Surveys were sent to six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question I1).

Table 2.2.1.10. Number of states that require local early intervention providers to share information about the Parent Training and Information Center with families when a referral is made

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	36	4
Yes	15	2
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question I2).

Table 2.2.1.11. Resources and services lead agencies offered to local early intervention programs in fiscal year 2020 to promote the involvement of families of children with Individualized Family Service Plans

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Funds to provider agencies to help parents/guardians participate in IFSP meetings (for example, funds for transportation, child care, translators)	19	1
Training on increasing parent/guardian involvement	27	3
Technical assistance related to promoting parent/guardian involvement	34	6
Written guidelines related to parent/guardian involvement	20	1
Other	8	0
None of the above	6	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IFSP = Individualized Family Service Plan.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question I3).

Table 2.2.1.12. Ways in which lead agency staff collaborated with the Parent Training and Information Center in fiscal year 2020

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Development or delivery of trainings	15	1
Delivery of technical assistance	14	2
Dissemination of information regarding each other's services	34	3
Development of training/guidance materials	19	2
Family outreach efforts (for example, parents/guardians and siblings)	21	0
Promotion of alternative dispute resolution models	5	0
Involvement in the development of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report	14	1
Implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan	14	1
Assisting with conducting the required parent survey	9	1
Other	6	0
None of the above	7	1
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Indicator C4 requires states to collect information on the percentage of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family a) know their rights, b) effectively communicate their children's needs, and c) help their children develop and learn.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question I4).

Table 2.2.1.13. Ways in which lead agencies supported the Parent Training and Information Center in fiscal year 2020

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Staff from the lead agency meet with PTI staff on a regular basis	23	2
Lead agency and PTI have joint planning sessions to coordinate services provided	9	0
Lead agency and PTI offer joint professional development	8	2
Lead agency provides financial support for PTI events or services	18	0
Other	13	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

PTI = Parent Training and Information.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question I5).

Table 2.2.1.14. Assistance districts provide to enable parents/guardians to participate in Individualized Education Program meetings for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child care assistance	13	2.0
Interpreters	69	2.6
Transportation vouchers	11	1.8
Other	13	2.0
Do not provide this type of assistance	22	2.5
Number of district responses	**437**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D5).

Table 2.2.1.14a. Assistance districts provide to enable parents/guardians to participate in Individualized Education Program meetings for school-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child care assistance	13	2.0	14	2.3	9!	3.6
Interpreters	69	2.6	70	2.9	63	6.1
Transportation vouchers	11	1.8	12	2.0	9!	3.5
Other	13	2.0	13	2.2	12!	3.8
Do not provide this type of assistance	22	2.5	22	2.7	26	5.6
Number of district responses	**437**		**333**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D5).

Table 2.2.1.14b. Assistance districts provide to enable parents/guardians to participate in Individualized Education Program meetings for school-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child care assistance	13	2.0	10	2.6	16	3.0
Interpreters	69	2.6	85	3.2	55*	4.0
Transportation vouchers	11	1.8	16	3.0	7*	2.1
Other	13	2.0	9	2.5	16	3.0
Do not provide this type of assistance	22	2.5	12	3.0	31*	3.8
Number of district responses	**437**		**216**		**221**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D5).

Table 2.2.1.14c. Assistance districts provide to enable parents/guardians to participate in Individualized Education Program meetings for school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child care assistance	13	2.0	8!	3.0	15	2.5
Interpreters	69	2.6	86	3.4	63*	3.3
Transportation vouchers	11	1.8	16	3.6	10	2.1
Other	13	2.0	10!	3.1	14	2.4
Do not provide this type of assistance	22	2.5	10	2.9	26*	3.1
Number of district responses	**437**		**154**		**283**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D5).

Table 2.2.1.15. Topics of written materials, workshops, discussions, or support groups districts offered in the 2019–2020 school year specifically for parents/guardians of students with Individualized Education Programs

Response category	Percentage of districts that provided written materials	Percentage of districts that offered workshops, discussions, or support groups	Percentage of districts that do not offer materials or supports to parents/guardians on this topic
Understanding student accommodations to help them access the general education curriculum (SE)	45 (2.9)	34 (2.7)	37 (2.8)
Developing and implementing a standards-based IEP (SE)	36 (2.8)	24 (2.4)	53 (2.9)
Understanding accommodations offered to students when taking state or districtwide assessments, including the use of alternative assessments (SE)	53 (2.9)	37 (2.8)	31 (2.7)
Understanding their child's disability (SE)	57 (2.9)	41 (2.7)	29 (2.5)
Understanding the law and their legal rights under IDEA (SE)	86 (2.0)	26 (2.5)	8 (1.7)
Using alternative dispute resolution procedures (SE)	67 (2.7)	16 (2.0)	30 (2.7)
Understanding any of the five special factors (behavior, limited English proficiency, Braille instruction, language and communication, and assistive technology) as part of the development, review, and revision of IEPs (SE)	42 (2.9)	26 (2.6)	46 (2.9)
Using interventions for children with behavioral challenges (SE)	49 (2.9)	43 (2.8)	32 (2.7)
Using strategies for making successful transitions between schools, such as elementary and middle schools (SE)	40 (2.8)	48 (2.9)	34 (2.8)
Understanding how to file a complaint and where to receive assistance in drafting an effective complaint (SE)	80 (2.4)	13 (1.9)	17 (2.3)
Number of district responses	**438**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; IEP = Individualized Education Program; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D8).

Table 2.2.1.16. Assistance districts provide to enable parents/guardians to participate in Individualized Education Program meetings for preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child care assistance	18	2.6
Interpreters	69	2.9
Transportation vouchers	13	2.3
Other	17	2.5
Do not provide this type of assistance	20	2.6
Number of district responses	**320**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C5).

Table 2.2.1.16a. Assistance districts provide to enable parents/guardians to participate in Individualized Education Program meetings for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child care assistance	18	2.6	18	2.6	.	.
Interpreters	69	2.9	70	2.9	53	15.3
Transportation vouchers	13	2.3	14	2.3	.	.
Other	17	2.5	16	2.6	.	.
Do not provide this type of assistance	20	2.6	19	2.7	31!	14.8
Number of district responses	**320**		**296**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C5).

Table 2.2.1.16b. Assistance districts provide to enable parents/guardians to participate in Individualized Education Program meetings for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child care assistance	18	2.6	16	3.3	20	4.1
Interpreters	69	2.9	84	3.3	52*	4.9
Transportation vouchers	13	2.3	21	3.7	4!*	2.2
Other	17	2.5	13	3.0	20	4.1
Do not provide this type of assistance	20	2.6	10	2.6	31*	4.7
Number of district responses	**320**		**192**		**128**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C5).

Table 2.2.1.16c. Assistance districts provide to enable parents/guardians to participate in Individualized Education Program meetings for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child care assistance	18	2.6	15!	4.6	19	3.0
Interpreters	69	2.9	87	4.4	65*	3.4
Transportation vouchers	13	2.3	17	4.9	13	2.5
Other	17	2.5	21	5.9	15	2.8
Do not provide this type of assistance	20	2.6	9!	3.7	22*	3.2
Number of district responses	**320**		**89**		**231**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C5).

Table 2.2.1.17. Local agencies or providers with which districts coordinate to engage parents/guardians of preschool-age children with disabilities in developing Individualized Education Programs

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Head Start agencies	71	2.8
Child care or nursery school providers, other than Head Start	56	3.3
Health care providers or agencies	40	3.3
Mental health providers or agencies	39	3.3
Home visiting providers or agencies	44	3.4
Social services providers or agencies	51	3.4
Other early intervention agencies or providers, including task forces or nonprofit organizations	24	2.8
Number of district responses	**312**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C6).

Table 2.2.1.17a. Local agencies or providers with which districts coordinate to engage parents/guardians of preschool-age children with disabilities in developing Individualized Education Programs, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Head Start agencies	71	2.8	73	2.8	.	.
Child care or nursery school providers, other than Head Start	56	3.3	57	3.4	.	.
Health care providers or agencies	40	3.3	41	3.3	.	.
Mental health providers or agencies	39	3.3	39	3.4	.	.
Home visiting providers or agencies	44	3.4	45	3.4	.	.
Social services providers or agencies	51	3.4	51	3.5	38!	16.0
Other early intervention agencies or providers, including task forces or nonprofit organizations	24	2.8	24	2.8	.	.
Number of district responses	**312**		**291**		**21**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C6).

Table 2.2.1.17b. Local agencies or providers with which districts coordinate to engage parents/guardians of preschool-age children with disabilities in developing Individualized Education Programs, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Head Start agencies	71	2.8	82	3.0	59*	5.1
Child care or nursery school providers, other than Head Start	56	3.3	64	4.3	47*	5.1
Health care providers or agencies	40	3.3	41	4.3	39	5.0
Mental health providers or agencies	39	3.3	43	4.5	33	4.9
Home visiting providers or agencies	44	3.4	44	4.5	43	5.1
Social services providers or agencies	51	3.4	52	4.5	49	5.3
Other early intervention agencies or providers, including task forces or nonprofit organizations	24	2.8	25	3.7	23	4.2
Number of district responses	**312**		**188**		**124**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C6).

Table 2.2.1.17c. Local agencies or providers with which districts coordinate to engage parents/guardians of preschool-age children with disabilities in developing Individualized Education Programs, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Head Start agencies	71	2.8	55	6.3	75*	3.2
Child care or nursery school providers, other than Head Start	56	3.3	58	6.7	56	3.8
Health care providers or agencies	40	3.3	30	5.3	43	3.8
Mental health providers or agencies	39	3.3	44	6.6	37	3.8
Home visiting providers or agencies	44	3.4	50	6.9	42	3.8
Social services providers or agencies	51	3.4	51	6.8	51	4.0
Other early intervention agencies or providers, including task forces or nonprofit organizations	24	2.8	29	5.9	23	3.1
Number of district responses	**312**		**85**		**227**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C6).

Table 2.2.1.18. Topics of written materials, workshops, discussions, or support groups districts offered in 2019–2020 school year specifically for parents/guardians of preschool-age children with Individualized Education Programs or Individualized Family Service Plans

Response category	Percentage of districts that provided written materials	Percentage of districts that offered workshops, discussions, or support groups	Percentage of districts that do not offer materials or supports to parents/guardians on this topic
Understanding student accommodations to help them access the general education curriculum (SE)	45 (3.4)	30 (3.1)	40 (3.3)
Developing and implementing a standards-based IEP (SE)	40 (3.3)	22 (2.7)	49 (3.4)
Understanding their child's disability (SE)	62 (3.3)	37 (3.2)	27 (3.0)
Understanding the law and their legal rights under IDEA (SE)	86 (2.3)	21 (2.6)	12 (2.1)
Using alternative dispute resolution procedures (SE)	66 (3.2)	13 (2.2)	31 (3.1)
Understanding any of the five special factors (behavior, limited English proficiency, Braille instruction, language and communication, and assistive technology) as part of the development, review, and revision of IEPs (SE)	51 (3.4)	21 (2.7)	43 (3.4)
Using interventions for students with behavioral challenges (SE)	56 (3.3)	42 (3.3)	27 (3.1)
Using strategies for making a successful transition from preschool to school (SE)	56 (3.4)	40 (3.2)	30 (3.1)
Understanding how to file a complaint and where to receive assistance in drafting an effective complaint (SE)	84 (2.5)	14 (2.3)	15 (2.4)
Number of district responses	**318**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; IEP = Individualized Education Program; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C7).

Table 2.2.1.19. Processes or programs districts used to promote the involvement of families of preschool-age children with disabilities in the 2019–2020 school year

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Teachers shared information, tools, and strategies that families could apply at home and in the community to accelerate student learning and school performance	85	2.5
Teachers met with parents/guardians outside of school to build relationships and increase family involvement	45	3.3
District included families at stakeholder meetings focused on special education and related services	37	3.1
District informed parents/guardians about their rights, responsibilities, and children's educational opportunities	87	2.3
District provided resources aimed at connecting parents/guardians to community resources and special education and related services	60	3.2
District provided resources aimed at improving parenting skills, family relationships, and children's mental health and behavior	48	3.3
Other	6	1.6
None of the above	3!	1.3
Number of district responses	**320**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C8).

Table 2.2.1.19a. Processes or programs districts used to promote the involvement of families of preschool-age children with disabilities in the 2019–2020 school year, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Teachers shared information, tools, and strategies that families could apply at home and in the community to accelerate student learning and school performance	85	2.5	86	2.5	61	14.8
Teachers met with parents/guardians outside of school to build relationships and increase family involvement	45	3.3	45	3.4	34!	14.6
District included families at stakeholder meetings focused on special education and related services	37	3.1	38	3.2	.	.
District informed parents/guardians about their rights, responsibilities, and children's educational opportunities	87	2.3	88	2.3	43!*	14.9
District provided resources aimed at connecting parents/guardians to community resources and special education and related services	60	3.2	61	3.3	30!*	13.9
District provided resources aimed at improving parenting skills, family relationships, and children's mental health and behavior	48	3.3	49	3.4	.	.
Other	6	1.6	6	1.6	.	.
None of the above	3!	1.3	3!	1.3	.	.
Number of district responses	**320**		**296**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C8).

Table 2.2.1.19b. Processes or programs districts used to promote the involvement of families of preschool-age children with disabilities in the 2019-2020 school year, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Teachers shared information, tools, and strategies that families could apply at home and in the community to accelerate student learning and school performance	85	2.5	91	2.7	78*	4.3
Teachers met with parents/guardians outside of school to build relationships and increase family involvement	45	3.3	49	4.5	40	4.9
District included families at stakeholder meetings focused on special education and related services	37	3.1	44	4.2	30*	4.6
District informed parents/guardians about their rights, responsibilities, and children's educational opportunities	87	2.3	94	2.0	78*	4.3
District provided resources aimed at connecting parents/guardians to community resources and special education and related services	60	3.2	71	4.0	48*	5.1
District provided resources aimed at improving parenting skills, family relationships, and children's mental health and behavior	48	3.3	52	4.4	44	5.0
Other	6	1.6	4!	1.7	8!	2.9
None of the above	3!	1.3	.	.	7!	2.7
Number of district responses	**320**		**192**		**128**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C8).

Table 2.2.1.19c. Processes or programs districts used to promote the involvement of families of preschool-age children with disabilities in the 2019–2020 school year, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Teachers shared information, tools, and strategies that families could apply at home and in the community to accelerate student learning and school performance	85	2.5	77	5.9	87	2.7
Teachers met with parents/guardians outside of school to build relationships and increase family involvement	45	3.3	47	6.7	44	3.8
District included families at stakeholder meetings focused on special education and related services	37	3.1	58	6.7	32*	3.5
District informed parents/guardians about their rights, responsibilities, and children's educational opportunities	87	2.3	82	5.5	88	2.5
District provided resources aimed at connecting parents/guardians to community resources and special education and related services	60	3.2	63	6.1	60	3.7
District provided resources aimed at improving parenting skills, family relationships, and children's mental health and behavior	48	3.3	56	6.4	46	3.8
Other	6	1.6	.	.	6!	1.9
None of the above	3!	1.3	.	.	3!	1.4
Number of district responses	**320**		**89**		**231**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C8).

2.2.2. Individualized plans to meet challenging objectives: IEP/IFSP content

Table 2.2.2.1. Topics covered in professional development provided by state agencies to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Developing standards-based IEP goals	44	5
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	45	8
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	45	9
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	43	8
Engaging staff from state or local community agencies or programs (for example, after-school program providers, employment and training providers) in the IEP process	34	6
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	44	8
Other professional development	15	2
None of the above	0	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. For the purpose of this question, respondents were told professional development could occur either in person or online. A quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student. Standards-based IEPs are those that align goals for students with disabilities with the content and academic achievement standards that form the basis of each state's general education curriculum. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of their circumstances.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E1).

Table 2.2.2.2. Topics on which state agencies provide written policy or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	33	6
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	40	8
Engaging families in the IEP process	39	7
Engaging staff from local community agencies or programs (for example, after-school program providers, employment and training providers) in the IEP process	30	6
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	37	8
Other topics	5	1
None of the above	2	0
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of their circumstances.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E2).

Table 2.2.2.3. Resources state agencies provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
A mandated standards-based IEP form or template	17	7
A suggested standards-based IEP form or template	21	2
A rubric or other resource describing features of quality IEPs, including appropriately ambitious IEP goals	22	3
A coach, mentor, or IEP facilitator to assist with writing the IEP	15	6
Other resources to promote the quality of IEPs	23	2
None of the above	2	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E3).

Table 2.2.2.4. Agencies or entities responsible for ensuring appropriate development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs of school-age children with disabilities enrolled in public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The charter school's authorizer	5	0
The charter school's district	21	0
The charter school	18	2
The student's local school district	13	0
The state	12	1
Other	1	0
Number of responses	**30**	**2**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having public charter schools that are part of traditional school districts (states: n=30; entities: n=2). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E4).

Table 2.2.2.5. Agencies or entities responsible for ensuring appropriate development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs of school-age children with disabilities enrolled in public charter schools that are their own school district

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The charter school's authorizer	7	0
The charter school's district	9	0
The charter school	23	0
The student's local school district	2	0
The state	14	0
Other	3	0
Number of responses	**32**	**0**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having public charter schools that are their own school districts (states: n=32; entities: n=0). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E6).

Table 2.2.2.6. Agencies or entities responsible for ensuring appropriate development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs of school-age children with disabilities enrolled in public virtual schools

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The authorizer (if virtual school is a charter school)	10	0
The local school district	21	0
The public virtual school	23	0
The state	16	0
Other	6	0
Number of responses	**38**	**0**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having public virtual schools (states: n=38; entities: n=0). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E8).

Table 2.2.2.7. Number of states that use a standardized alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	4	1
Yes	47	8
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F1).

Table 2.2.2.8. Criteria state agencies use to determine eligibility to participate in alternate assessments

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The student has a significant cognitive disability	48	7
The student is learning content based on grade-level alternate achievement standards	42	4
The student requires extensive direct individualized instruction and supports to achieve measurable gains from year to year	40	4
The student performs substantially below grade-level expectations on the academic content standards for the grade in which they are enrolled, even with the use of adaptations	29	5
The student's demonstrated cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior are significantly below age expectations even with program modifications, adaptations, and accommodations	41	9
The school psychologist presents evidence that the student's cognitive and adaptive functioning is consistent with that of a student with a significant cognitive disability	16	2
Other	4	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F2).

Table 2.2.2.9. Number of state agencies whose current guidelines for assessment-eligibility using alternate academic achievement standards are available on a website

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Information not available on a website	3	6
Information available on a website	48	3
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F3).

Table 2.2.2.10. Strategies states use to stay within the 1% cap

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state requested a waiver from the 1% cap	30	0
The state revised its definition of students with most significant cognitive disabilities	19	0
The state's general assessment provided appropriate accessibility features and accommodations that enabled more students with disabilities to participate in the general assessment	32	4
The state reviewed cases with certain disability categories such as learning disabilities and speech-language impairments who participate in alternate assessments to confirm they are receiving the most appropriate assessment	30	3
The state reviewed English learner cases who participate in alternate assessments to confirm they are receiving the most appropriate assessment	13	0
The state reviewed expressive communication skills of students who participate in alternate assessment to confirm they are receiving the most appropriate assessment	11	4
The state reviewed receptive communication skills of students who participate in alternate assessment to confirm they are receiving the most appropriate assessment	11	4
The state provided professional development for district staff to support understanding of alternate assessments	48	4
Other	14	1
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. 1% cap: Under the Every Student Succeeds Act, the total number of students assessed in a subject using an alternate assessment should not exceed 1 percent of the total number of students in the state who are assessed in that subject.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F4).

Table 2.2.2.11. Topics covered in professional development offered to district staff to support understanding of Alternate Assessment Based on alternate academic achievement standards

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Understanding federal or state AA-AAAS policy	45	4
The process for ensuring students with disabilities participate in AA-AAAS, as appropriate	48	4
Ensuring school staff administer AA-AAAS as appropriate	42	4
The long-term implications for students of participating in AA-AAAS (for example, eligibility for certain diploma types or training programs)	33	1
Explaining AA-AAAS results to parents/guardians	23	1
Other	3	0
Number of responses	**48**	**4**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported providing professional development for district staff to support understanding of alternate assessments (states: n=48; entities: n=4). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

AA-AAAS = Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Academic Achievement Standards.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F5).

Table 2.2.2.12. Number of states that offer an alternate diploma for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	39	6
Yes	12	3
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F6).

Table 2.2.2.13. Number of states with alternate diplomas that are standards-based or aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
It is standards-based	8	2
It is aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma	8	3
It is not standards-based or aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma	1	0
Number of responses	**12**	**3**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported offering an alternate diploma for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities (states: n=12; entities: n=3). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F7).

Table 2.2.2.14. Criteria states use to determine whether school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities are eligible for the state's alternate diploma

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The student participates in AA-AAAS	9	1
The student is learning content based on grade-level alternate achievement standards	9	2
The student requires extensive direct individualized instruction and supports to achieve measurable gains from year to year	9	3
The student performs substantially below grade-level expectations on the academic content standards for the grade in which they are enrolled, even with the use of adaptations	7	2
The student's demonstrated cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior are significantly below age expectations even with program modifications, adaptations, and accommodations	8	2
Other	2	0
Number of responses	**12**	**3**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported offering an alternate diploma for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities (states: n=12; entities: n=3). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

AA-AAAS = Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Academic Achievement Standards.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F8).

Table 2.2.2.15. Number of state agencies that offer professional development to district staff to support understanding and use of a state-defined alternate diploma

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	1	1
Yes	11	2
Number of responses	**12**	**3**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported offering an alternate diploma for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities (states: n=12; entities: n=3). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F9).

Table 2.2.2.16. Topics covered in professional development offered to district staff to support understanding and use of a state-defined alternate diploma

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Understanding federal or state policy for awarding a state-defined alternate diploma	10	1
The process for ensuring eligible students receive a state-defined alternate diploma, as appropriate	11	1
Ensuring school staff award state-defined alternate diplomas, as appropriate	10	2
The long-term implications for students of receiving a state-defined alternate diploma (for example, eligibility for certain postsecondary education or training programs)	9	1
Explaining state-defined alternate diplomas to parents/guardians	10	1
Other	0	0
Number of responses	**11**	**2**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported offering professional development to district staff to support understanding and use of a state-defined alternate diploma (states: n=11; entities: n=2). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F10).

Table 2.2.2.17. Number of states whose early learning standards for preschool-age children align with early learning guidelines or K-12 standards

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
With early learning guidelines (birth through age 2)	37	3
With K-12 standards	44	6
Do not align with early learning guidelines or K-12 standards	2	2
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D1).

Table 2.2.2.18. Domains covered by early learning standards for preschool-age children

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Physical/health	46	6
Cognitive	44	7
Approaches to learning	44	2
Social/emotional	48	7
Communication/language	48	7
Adaptive behavior	32	4
Motor development	43	7
Other	19	1
None of the above	0	0
Number of responses	**49**	**7**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having early learning standards for preschool-age children align with early learning guidelines or K-12 standards (states: n=49; entities: n=7). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D2).

Table 2.2.2.19. Number of states with formal written policies on developing and using standards-based Individualized Education Programs for preschool-age children with disabilities in the 2019-2020 school year

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	34	6
Yes	17	3
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D3).

Table 2.2.2.20. Proportions of state staff who worked with preschool-age children and who participated in professional development on standards-based Individualized Education Program development for preschool-age children with disabilities in the 2019–2020 and 2018–2019 school years

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
0 to 20 percent	34	0
21 to 40 percent	4	1
41 to 60 percent	2	1
61 to 80 percent	3	1
81 to 100 percent	5	4
Number of responses	**48**	**7**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having early learning standards for preschool-age children align with early learning guidelines or K-12 standards (states: n=49; entities: n=7). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to provide their best estimate.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D4).

Table 2.2.2.21. Topics covered in professional development provided by state agencies to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Developing standards-based IEPs goals	30	5
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	36	6
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	37	9
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	37	7
Engaging staff from state or local community agencies or programs (for example, Head Start and child care staff) in the IEP process	32	9
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	37	8
Other professional development	15	0
None of the above	5	0
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. For the purpose of this question, respondents were told professional development could occur either in person or online. A quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student. Standards-based IEPs are those that align goals for students with disabilities with the content and academic achievement standards that form the basis of each state's general education curriculum. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of their circumstances.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D5).

Table 2.2.2.22. Topics covered in written policy or guidelines provided by state agencies to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	26	5
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	36	7
Engaging parent/guardians in the IEP process	33	7
Engaging staff from local community agencies or programs (for example, Head Start and child care staff) in the IEP process	25	6
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	31	6
Other topics	8	0
None of the above	7	2
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of their circumstances.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D6).

Table 2.2.2.23. Resources state agencies provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
A mandated standards-based IEP form or template	13	6
A suggested standards-based IEP form or template	14	3
A rubric or other resource describing features of quality IEPs, including appropriately ambitious IEP goals	15	4
A coach, mentor, or IEP facilitator to assist with writing the IEP	12	4
Other resources to promote the quality of IEPs	21	2
None of the above	10	0
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of their circumstances.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D7).

Table 2.2.2.24. Agencies or entities responsible for ensuring appropriate development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs of preschool-age children with disabilities enrolled in public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The charter school's authorizer	3	0
The charter school's district	4	0
The charter school	4	1
The student's local school district	3	0
The state	5	1
Other	0	0
Number of responses	**10**	**1**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having public charter preschools that are part of traditional school districts (states: n=10; entities: n=1). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D11).

Table 2.2.2.25. Agencies or entities responsible for ensuring appropriate development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs of preschool-age children with disabilities enrolled in public charter schools that are their own school district

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The charter school's authorizer	5	0
The charter school's district	6	0
The charter school	7	0
The student's local school district	3	1
The state	9	0
Other	5	0
Number of responses	**18**	**1**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having public charter preschools that are their own district (states: n=18; entities: n=1). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D12).

Table 2.2.2.26. Number of states with general early learning guidelines for infants and toddlers birth through age 2

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	7	0
Yes	44	6
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Early learning guidelines describe expectations for young children's learning and development.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question C1).

Table 2.2.2.27. Domains covered by state early learning guidelines

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Physical health	39	4
Cognitive	41	6
Approaches to learning	31	4
Social/emotional	43	6
Communication/language	42	6
Adaptive behavior	35	5
Motor development	41	6
Other	4	0
None of the above	1	0
Number of responses	**44**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all lead agencies that reported having general early learning guidelines for infants and toddlers birth through age 2 in their state (states: n=44; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Early learning guidelines describe expectations for young children's learning and development. Adaptive behavior refers to behavior that enables a person to get along in his or her environment with greatest success and least conflict with others.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question C2).

Table 2.2.2.28. Number of states with formal policies on aligning Part C early intervention services with early learning guidelines in fiscal year 2020

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	32	0
Yes	12	6
Number of responses	**44**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all lead agencies that reported having general early learning guidelines for infants and toddlers birth through age 2 in their state (states: n=44; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Early learning guidelines describe expectations for young children's learning and development.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question C3).

Table 2.2.2.29. Number of lead agencies that provided training or professional development on aligning early learning guidelines and Part C early intervention services in fiscal years 2019 and 2020

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	32	1
Yes	12	5
Number of responses	**44**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all lead agencies that reported having general early learning guidelines for infants and toddlers birth through age 2 in their state (states: n=44; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question C4).

Table 2.2.2.30. Topics covered in professional development provided by lead agencies to promote Individualized Family Service Plan process quality for infants and toddlers with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Setting developmentally appropriate IFSP outcomes	46	4
Setting high quality functional IFSP outcomes	47	4
Identifying appropriate early intervention services to meet IFSP outcomes	43	4
Engaging families in the IFSP process	44	6
Engaging staff from local community agencies or programs (for example, pre-K, Early Head Start, or child care staff) in the IFSP process	33	2
Monitoring progress toward achieving IFSP outcomes, including through use of data	36	4
Other training or professional development	18	1
None of the above	1	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. For the purpose of this question, respondents were told professional development could occur either in person or online.

IFSP = Individualized Family Service Plan.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question C5).

Table 2.2.2.31. Topics covered in written policy or guidelines provided by lead agencies to promote Individualized Family Service Plan process quality

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Setting developmentally appropriate IFSP outcomes	36	4
Setting high quality functional IFSP outcomes	38	3
Identifying appropriate early intervention services to meet IFSP outcomes	32	3
Engaging families in the IFSP process	39	3
Engaging staff from local community agencies or programs (for example, pre-K, Early Head Start, or child care staff) in the IFSP process	28	1
Monitoring progress toward achieving IFSP outcomes, including through use of data	33	3
Other written policies or guidelines	8	1
None of the above	5	1
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IFSP = Individualized Family Service Plan.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question C6).

Table 2.2.2.32. Resources lead agencies provide to promote Individualized Family Service Plan process quality

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
A mandated IFSP form or template	44	4
A suggested IFSP form or template	4	1
A rubric or other resource describing features of quality IFSPs	26	3
A coach, mentor, or IFSP facilitator to assist with writing the IFSP	11	4
Other resources to promote the quality of IFSPs	17	1
None of the above	0	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IFSP = Individualized Family Service Plan.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question C7).

Table 2.2.2.33. Topics covered in professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Developing standards-based IEPs	67	2.8
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	65	2.8
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	85	2.2
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	70	2.7
Engaging school staff (for example, general educators) in the IEP process	71	2.7
Engaging students in the IEP process	59	2.9
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	80	2.3
Other professional development to promote the quality of IEPs	24	2.5
None of the above	4	1.2
Number of district responses	**438**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). For the purpose of this question, respondents were told professional development could occur either in person or online. A quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student. Standards-based IEPs are those that align goals for students with disabilities with the content and academic achievement standards that form the basis of each state's general education curriculum. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D1).

Table 2.2.2.33a. Topics covered in professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Developing standards-based IEPs	67	2.8	65	3.2	78*	4.9
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	65	2.8	65	3.2	67	5.7
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	85	2.2	86	2.3	77	5.3
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	70	2.7	70	3.0	70	5.4
Engaging school staff (for example, general educators) in the IEP process	71	2.7	70	3.0	75	5.2
Engaging students in the IEP process	59	2.9	59	3.2	52	6.0
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	80	2.3	80	2.6	81	4.8
Other professional development to promote the quality of IEPs	24	2.5	24	2.8	23	5.1
None of the above	4	1.2	4!	1.4	.	.
Number of district responses	**438**		**334**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). For the purpose of this question, respondents were told professional development could occur either in person or online. A quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student. Standards-based IEPs are those that align goals for students with disabilities with the content and academic achievement standards that form the basis of each state's general education curriculum. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D1).

Table 2.2.2.33b. Topics covered in professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Developing standards-based IEPs	67	2.8	71	3.9	64	3.9
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	65	2.8	66	4.2	65	3.8
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	85	2.2	88	3.0	82	3.0
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	70	2.7	73	3.8	68	3.7
Engaging school staff (for example, general educators) in the IEP process	71	2.7	76	3.7	67	3.8
Engaging students in the IEP process	59	2.9	65	4.1	53*	4.0
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	80	2.3	87	3.0	74*	3.5
Other professional development to promote the quality of IEPs	24	2.5	31	4.1	18*	3.0
None of the above	4	1.2	.	.	6!	2.0
Number of district responses	**438**		**216**		**222**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). For the purpose of this question, respondents were told professional development could occur either in person or online. A quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student. Standards-based IEPs are those that align goals for students with disabilities with the content and academic achievement standards that form the basis of each state's general education curriculum. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D1).

Table 2.2.2.33c. Topics covered in professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Developing standards-based IEPs	67	2.8	68	5.4	66	3.3
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	65	2.8	68	5.2	64	3.4
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	85	2.2	87	3.5	84	2.6
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	70	2.7	80	4.1	67*	3.3
Engaging school staff (for example, general educators) in the IEP process	71	2.7	78	4.6	69	3.2
Engaging students in the IEP process	59	2.9	62	5.2	57	3.4
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	80	2.3	86	3.4	78	2.9
Other professional development to promote the quality of IEPs	24	2.5	27	4.6	23	3.0
None of the above	4	1.2	.	.	4!	1.5
Number of district responses	**438**		**155**		**283**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). For the purpose of this question, respondents were told professional development could occur either in person or online. A quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student. Standards-based IEPs are those that align goals for students with disabilities with the content and academic achievement standards that form the basis of each state's general education curriculum. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D1).

Table 2.2.2.34. Target audiences for professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Principals	38	2.8
School administrative officials	26	2.6
Special education teachers	97	1.3
General education teachers	42	3.0
Paraprofessionals or instructional learning assistants	38	2.9
Reading specialists	13	2.0
Math specialists	8	1.6
Speech and language therapists/pathologists	62	2.9
School counselors	19	2.3
School psychologists	50	2.9
School or district nurse	8	1.6
Other	13	1.9
Number of district responses	**423**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported providing professional development to help promote the quality of the Individualized Education Program process for school-age children with disabilities (n=423). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D2).

Table 2.2.2.35. Topics on which districts provide written policies or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Developing standards-based IEPs	47	3.0
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	39	2.9
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	58	2.9
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	48	3.0
Engaging school staff (for example, general educators) in the IEP process	44	2.9
Engaging students in the IEP process	39	2.9
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	58	3.0
Other topics	8	1.7
None of the above	23	2.6
Number of district responses	**436**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D3).

Table 2.2.2.35a. Topics on which districts provide written policies or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Developing standards-based IEPs	47	3.0	45	3.3	60*	6.0
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	39	2.9	38	3.2	47	6.2
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	58	2.9	57	3.3	66	5.9
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	48	3.0	47	3.3	57	6.1
Engaging school staff (for example, general educators) in the IEP process	44	2.9	42	3.3	53	6.2
Engaging students in the IEP process	39	2.9	39	3.2	38	6.0
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	58	3.0	58	3.3	59	6.1
Other topics	8	1.7	7	1.8	13!	4.4
None of the above	23	2.6	24	2.9	16	4.5
Number of district responses	**436**		**332**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D3).

Table 2.2.2.35b. Topics on which districts provide written policies or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Developing standards-based IEPs	47	3.0	49	4.3	46	4.0
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	39	2.9	42	4.3	37	3.9
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	58	2.9	62	4.3	54	4.0
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	48	3.0	49	4.4	47	4.1
Engaging school staff (for example, general educators) in the IEP process	44	2.9	43	4.3	44	4.0
Engaging students in the IEP process	39	2.9	41	4.2	38	3.9
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	58	3.0	61	4.4	55	4.1
Other topics	8	1.7	9	2.7	7!	2.1
None of the above	23	2.6	20	3.8	25	3.6
Number of district responses	**436**		**215**		**221**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D3).

Table 2.2.2.35c. Topics on which districts provide written policies or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Developing standards-based IEPs	47	3.0	56	5.3	44	3.5
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	39	2.9	51	5.4	35*	3.4
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	58	2.9	68	5.0	55*	3.6
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	48	3.0	53	5.3	46	3.6
Engaging school staff (for example, general educators) in the IEP process	44	2.9	49	5.2	42	3.5
Engaging students in the IEP process	39	2.9	41	5.1	39	3.4
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	58	3.0	59	5.2	57	3.6
Other topics	8	1.7	8!	3.1	8	2.0
None of the above	23	2.6	21	4.3	24	3.2
Number of district responses	**436**		**154**		**282**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D3).

Table 2.2.2.36. Resources districts provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A mandated standards-based IEP form or template	41	2.8
A suggested standards-based IEP form or template	29	2.6
A rubric or other resource describing features of quality IEPs, including appropriately ambitious IEP goals	40	2.8
A coach, mentor, or IEP facilitator to assist with writing the IEP	59	2.9
A list of contact information for specialized instructional support personnel and/or intervention staff	34	2.7
Staff handbook or procedures manual with example IEPs	47	2.8
Other resources to promote the quality of IEPs	19	2.2
None of the above	8	1.6
Number of district responses	**437**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D4).

Table 2.2.2.36a. Resources districts provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A mandated standards-based IEP form or template	41	2.8	40	3.1	47	6.0
A suggested standards-based IEP form or template	29	2.6	28	2.9	36	5.7
A rubric or other resource describing features of quality IEPs, including appropriately ambitious IEP goals	40	2.8	40	3.1	43	5.9
A coach, mentor, or IEP facilitator to assist with writing the IEP	59	2.9	58	3.2	66	5.8
A list of contact information for specialized instructional support personnel and/or intervention staff	34	2.7	35	3.0	28	5.4
Staff handbook or procedures manual with example IEPs	47	2.8	47	3.1	45	6.0
Other resources to promote the quality of IEPs	19	2.2	20	2.5	13!	4.1
None of the above	8	1.6	8	1.8	.	.
Number of district responses	**437**		**333**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D4).

Table 2.2.2.36b. Resources districts provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A mandated standards-based IEP form or template	41	2.8	46	4.2	38	3.8
A suggested standards-based IEP form or template	29	2.6	26	3.7	31	3.7
A rubric or other resource describing features of quality IEPs, including appropriately ambitious IEP goals	40	2.8	42	4.1	39	3.9
A coach, mentor, or IEP facilitator to assist with writing the IEP	59	2.9	61	4.3	57	4.0
A list of contact information for specialized instructional support personnel and/or intervention staff	34	2.7	37	4.0	32	3.7
Staff handbook or procedures manual with example IEPs	47	2.8	55	4.2	39*	3.9
Other resources to promote the quality of IEPs	19	2.2	23	3.5	16	2.8
None of the above	8	1.6	5!	2.0	10	2.5
Number of district responses	**437**		**215**		**222**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D4).

Table 2.2.2.36c. Resources districts provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A mandated standards-based IEP form or template	41	2.8	53	5.4	37*	3.3
A suggested standards-based IEP form or template	29	2.6	29	4.6	29	3.1
A rubric or other resource describing features of quality IEPs, including appropriately ambitious IEP goals	40	2.8	44	4.8	39	3.4
A coach, mentor, or IEP facilitator to assist with writing the IEP	59	2.9	63	4.8	57	3.5
A list of contact information for specialized instructional support personnel and/or intervention staff	34	2.7	33	4.5	35	3.3
Staff handbook or procedures manual with example IEPs	47	2.8	47	5.0	47	3.4
Other resources to promote the quality of IEPs	19	2.2	25	4.5	17	2.5
None of the above	8	1.6	5!	2.0	9	2.1
Number of district responses	**437**		**155**		**282**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D4).

Table 2.2.2.37. Percentage of districts that use an early warning system to identify students with disabilities at risk of dropping out of school

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	45	2.8
Yes	55	2.8
Number of district responses	**435**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). An early warning system is based on student data and is used to help identify students who exhibit behavior or academic performance that puts them at risk of dropping out of school. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E1).

Table 2.2.2.37a. Percentage of districts that use an early warning system to identify students with disabilities at risk of dropping out of school, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	45	2.8	42	3.1	64*	5.8
Yes	55	2.8	58	3.1	36*	5.8
Number of district responses	**435**		**332**		**103**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). An early warning system is based on student data and is used to help identify students who exhibit behavior or academic performance that puts them at risk of dropping out of school. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E1).

Table 2.2.2.37b. Percentage of districts that use an early warning system to identify students with disabilities at risk of dropping out of school, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	45	2.8	35	3.9	53*	4.0
Yes	55	2.8	65	3.9	47*	4.0
Number of district responses	**435**		**215**		**220**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). An early warning system is based on student data and is used to help identify students who exhibit behavior or academic performance that puts them at risk of dropping out of school. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E1).

Table 2.2.2.37c. Percentage of districts that use an early warning system to identify students with disabilities at risk of dropping out of school, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	45	2.8	46	5.1	44	3.4
Yes	55	2.8	54	5.1	56	3.4
Number of district responses	**435**		**155**		**280**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). An early warning system is based on student data and is used to help identify students who exhibit behavior or academic performance that puts them at risk of dropping out of school. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E1).

Table 2.2.2.38. Percentage of districts whose early warning system indicators vary based on the disability category of the student

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	64	3.6
Yes	36	3.6
Number of district responses	**237**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported using an early warning system to identify students with disabilities who are at risk of dropping out of school (n=237). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E2).

Table 2.2.2.39. Ways in which districts use early warning system data to help students with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The data are used to identify students for participation in dropout prevention programs	40	3.8
The data are used to provide targeted interventions to children with IEPs	78	3.2
The data are used to monitor progress toward attainment of IEP goals	64	3.7
The data are used to inform professional development for educators about preventing dropout	30	3.5
Other	5	1.5
None of the above	2!	0.9
Number of district responses	**237**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported using an early warning system to identify students with disabilities who are at risk of dropping out of school (n=237). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E3).

Table 2.2.2.40. Percentage of districts with a dropout prevention program

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	63	2.6
Yes	37	2.6
Number of district responses	**435**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E4).

Table 2.2.2.40a. Percentage of districts with a dropout prevention program, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	63	2.6	60	2.9	81*	4.7
Yes	37	2.6	40	2.9	19*	4.7
Number of district responses	**435**		**332**		**103**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E4).

Table 2.2.2.40b. Percentage of districts with a dropout prevention program, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	63	2.6	48	4.1	76*	3.4
Yes	37	2.6	52	4.1	24*	3.4
Number of district responses	**435**		**216**		**219**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E4).

Table 2.2.2.40c. Percentage of districts with a dropout prevention program, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	63	2.6	70	4.2	60*	3.2
Yes	37	2.6	30	4.2	40*	3.2
Number of district responses	**435**		**155**		**280**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E4).

Table 2.2.2.41. Dropout prevention program strategies districts use to help students with and without disabilities who are at risk of dropping out

Response category	Percentage of districts that use this strategy for students with disabilities	Percentage of districts that use this strategy for students without disabilities	Percentage of districts that do not use this strategy as part of their dropout prevention program
Provide mentoring to students (SE)	85 (3.3)	81 (3.5)	15 (3.2)
Provide tutoring to students (SE)	90 (2.6)	87 (2.9)	10 (2.6)
Engage students in community service opportunities (SE)	72 (4.1)	68 (4.3)	28 (4.1)
Provide alternative or nontraditional schooling options, such as alternative times or environments (SE)	92 (2.4)	88 (2.8)	6! (2.2)
Offer career and technical education courses to students (SE)	92 (2.4)	92 (2.4)	8! (2.4)
Provide after-school enhancement programs (SE)	58 (4.5)	56 (4.5)	42 (4.5)
Provide summer enhancement programs (SE)	73 (4.0)	65 (4.2)	27 (4.0)
Provide individualized learning to allow students to move through courses at their own pace (SE)	92 (2.2)	83 (3.4)	7! (2.1)
Provide personalized learning tailored to the preferences and interests of students (SE)	78 (3.8)	68 (4.1)	22 (3.8)
Ensure a safe learning environment through the use of a comprehensive discipline plan or violence prevention plan (SE)	87 (2.9)	86 (3.1)	13 (2.9)
Engage families to help assess student needs and reduce absenteeism and truancy (SE)	94 (2.1)	93 (2.2)	5! (1.9)
Review attendance and tardiness data to determine any patterns related to poor attendance (SE)	97 (1.6)	97 (1.7)	.
Other (SE)	26 (3.6)	24 (3.5)	74 (3.6)
Number of district responses	**169**		

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having a dropout prevention program (n=169). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E5).

Table 2.2.2.42. Percentage of districts with an alternate diploma policy, standards-based and aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma, for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	50	2.9
Yes	50	2.9
Number of district responses	**432**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F1).

Table 2.2.2.42a. Percentage of districts with an alternate diploma policy, standards-based and aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma, for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	50	2.9	51	3.2	41	5.9
Yes	50	2.9	49	3.2	59	5.9
Number of district responses	**432**		**330**		**102**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F1).

Table 2.2.2.42b. Percentage of districts with an alternate diploma policy, standards-based and aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma, for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	50	2.9	52	4.2	47	4.1
Yes	50	2.9	48	4.2	53	4.1
Number of district responses	**432**		**214**		**218**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F1).

Table 2.2.2.42c. Percentage of districts with an alternate diploma policy, standards-based and aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma, for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	50	2.9	46	5.0	51	3.5
Yes	50	2.9	54	5.0	49	3.5
Number of district responses	**432**		**152**		**280**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F1).

Table 2.2.2.43. School entities or staff who decide whether a school-age child with disabilities is eligible for a state-defined alternate diploma

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
IEP team	81	3.6
Special education staff, not the full IEP team	.	.
Other school staff	.	.
District staff	13	3.0
State agency	.	.
Number of district responses	**223**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having a policy to offer an alternate diploma for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities that is standards-based and aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma (n=224). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F2).

Table 2.2.2.44. School entities or staff who decide whether a school-age child with disabilities has met the requirements for, and should be awarded, a state-defined alternate diploma

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
IEP team	73	3.9
Special education staff, not the full IEP team	3!	1.3
Other school staff	6!	1.8
District staff	17	3.5
State agency	.	.
Number of district responses	**222**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having a policy to offer an alternate diploma for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities that is standards-based and aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma (n=224). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F3).

Table 2.2.2.45. Percentage of districts whose requirements to earn an alternate diploma for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities exceed the requirements of the state-defined alternate diploma

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district's requirements to earn an alternate diploma are the same as the requirements of the state-defined alternate diploma	97	1.9
The district's requirements to earn an alternate diploma exceed the requirements of the state-defined alternate diploma	.	.
Number of district responses	**222**	

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having a policy to offer an alternate diploma for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities that is standards-based and aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma (n=224). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F4).

Table 2.2.2.46. Percentage of students with significant cognitive disabilities who earned a state-defined alternate diploma in the 2018-2019 school year

Response category	Mean	Standard error
Percent with significant cognitive disabilities who earned alternative diploma	14	2.8
Number of district responses	**185**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having a policy to offer an alternate diploma for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities that is standards-based and aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma (n=224). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Differences in the characteristics of responders and the full population of districts do not show evidence of potential nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F5).

Table 2.2.2.47. Supports districts provide to teachers using grade-level content to teach school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities working toward a state-defined alternate diploma

Response category	Percentage of districts that provide support to help teachers adapt curriculum with appropriate complexity and breadth, including incorporation of UDL principles	Percentage of districts that provide support to help teachers provide accommodations	Percentage of districts that provide support to help teachers manage student behavior	Percentage of districts that do not provide support through this mechanism
Training through a workshop, institute, or online module (SE)	63 (4.2)	66 (4.2)	56 (4.4)	25 (3.8)
Ongoing individualized support (such as consultation, coaching, or mentoring) (SE)	63 (4.2)	72 (4.1)	68 (4.1)	21 (3.8)
Ongoing group support (in the form of special education department meetings or community of practice/professional learning communities) (SE)	67 (4.1)	72 (3.9)	70 (4.0)	21 (3.6)
Release time (including common preparation periods and non-student days) to attend conferences and workshops outside of school (SE)	70 (3.8)	58 (4.4)	60 (4.1)	23 (3.6)
Other (SE)	10 (2.5)	8 (2.2)	7 (2.2)	89 (2.6)
Number of district responses	**223**			

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having a policy to offer an alternate diploma for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities that is standards-based and aligned with state requirements for the traditional high school diploma (n=224). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error; UDL = Universal Design for Learning.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question F6).

Table 2.2.2.48. Proportion of district staff working with preschool-age children who participated in professional development on standards-based Individualized Education Program development in the 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 school years

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
0 to 20 percent	42	3.3
21 to 40 percent	7	1.8
41 to 60 percent	7	1.7
61 to 80 percent	6	1.6
81 to 100 percent	38	3.3
Number of district responses	**317**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Respondents were asked to provide their best estimate. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C1).

Table 2.2.2.48a. Proportion of district staff working with preschool-age children who participated in professional development on standards-based Individualized Education Program development in the 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 school years, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
0 to 20 percent	42	3.3	41	3.4	60	14.9
21 to 40 percent	7	1.8	7	1.8	.	.
41 to 60 percent	7	1.7	7	1.7	.	.
61 to 80 percent	6	1.6	6	1.6	.	.
81 to 100 percent	38	3.3	39	3.4	.	.
Number of district responses	**317**		**293**		**24**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Respondents were asked to provide their best estimate. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C1).

Table 2.2.2.48b. Proportion of district staff working with preschool-age children who participated in professional development on standards-based Individualized Education Program development in the 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 school years, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
0 to 20 percent	42	3.3	35	4.2	49*	5.2
21 to 40 percent	7	1.8	10	2.8	5!	2.1
41 to 60 percent	7	1.7	7!	2.4	7!	2.4
61 to 80 percent	6	1.6	5!	1.6	8!	2.8
81 to 100 percent	38	3.3	43	4.5	31	5.0
Number of district responses	**317**		**191**		**126**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Respondents were asked to provide their best estimate. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C1).

Table 2.2.2.48c. Proportion of district staff working with preschool-age children who participated in professional development on standards-based Individualized Education Program development in the 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 school years, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
0 to 20 percent	42	3.3	46	6.5	41	3.8
21 to 40 percent	7	1.8	8!	3.8	7	2.0
41 to 60 percent	7	1.7	.	.	7	1.9
61 to 80 percent	6	1.6	4!	1.9	6	1.9
81 to 100 percent	38	3.3	35	6.2	39	3.8
Number of district responses	**317**		**89**		**228**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Respondents were asked to provide their best estimate. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C1).

Table 2.2.2.49. Topics covered in professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Developing standards-based IEPs	61	3.2
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	56	3.3
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	74	3.0
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	62	3.3
Engaging early childhood program staff (for example, Head Start or childcare staff) in the IEP process	46	3.4
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	72	3.0
Other professional development to promote the quality of IEPs	17	2.4
None of the above	10	2.1
Number of district responses	**319**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). For the purpose of this question, respondents were told professional development could occur either in person or online. A quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student. Standards-based IEPs are those that align goals for students with disabilities with the content and academic achievement standards that form the basis of each state's general education curriculum. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C2).

Table 2.2.2.49a. Topics covered in professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Developing standards-based IEPs	61	3.2	61	3.3	72	14.4
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	56	3.3	56	3.4	65	14.3
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	74	3.0	75	3.0	69	14.2
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	62	3.3	61	3.4	92*	6.2
Engaging early childhood program staff (for example, Head Start or childcare staff) in the IEP process	46	3.4	46	3.4	38!	14.6
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	72	3.0	72	3.1	81	11.5
Other professional development to promote the quality of IEPs	17	2.4	17	2.5	.	.
None of the above	10	2.1	10	2.2	.	.
Number of district responses	**319**		**295**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). For the purpose of this question, respondents were told professional development could occur either in person or online. A quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student. Standards-based IEPs are those that align goals for students with disabilities with the content and academic achievement standards that form the basis of each state's general education curriculum. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C2).

Table 2.2.2.49b. Topics covered in professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Developing standards-based IEPs	61	3.2	69	4.1	53*	5.1
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	56	3.3	61	4.3	51	5.2
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	74	3.0	79	3.7	69	4.8
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	62	3.3	66	4.3	57	5.2
Engaging early childhood program staff (for example, Head Start or childcare staff) in the IEP process	46	3.4	50	4.5	42	5.1
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	72	3.0	79	3.6	65*	5.0
Other professional development to promote the quality of IEPs	17	2.4	18	3.2	15	3.7
None of the above	10	2.1	6!	2.1	14	3.7
Number of district responses	**319**		**191**		**128**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). For the purpose of this question, respondents were told professional development could occur either in person or online. A quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student. Standards-based IEPs are those that align goals for students with disabilities with the content and academic achievement standards that form the basis of each state's general education curriculum. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C2).

Table 2.2.2.49c. Topics covered in professional development provided by districts to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Developing standards-based IEPs	61	3.2	60	6.6	62	3.6
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	56	3.3	59	6.2	56	3.9
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	74	3.0	74	6.1	75	3.4
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	62	3.3	69	6.3	60	3.8
Engaging early childhood program staff (for example, Head Start or childcare staff) in the IEP process	46	3.4	38	6.3	48	3.9
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	72	3.0	69	6.4	73	3.4
Other professional development to promote the quality of IEPs	17	2.4	19	4.2	16	2.8
None of the above	10	2.1	10!	4.7	10	2.3
Number of district responses	**319**		**88**		**231**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). For the purpose of this question, respondents were told professional development could occur either in person or online. A quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student. Standards-based IEPs are those that align goals for students with disabilities with the content and academic achievement standards that form the basis of each state's general education curriculum. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C2).

Table 2.2.2.50. Topics on which districts provide written policies or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Developing standards-based IEPs	47	3.3
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	37	3.2
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	54	3.3
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	55	3.4
Engaging early childhood program staff (for example, Head Start or childcare staff) in the IEP process	33	3.2
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	56	3.3
Other topics	7	1.6
None of the above	21	2.7
Number of district responses	**319**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C3).

Table 2.2.2.50a. Topics on which districts provide written policies or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Developing standards-based IEPs	47	3.3	47	3.3	49!	15.3
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	37	3.2	37	3.3	35!	14.4
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	54	3.3	54	3.4	56	15.2
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	55	3.4	55	3.4	48!	15.3
Engaging early childhood program staff (for example, Head Start or childcare staff) in the IEP process	33	3.2	34	3.3	.	.
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	56	3.3	56	3.4	46!	15.3
Other topics	7	1.6	7	1.6	0*	.
None of the above	21	2.7	21	2.8	.	.
Number of district responses	**319**		**295**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C3).

Table 2.2.2.50b. Topics on which districts provide written policies or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Developing standards-based IEPs	47	3.3	51	4.2	43	5.1
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	37	3.2	41	4.3	33	4.9
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	54	3.3	57	4.3	50	5.2
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	55	3.4	55	4.4	54	5.1
Engaging early childhood program staff (for example, Head Start or childcare staff) in the IEP process	33	3.2	36	4.2	30	4.8
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	56	3.3	57	4.4	54	5.1
Other topics	7	1.6	8	2.3	5!	2.1
None of the above	21	2.7	20	3.4	22	4.3
Number of district responses	**319**		**191**		**128**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C3).

Table 2.2.2.50c. Topics on which districts provide written policies or guidelines to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Developing standards-based IEPs	47	3.3	41	6.0	48	3.8
Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals	37	3.2	33	5.6	38	3.8
Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals	54	3.3	57	6.3	53	3.9
Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process	55	3.4	58	6.6	54	3.9
Engaging early childhood program staff (for example, Head Start or childcare staff) in the IEP process	33	3.2	27	6.0	35	3.7
Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data	56	3.3	49	6.6	57	3.8
Other topics	7	1.6	9!	3.5	6	1.8
None of the above	21	2.7	21	5.5	21	3.1
Number of district responses	**319**		**88**		**231**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C3).

Table 2.2.2.51. Resources districts provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A mandated standards-based IEP form or template	50	3.4
A suggested standards-based IEP form or template	22	2.8
A rubric or other resource describing features of quality IEPs, including appropriately ambitious IEP goals	33	3.2
A coach, mentor, or IEP facilitator to assist with writing the IEP	56	3.3
A list of contact information for specialized instructional support personnel and/or intervention staff	30	3.1
Staff handbook or procedures manual with example IEPs	44	3.3
Other resources to promote the quality of IEPs	13	2.1
None of the above	10	2.2
Number of district responses	**319**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C4).

Table 2.2.2.51a. Resources districts provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A mandated standards-based IEP form or template	50	3.4	51	3.4	48!	15.3
A suggested standards-based IEP form or template	22	2.8	22	2.8	.	.
A rubric or other resource describing features of quality IEPs, including appropriately ambitious IEP goals	33	3.2	33	3.2	33!	14.4
A coach, mentor, or IEP facilitator to assist with writing the IEP	56	3.3	56	3.4	37!	14.4
A list of contact information for specialized instructional support personnel and/or intervention staff	30	3.1	31	3.2	.	.
Staff handbook or procedures manual with example IEPs	44	3.3	44	3.4	52	15.2
Other resources to promote the quality of IEPs	13	2.1	13	2.1	.	.
None of the above	10	2.2	10	2.2	.	.
Number of district responses	**319**		**295**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C4).

Table 2.2.2.51b. Resources districts provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A mandated standards-based IEP form or template	50	3.4	53	4.5	48	5.1
A suggested standards-based IEP form or template	22	2.8	22	3.6	21	4.3
A rubric or other resource describing features of quality IEPs, including appropriately ambitious IEP goals	33	3.2	39	4.4	27	4.6
A coach, mentor, or IEP facilitator to assist with writing the IEP	56	3.3	60	4.3	51	5.2
A list of contact information for specialized instructional support personnel and/or intervention staff	30	3.1	33	4.2	26	4.6
Staff handbook or procedures manual with example IEPs	44	3.3	50	4.4	38	5.0
Other resources to promote the quality of IEPs	13	2.1	14	2.8	12	3.1
None of the above	10	2.2	7!	2.5	13	3.7
Number of district responses	**319**		**191**		**128**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C4).

Table 2.2.2.51c. Resources districts provide to promote Individualized Education Program process quality for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A mandated standards-based IEP form or template	50	3.4	53	6.7	50	3.9
A suggested standards-based IEP form or template	22	2.8	13	3.7	24*	3.3
A rubric or other resource describing features of quality IEPs, including appropriately ambitious IEP goals	33	3.2	26	5.6	35	3.7
A coach, mentor, or IEP facilitator to assist with writing the IEP	56	3.3	51	6.2	57	3.9
A list of contact information for specialized instructional support personnel and/or intervention staff	30	3.1	29	5.8	30	3.6
Staff handbook or procedures manual with example IEPs	44	3.3	42	6.2	45	3.8
Other resources to promote the quality of IEPs	13	2.1	21	5.2	11	2.3
None of the above	10	2.2	15!	5.4	9	2.4
Number of district responses	**319**		**89**		**230**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question C4).

Table 2.2.2.52. Methods and actions school staff take to ensure quality Individualized Education Programs

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Facilitate school staff attendance and participation in IEP meetings	98	0.6
Facilitate attendance and participation of staff from agencies outside the district in IEP meetings	72	2.5
Monitor the development of appropriately ambitious goals, as documented in an IEP	88	1.7
Monitor the services and supports specified in the IEP	95	1.1
Periodic review of completed IEPs	86	1.3
Facilitate student attendance and participation in IEP meetings	61	2.4
Include the student's general education teacher(s) on the IEP team	98	0.6
Meet with students prior to the IEP meeting to discuss how they can participate in the meeting	39	2.2
Meet with students to discuss strengths, interests, preferences, or any concerns the student may have to inform IEP development	62	2.4
Meet with students to discuss their progress, goals, current functioning, or academic performance to inform IEP development	63	2.3
Discuss student satisfaction with goals and supports in previous IEP	40	2.1
Discuss student progress, current functioning, or academic performance with parents/guardians to inform IEP development	91	1.1
Facilitate parent/guardian attendance and participation in IEP meetings	97	0.6
Provide parents/guardians with materials in advance of the IEP meeting, such as current academic performance or assessment data	73	1.9
Meet with parents/guardians prior to the IEP meeting to discuss how they can participate in the meeting	39	2.3
Discuss parent/guardian satisfaction with goals and supports in previous IEP	77	1.7
Do not do any of the above	.	.
Number of school responses	**1,366**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). A quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B1).

Table 2.2.2.52a. Methods and actions school staff take to ensure quality Individualized Education Programs, by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Facilitate school staff attendance and participation in IEP meetings	98	0.6	98	0.6	98	1.2	97	1.5
Facilitate attendance and participation of staff from agencies outside the district in IEP meetings	72	2.5	72	2.7	78	3.5	67	4.3
Monitor the development of appropriately ambitious goals, as documented in an IEP	88	1.7	88	1.8	90	3.0	92	2.5
Monitor the services and supports specified in the IEP	95	1.1	95	1.2	96	1.6	98	1.1
Periodic review of completed IEPs	86	1.3	86	1.4	81	3.2	87	3.1
Facilitate student attendance and participation in IEP meetings	61	2.4	61	2.6	67	4.0	68	4.2
Include the student's general education teacher(s) on the IEP team	98	0.6	98	0.6	97	1.7	100*	0.2
Meet with students prior to the IEP meeting to discuss how they can participate in the meeting	39	2.2	39	2.4	48	4.3	48	4.5
Meet with students to discuss strengths, interests, preferences, or any concerns the student may have to inform IEP development	62	2.4	62	2.5	74*	3.8	68	4.2
Meet with students to discuss their progress, goals, current functioning, or academic performance to inform IEP development	63	2.3	63	2.4	69	4.1	64	4.4
Discuss student satisfaction with goals and supports in previous IEP	40	2.1	40	2.3	42	3.8	50*	4.4
Discuss student progress, current functioning, or academic performance with parents/guardians to inform IEP development	91	1.1	91	1.1	88	3.1	92	2.4
Facilitate parent/guardian attendance and participation in IEP meetings	97	0.6	97	0.7	95	1.8	98	1.2
Provide parents/guardians with materials in advance of the IEP meeting, such as current academic performance or assessment data	73	1.9	72	2.0	71	4.1	83*	3.3
Meet with parents/guardians prior to the IEP meeting to discuss how they can participate in the meeting	39	2.3	39	2.4	39	4.1	43	4.3
Discuss parent/guardian satisfaction with goals and supports in previous IEP	77	1.7	77	1.8	74	4.2	82	3.5
Do not do any of the above	.	.	.	.	0	.	0	.
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**977**		**178**		**211**	

Table 2.2.2.52a. Methods and actions school staff take to ensure quality Individualized Education Programs, by school type (continued)

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional schools (p < .05).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). A quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B1).

Table 2.2.2.52b. Methods and actions school staff take to ensure quality Individualized Education Programs, by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Facilitate school staff attendance and participation in IEP meetings	98	0.6	98	0.8	98	0.7
Facilitate attendance and participation of staff from agencies outside the district in IEP meetings	72	2.5	67	4.7	76	2.1
Monitor the development of appropriately ambitious goals, as documented in an IEP	88	1.7	87	3.2	89	1.6
Monitor the services and supports specified in the IEP	95	1.1	95	2.1	96	1.0
Periodic review of completed IEPs	86	1.3	85	2.1	86	1.7
Facilitate student attendance and participation in IEP meetings	61	2.4	56	4.4	65	2.2
Include the student's general education teacher(s) on the IEP team	98	0.6	98	1.0	98	0.6
Meet with students prior to the IEP meeting to discuss how they can participate in the meeting	39	2.2	34	3.7	44*	2.5
Meet with students to discuss strengths, interests, preferences, or any concerns the student may have to inform IEP development	62	2.4	55	4.2	68*	2.3
Meet with students to discuss their progress, goals, current functioning, or academic performance to inform IEP development	63	2.3	56	4.0	68*	2.2
Discuss student satisfaction with goals and supports in previous IEP	40	2.1	38	3.7	42	2.4
Discuss student progress, current functioning, or academic performance with parents/guardians to inform IEP development	91	1.1	93	1.4	90	1.5
Facilitate parent/guardian attendance and participation in IEP meetings	97	0.6	98	1.0	97	0.8
Provide parents/guardians with materials in advance of the IEP meeting, such as current academic performance or assessment data	73	1.9	72	3.2	73	2.2
Meet with parents/guardians prior to the IEP meeting to discuss how they can participate in the meeting	39	2.3	37	4.2	41	2.4
Discuss parent/guardian satisfaction with goals and supports in previous IEP	77	1.7	76	3.0	78	1.9
Do not do any of the above	.	.	0	.	.	.
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**656**		**710**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). A quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B1).

Table 2.2.2.52c. Methods and actions school staff take to ensure quality Individualized Education Programs, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response category	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Facilitate school staff attendance and participation in IEP meetings	98	0.6	98	0.7	98	0.8
Facilitate attendance and participation of staff from agencies outside the district in IEP meetings	72	2.5	72	2.5	71	4.6
Monitor the development of appropriately ambitious goals, as documented in an IEP	88	1.7	89	1.7	87	2.9
Monitor the services and supports specified in the IEP	95	1.1	96	1.1	94	1.7
Periodic review of completed IEPs	86	1.3	85	1.8	87	2.1
Facilitate student attendance and participation in IEP meetings	61	2.4	62	2.9	60	4.0
Include the student's general education teacher(s) on the IEP team	98	0.6	98	0.7	97	0.9
Meet with students prior to the IEP meeting to discuss how they can participate in the meeting	39	2.2	42	2.7	36	3.4
Meet with students to discuss strengths, interests, preferences, or any concerns the student may have to inform IEP development	62	2.4	64	2.6	59	4.1
Meet with students to discuss their progress, goals, current functioning, or academic performance to inform IEP development	63	2.3	65	2.6	60	3.6
Discuss student satisfaction with goals and supports in previous IEP	40	2.1	41	2.5	40	3.4
Discuss student progress, current functioning, or academic performance with parents/guardians to inform IEP development	91	1.1	91	1.4	92	1.8
Facilitate parent/guardian attendance and participation in IEP meetings	97	0.6	98	0.6	96	1.2
Provide parents/guardians with materials in advance of the IEP meeting, such as current academic performance or assessment data	73	1.9	71	2.3	75	2.9
Meet with parents/guardians prior to the IEP meeting to discuss how they can participate in the meeting	39	2.3	38	2.4	41	4.0
Discuss parent/guardian satisfaction with goals and supports in previous IEP	77	1.7	75	2.3	80	2.7
Do not do any of the above	.	.	.	.	.	.
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**819**		**526**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). A quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B1).

Table 2.2.2.53. Factors schools consider when determining an appropriately ambitious goal for a student

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
College/career readiness skills	56	2.0
Results of standardized tests to measure intelligence	82	1.7
Results of standardized academic achievement tests	94	0.9
Results of curriculum-based tests	91	1.1
Results of other assessments	86	1.5
Information from student interviews, such as the student's strengths, interests, or preferences	71	1.8
Information from parent/guardian interviews, such as parent's/guardian's goals or aspirations for their child	82	1.6
Portfolio of current student work	62	1.9
Progress monitoring data on prior goals	91	1.2
Academic checklists (non-standardized)	42	1.8
Checklists or other assessment of behavior or social-emotional development	75	1.7
Checklists or other assessment of functional skills	67	1.8
Checklists or other assessment of transition planning	50	2.0
Number of school responses	**1,366**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Respondents were asked to include assessments that were used to determine eligibility for special education and related services when selecting from the list of options. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B3).

Table 2.2.2.53a. Factors schools consider when determining an appropriately ambitious goal for a student, by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
College/career readiness skills	56	2.0	56	2.1	52	4.4	52	4.5
Results of standardized tests to measure intelligence	82	1.7	82	1.8	76	3.8	83	3.6
Results of standardized academic achievement tests	94	0.9	94	0.9	88*	2.8	93	2.3
Results of curriculum-based tests	91	1.1	91	1.2	88	2.8	90	2.6
Results of other assessments	86	1.5	86	1.5	81	4.4	85	3.2
Information from student interviews, such as the student's strengths, interests, or preferences	71	1.8	70	1.9	72	3.9	73	4.0
Information from parent/guardian interviews, such as parent's/guardian's goals or aspirations for their child	82	1.6	82	1.7	81	3.2	88	2.9
Portfolio of current student work	62	1.9	63	2.0	56	4.1	63	4.4
Progress monitoring data on prior goals	91	1.2	91	1.3	92	2.2	95	2.0
Academic checklists (non-standardized)	42	1.8	42	1.9	42	4.5	48	4.4
Checklists or other assessment of behavior or social-emotional development	75	1.7	75	1.8	71	4.4	76	3.7
Checklists or other assessment of functional skills	67	1.8	67	1.9	60	4.3	65	4.2
Checklists or other assessment of transition planning	50	2.0	50	2.1	51	4.5	56	4.4
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**977**		**178**		**211**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Respondents were asked to include assessments that were used to determine eligibility for special education and related services when selecting from the list of options. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B3).

Table 2.2.2.53b. Factors schools consider when determining an appropriately ambitious goal for a student, by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
College/career readiness skills	56	2.0	50	3.2	61*	2.3
Results of standardized tests to measure intelligence	82	1.7	84	2.7	80	2.0
Results of standardized academic achievement tests	94	0.9	95	1.5	93	1.0
Results of curriculum-based tests	91	1.1	90	2.0	92	1.2
Results of other assessments	86	1.5	85	2.6	87	1.5
Information from student interviews, such as the student's strengths, interests, or preferences	71	1.8	67	2.9	74*	2.0
Information from parent/guardian interviews, such as parent's/guardian's goals or aspirations for their child	82	1.6	79	3.0	85	1.6
Portfolio of current student work	62	1.9	63	3.2	62	2.3
Progress monitoring data on prior goals	91	1.2	92	1.8	90	1.5
Academic checklists (non-standardized)	42	1.8	40	2.9	44	2.4
Checklists or other assessment of behavior or social-emotional development	75	1.7	72	2.9	77	1.9
Checklists or other assessment of functional skills	67	1.8	67	3.1	68	2.1
Checklists or other assessment of transition planning	50	2.0	46	3.2	53	2.4
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**656**		**710**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Respondents were asked to include assessments that were used to determine eligibility for special education and related services when selecting from the list of options. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B3).

Table 2.2.2.53c. Factors schools consider when determining an appropriately ambitious goal for a student, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response category	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
College/career readiness skills	56	2.0	58	2.6	53	3.0
Results of standardized tests to measure intelligence	82	1.7	83	1.9	81	2.8
Results of standardized academic achievement tests	94	0.9	94	1.1	95	1.5
Results of curriculum-based tests	91	1.1	91	1.3	91	2.0
Results of other assessments	86	1.5	86	1.8	87	2.7
Information from student interviews, such as the student's strengths, interests, or preferences	71	1.8	71	2.4	71	2.4
Information from parent/guardian interviews, such as parent's/guardian's goals or aspirations for their child	82	1.6	82	2.1	82	2.5
Portfolio of current student work	62	1.9	64	2.6	61	2.6
Progress monitoring data on prior goals	91	1.2	93	1.3	88*	2.2
Academic checklists (non-standardized)	42	1.8	41	2.6	43	2.8
Checklists or other assessment of behavior or social-emotional development	75	1.7	74	2.3	75	2.5
Checklists or other assessment of functional skills	67	1.8	67	2.5	68	2.8
Checklists or other assessment of transition planning	50	2.0	50	2.6	50	2.9
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**819**		**526**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for schools eligible for Title I ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Respondents were asked to include assessments that were used to determine eligibility for special education and related services when selecting from the list of options. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B3).

Table 2.2.2.54. Percentage of schools with personnel who received professional development on setting or monitoring appropriately ambitious goals in Individualized Education Programs in the 2018–2019 school year

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
On setting appropriately ambitious IEP goals	64	2.2
On monitoring appropriately ambitious goals	55	2.1
School personnel did not receive this professional development	29	1.9
Number of school responses	**1,366**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). For the purpose of this question, respondents were told that professional development could be provided by their state, school district, school, or an outside agency. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B4).

Table 2.2.2.54a. Percentage of schools with personnel who received professional development on setting or monitoring appropriately ambitious goals in Individualized Education Programs in the 2018–2019 school year, by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
On setting appropriately ambitious IEP goals	64	2.2	64	2.3	65	4.0	69	4.2
On monitoring appropriately ambitious goals	55	2.1	55	2.3	54	4.4	65*	4.2
School personnel did not receive this professional development	29	1.9	29	2.0	30	3.7	23	3.8
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**977**		**178**		**211**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). For the purpose of this question, respondents were told that professional development could be provided by their state, school district, school, or an outside agency. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B4).

Table 2.2.2.54b. Percentage of schools with personnel who received professional development on setting or monitoring appropriately ambitious goals in Individualized Education Programs in the 2018–2019 school year, by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
On setting appropriately ambitious IEP goals	64	2.2	65	3.7	63	2.4
On monitoring appropriately ambitious goals	55	2.1	58	3.6	52	2.4
School personnel did not receive this professional development	29	1.9	27	3.1	31	2.2
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**656**		**710**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). For the purpose of this question, respondents were told that professional development could be provided by their state, school district, school, or an outside agency. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B4).

Table 2.2.2.54c. Percentage of schools with personnel who received professional development on setting or monitoring appropriately ambitious goals in Individualized Education Programs in the 2018–2019 school year, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response category	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
On setting appropriately ambitious IEP goals	64	2.2	64	2.5	65	3.4
On monitoring appropriately ambitious goals	55	2.1	54	2.6	56	3.4
School personnel did not receive this professional development	29	1.9	29	2.4	29	2.8
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**819**		**526**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). For the purpose of this question, respondents were told that professional development could be provided by their state, school district, school, or an outside agency. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B4).

Table 2.2.2.55. Frequency with which staff from an outside agency are consulted when writing Individualized Education Programs for prekindergarten students with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
An outside agency is often consulted when writing IEPs	20	2.6
An outside agency is sometimes consulted when writing IEPs	55	3.0
An outside agency is never consulted when writing IEPs	25	2.7
Number of school responses	**517**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering prekindergarten (n=522). Outside agencies include agencies such as social services, Head Start, and other community-based child care programs. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B5).

Table 2.2.2.56. Percentage of schools that have a dropout prevention program

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
No	58	3.5
Yes	42	3.5
Number of school responses	**451**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade (n=454). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question C3).

Table 2.2.2.57. Dropout prevention program strategies schools use to help students with and without disabilities who are at risk of dropping out

Response category	Percentage of schools that use this strategy for students with disabilities	Percentage of schools that use this strategy for students without disabilities	Percentage of schools that do not use this strategy in their dropout prevention program
Provide mentoring to students (SE)	82 (4.5)	79 (4.6)	18 (4.5)
Provide tutoring to students (SE)	91 (2.6)	90 (2.8)	9! (2.6)
Engage students in community service opportunities (SE)	79 (4.2)	79 (4.3)	20 (4.1)
Provide alternative or non-traditional schooling options, such as alternative times or environments (SE)	76 (5.7)	75 (5.7)	22 (5.7)
Offer career and technical education courses to students (SE)	91 (2.2)	92 (2.1)	7 (2.0)
Provide after-school enhancement programs (SE)	63 (4.7)	63 (4.7)	37 (4.7)
Provide summer enhancement programs (SE)	63 (4.7)	61 (4.9)	36 (4.6)
Provide individualized learning to allow students to move through courses at their own pace (SE)	90 (2.4)	84 (2.9)	7 (2.0)
Provide personalized learning tailored to the preferences and interests of students (SE)	85 (4.8)	73 (5.6)	14! (4.8)
Ensure a safe learning environment through the use of a comprehensive discipline plan or violence prevention plan (SE)	95 (1.7)	94 (2.1)	4! (1.6)
Engage families to help assess student needs and reduce absenteeism and truancy (SE)	97 (1.4)	96 (1.6)	.
Review attendance and tardiness data to determine any patterns related to poor attendance (SE)	97 (1.5)	97 (1.3)	.
Other (SE)	18 (3.3)	18 (3.3)	82 (3.3)
Number of school responses	**198**		

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported having a dropout prevention program (n=199). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question C4).

Table 2.2.2.58. Percentage of schools that require participation in dropout prevention programs from students with disabilities who are identified as at risk of dropping out

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
No	62	5.0
Yes	38	5.0
Number of school responses	**198**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported having a dropout prevention program (n=199). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question C5).

2.2.3. Individualized plans to meet challenging objectives: Monitoring progress

Table 2.2.3.1. Ways in which state agencies monitor Individualized Education Program goals established by public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Reviews data from state data system (for example, data on planned and delivered IEP services)	15	2
Conducts on-site monitoring visits of public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district	19	1
Reviews a selection of IEPs from public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district	22	0
Surveys parents/guardians in public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district about IEP goals or services	15	0
Other	0	0
None of the above	2	0
Number of responses	**30**	**2**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having public charter schools that are part of traditional school districts (states: n=30; entities: n=2). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E5).

Table 2.2.3.2. Ways in which state agencies monitor Individualized Education Program goals established by public charter schools that are their own school district

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Reviews data from state data system (for example, data on planned and delivered IEP services)	16	0
Conducts on-site monitoring visits of public charter schools that are their own school district	27	0
Reviews a selection of IEPs from public charter schools that are their own school district	25	0
Surveys parents/guardians in public charter schools that are their own school district about IEP goals or services	19	0
Other	2	0
None of the above	1	0
Number of responses	**32**	**0**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having public charter schools that are their own school districts (states: n=32; entities: n=0). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
IEP = Individualized Education Program.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E7).

Table 2.2.3.3. Ways in which state agencies monitor Individualized Education Program goals established by public virtual schools

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Reviews data from state data system (for example, data on planned and delivered IEP services)	21	0
Conducts on-site monitoring visits of public virtual schools	26	0
Reviews a selection of IEPs from public virtual schools	27	0
Surveys parents/guardians in public virtual schools about IEP goals or services	20	0
Other	5	0
None of the above	2	0
Number of responses	**38**	**0**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having public virtual schools (states: n=38; entities: n=0). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E9).

Table 2.2.3.4. Ways in which state agencies monitor local programs to ensure Individualized Education Program teams identify appropriate goals

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Review data from state data system (for example, data on planned and delivered IEP services)	22	6
Conducts on-site monitoring visits of school districts and preschool programs	39	9
Reviews a selection of IEPs from school districts	38	8
Surveys parents/guardians about IEP goals or services	22	7
Other	6	1
None of the above	2	0
Number of responses	**49**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D8).

Table 2.2.3.5. Ways in which state agencies monitor local programs to ensure appropriate service decisions are delivered in accordance with the Individualized Education Program

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Review data from state data system (for example, data on planned and delivered IEP services)	22	6
Conducts on-site monitoring visits at school districts (for example, stakeholder interviews or observation of IEP meetings)	36	9
Reviews a selection of IEPs from school districts	37	8
Surveys parents/guardians about IEP goals and services	19	7
Other	4	1
None of the above	4	0
Number of responses	**49**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D9).

Table 2.2.3.6. Number of states with public charter preschools

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Have charter preschools that are part of traditional school districts	10	1
Have charter preschools that are part of their own school district	18	1
Do not have public charter preschools	27	7
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D10).

Table 2.2.3.7. Methods lead agencies use to monitor local early intervention programs to ensure Individualized Family Service Plan teams appropriately identify outcomes

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Reviews data from state data system (for example, data on planned and delivered IFSP services)	39	4
Conducts on-site monitoring visits of local early intervention providers (for example, stakeholder interviews or observation of IFSP meetings)	36	4
Reviews a selection of IFSPs from local early intervention providers	40	3
Surveys parents/guardians about IFSP outcomes or services	24	4
Other	7	0
None of the above	2	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IFSP = Individualized Family Service Plan.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question C8).

Table 2.2.3.8. Methods lead agencies use to monitor local early intervention programs to ensure service decisions are delivered in accordance with the Individualized Family Service Plan

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Reviews data from state data system (for example, data on planned and delivered IFSP services)	36	5
Conducts on-site monitoring visits of local early intervention providers (for example, stakeholder interviews or observation of IFSP meetings)	33	4
Reviews a selection of IFSPs from local early intervention providers	35	3
Surveys parents/guardians about IFSP outcomes or services	23	3
Other	7	0
None of the above	1	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IFSP = Individualized Family Service Plan.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question C9).

Table 2.2.3.9. Percentage of districts with processes to assess Individualized Education Program quality

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	20	2.3
Yes	73	2.5
Don't know	7	1.5
Number of district responses	**438**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D6).

Table 2.2.3.9a. Percentage of districts with processes to assess Individualized Education Program quality, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	20	2.3	21	2.6	15	4.1
Yes	73	2.5	73	2.8	76	5.2
Don't know	7	1.5	7	1.7	9!	3.7
Number of district responses	**438**		**334**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D6).

Table 2.2.3.9b. Percentage of districts with processes to assess Individualized Education Program quality, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	20	2.3	16	3.1	23	3.4
Yes	73	2.5	81	3.4	66*	3.7
Don't know	7	1.5	.	.	11	2.5
Number of district responses	**438**		**216**		**222**	

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D6).

Table 2.2.3.9c. Percentage of districts with processes to assess Individualized Education Program quality, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	20	2.3	13	3.2	22*	2.9
Yes	73	2.5	82	3.7	70*	3.1
Don't know	7	1.5	5!	2.0	8	1.9
Number of district responses	**438**		**155**		**283**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D6).

Table 2.2.3.10. Approaches districts use to assess Individualized Education Program quality

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Periodic review of completed IEPs	97	1.1
Interview students about IEP goals and supports	17	2.8
Interview teachers about IEP goals and supports	37	3.5
Interview parents/guardians about IEP goals and supports	28	3.3
Interview administrators about IEP provisions	18	2.7
Monitor the services and supports specified in the IEP	78	3.1
Monitor participation rates of parents/guardians in IEP meetings	40	3.5
Monitor participation rates of students in IEP meetings	30	3.3
Monitor participation rates of district and school staff in IEP meetings	38	3.5
Monitor participation rates of staff from agencies outside the district in IEP meetings	22	2.8
Monitor academic outcomes of students with an IEP	71	3.2
Monitor disciplinary actions of students with an IEP	66	3.5
Monitor the development of appropriately ambitious goals, as documented in an IEP	47	3.5
Number of district responses	**327**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having a process to assess the quality of Individualized Education Programs (n=327). A quality Individualized Education Program (IEP) is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student. Appropriately ambitious goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D7).

Table 2.2.3.11. Information schools collect to assess Individualized Education Program quality for students with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Records of IEP meeting attendees to ensure there is appropriate representation of all key parties	88	1.6
Formal assessment of the quality of some or all IEPs based on a checklist or rubric	55	2.0
Formal assessment of goals in some or all IEPs to ensure they are appropriately ambitious	61	2.2
Interviews or surveys of teachers about IEP goals and supports	59	2.2
Interviews or surveys of students about IEP goals and supports	34	2.2
Interviews or surveys of parents/guardians about IEP goals and supports	52	2.0
Academic outcomes of students with an IEP to monitor alignment with IEP goals and supports	83	1.7
Disciplinary records of students to ensure IEP includes relevant supports	75	1.8
Other	4	0.6
Review IEPs to assess their quality, but do not collect any additional information as part of that review	4	1.0
Number of school responses	**1,366**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B2).

Table 2.2.3.11a. Information schools collect to assess Individualized Education Program quality for students with disabilities, by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Records of IEP meeting attendees to ensure there is appropriate representation of all key parties	88	1.6	88	1.7	94*	2.1	87	3.1
Formal assessment of the quality of some or all IEPs based on a checklist or rubric	55	2.0	55	2.1	60	4.1	60	4.4
Formal assessment of goals in some or all IEPs to ensure they are appropriately ambitious	61	2.2	60	2.3	64	4.1	71*	4.0
Interviews or surveys of teachers about IEP goals and supports	59	2.2	59	2.4	61	4.3	54	4.5
Interviews or surveys of students about IEP goals and supports	34	2.2	34	2.3	38	3.8	39	4.3
Interviews or surveys of parents/guardians about IEP goals and supports	52	2.0	52	2.1	49	4.4	58	4.4
Academic outcomes of students with an IEP to monitor alignment with IEP goals and supports	83	1.7	83	1.8	89*	2.4	87	3.2
Disciplinary records of students to ensure IEP includes relevant supports	75	1.8	75	1.9	81	2.9	75	4.0
Other	4	0.6	4	0.6	5!	1.6	5!	2.0
Review IEPs to assess their quality, but do not collect any additional information as part of that review	4	1.0	4	1.1	.	.	5!	2.1
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**977**		**178**		**211**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B2).

Table 2.2.3.11b. Information schools collect to assess Individualized Education Program quality for students with disabilities, by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Records of IEP meeting attendees to ensure there is appropriate representation of all key parties	88	1.6	87	2.9	89	1.5
Formal assessment of the quality of some or all IEPs based on a checklist or rubric	55	2.0	54	3.2	56	2.4
Formal assessment of goals in some or all IEPs to ensure they are appropriately ambitious	61	2.2	59	4.0	62	2.3
Interviews or surveys of teachers about IEP goals and supports	59	2.2	59	4.0	59	2.4
Interviews or surveys of students about IEP goals and supports	34	2.2	32	3.7	37	2.4
Interviews or surveys of parents/guardians about IEP goals and supports	52	2.0	47	3.1	56*	2.4
Academic outcomes of students with an IEP to monitor alignment with IEP goals and supports	83	1.7	82	3.1	84	1.8
Disciplinary records of students to ensure IEP includes relevant supports	75	1.8	73	3.0	77	2.0
Other	4	0.6	3	0.8	5	0.9
Review IEPs to assess their quality, but do not collect any additional information as part of that review	4	1.0	5!	2.1	4	0.7
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**656**		**710**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B2).

Table 2.2.3.11c. Information schools collect to assess Individualized Education Program quality for students with disabilities, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response category	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Records of IEP meeting attendees to ensure there is appropriate representation of all key parties	88	1.6	86	2.3	91*	1.6
Formal assessment of the quality of some or all IEPs based on a checklist or rubric	55	2.0	57	2.7	54	3.0
Formal assessment of goals in some or all IEPs to ensure they are appropriately ambitious	61	2.2	62	2.8	59	3.2
Interviews or surveys of teachers about IEP goals and supports	59	2.2	56	2.7	62	3.4
Interviews or surveys of students about IEP goals and supports	34	2.2	35	2.6	34	3.7
Interviews or surveys of parents/guardians about IEP goals and supports	52	2.0	51	2.5	54	3.0
Academic outcomes of students with an IEP to monitor alignment with IEP goals and supports	83	1.7	83	2.1	83	2.6
Disciplinary records of students to ensure IEP includes relevant supports	75	1.8	76	2.4	74	2.6
Other	4	0.6	4	0.8	4	1.0
Review IEPs to assess their quality, but do not collect any additional information as part of that review	4	1.0	5!	1.7	3	0.8
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**819**		**526**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for schools eligible for Title I ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question B2).

Table 2.2.3.12. Percentage of schools that use an early warning system to identify students with disabilities who are at risk of dropping out of school

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Use an early warning system	40	3.4
Discuss students who are at risk of dropping out of school, but do not use an early warning system	51	3.5
Do not use an early warning system or discuss students who are at risk of dropping out of school	9	2.4
Number of school responses	**452**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade (n=454). An early warning system is based on student data and is used to help identify students who exhibit behavior or academic performance that puts them at risk of dropping out of school. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question C1).

Table 2.2.3.13. Ways in which schools use early warning system data to help students with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
The data are used to identify students for participation in dropout prevention programs	60	4.7
The data are used to provide targeted interventions to students with IEPs	91	4.1
The data are used to monitor progress toward attainment of IEP goals	75	4.4
The data are used to inform professional development for educators about preventing dropout	45	4.7
Other	16!	5.3
None of the above	.	.
Number of school responses	**201**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported using an early warning system to identify students with disabilities who are at risk of dropping out of school (n=201). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question C2).

2.3.1. Access to general education programs and supports: Environment and significant disproportionality in placement

Table 2.3.1.1. Actions state agencies take when a district is required to address significant disproportionality in placement (least restrictive environment)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Develops or works with district to develop a specific plan for the district to follow to address significant disproportionality in placement	37	1
Reviews and approves a district-developed plan	42	0
Reviews or revises (if appropriate) policies, practices, and procedures	40	1
Provides or arranges training for the district	39	2
Provides or arranges technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for the district	40	2
Provides additional (beyond the 15% required by Part B) targeted monetary or staff resources to the district	6	0
Recommends focusing funds on elementary schools	4	0
Recommends focusing funds on middle schools	4	0
Recommends focusing funds on high schools	4	0
Recommends focusing funds on specific interventions	4	1
Recommends focusing funds on specific areas, such as literacy or comprehensive behavioral supports	9	2
Other	5	1
None of the above	5	6
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Significant disproportionality in least restrictive environment placement occurs when districts place in more restrictive settings children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district. Respondents were asked to include all actions that are used in the state, even if they are not used in all situations.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D4).

Table 2.3.1.2. Actions state agencies take to ensure services are linguistically and culturally competent (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Provide professional development on culturally competent practices	25	3
Include parents/guardians on state advisory committees, task forces, or work groups representing diverse populations	39	8
Solicit periodic feedback from stakeholders and families representing diverse populations	29	4
Monitor how interpreters and translators are used	9	1
Monitor the use of culturally competent practices	5	1
Provide guidance specifically designed to support the use of linguistically and culturally competent practices (for example, written guidance or webinars)	24	5
Work with the state's Parent Training and Information Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate	34	4
Number of responses	**49**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L3).

Table 2.3.1.3. Challenges state agencies experience in ensuring services are linguistically and culturally competent (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Addressing family reluctance to engage with schools around special education	23	3
Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status	21	0
Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals	38	3
Having an insufficient number of interpreters	33	3
Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes	25	4
Other	2	0
None of the above	3	3
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L5).

Table 2.3.1.4. Number of states that operated state-funded universal preschool program in the 2019–2020 school year

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state does not operate a state-funded universal preschool program	37	7
All districts offer a state-funded universal preschool program	4	2
The state provides funding to districts that choose to implement a universal preschool program	10	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Universal preschool refers to preschool access for all preschool-age children, similar to kindergarten availability through public schools. In some states, universal preschool is available without cost to only certain student groups, such as low-income children, children from working families, or children identified "at risk" of school failure. Respondents were asked to respond to this question if their state's program fits the general description of a universal preschool, even if it is not called a universal preschool.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question E1).

Table 2.3.1.5. Number of states in which the local district decides which age groups (3, 4, or 5) are eligible for the state-funded universal preschool program

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Local district determines which ages eligible for state-funded universal PreK	1	0
Number of responses	**4**	**2**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported all districts offered a state-funded universal preschool program during the 2019-2020 school year (states: n=4; entities: n=2). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question E2).

Table 2.3.1.6a. State-funded universal preschool program eligibility, by age (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of states with programs open to 3 year olds	Number of states with programs open to 4 year olds	Number of states with programs open to 5 year olds
All children in this age group	1	3	2
Not all children in this age group	1	0	1
No children in this age group	1	0	0
Number of state responses	**3**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported all districts offered a state-funded universal preschool program during the 2019-2020 school year and eligibility decisions were not made locally (n=3). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question E2, E2a, and E2b).

Table 2.3.1.6b. State-level-funded universal preschool program eligibility, by age (entities)

Response category	Number of entities with programs open to 3 year olds	Number of entities with programs open to 4 year olds	Number of entities with programs open to 5 year olds
All children in this age group	2	2	2
Not all children in this age group	0	0	0
No children in this age group	0	0	0
Number of entity responses	**2**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state-level agencies that reported all districts offered a state-level-funded universal preschool program during the 2019–2020 school year and eligibility decisions were not made locally (n=2). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question E2, E2a, and E2b).

Table 2.3.1.7. Number of states in which the local district decides which children in each age group (3, 4, or 5) are eligible for the state-funded universal preschool program

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Local district determines children eligible for state-funded universal PreK	0	0
Number of responses	**1**	**0**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported all districts offered a state-funded universal preschool program during the 2019-2020 school year, eligibility decisions were not made locally, and not all children were eligible in at least one were age group (states: n=1; entities: n=0). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question E3).

Table 2.3.1.8a. Groups of children, by age, who are eligible for the state-funded universal preschool program (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of states with programs open to 3 year olds	Number of states with programs open to 4 year olds	Number of states with programs open to 5 year olds	Number not applicable
Children from low-income families	1	0	0	0
Children with disabilities	1	0	1	0
Children with other specific risk factors	1	0	1	1
Number of state responses	**1**			

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported all districts offered a state-funded universal preschool program during the 2019-2020 school year, eligibility decisions were not made locally, and not all children were eligible in at least one were age group (n=1). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question E3).

Table 2.3.1.8b. Groups of children, by age, who are eligible for the state-level-funded universal preschool program (entities)

Response category	Number of entities with programs open to 3 year olds	Number of entities with programs open to 4 year olds	Number of entities with programs open to 5 year olds	Number not applicable
Children from low-income families	0	0	0	0
Children with disabilities	0	0	0	0
Children with other specific risk factors	0	0	0	0
Number of entity responses	**0**			

Note: The sample for this table includes all state-level agencies that reported all districts offered a state-level-funded universal preschool program during the 2019-2020 school year, eligibility decisions were not made locally, and not all children were eligible in at least one were age group (n=0). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question E3).

Table 2.3.1.9. Actions state agencies take to ensure services are linguistically and culturally competent (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Provide professional development on culturally competent practices	26	2
Include parents/guardians on state advisory committees, task forces, or work groups representing diverse populations	39	6
Solicit periodic feedback from stakeholders and families representing diverse populations	24	4
Monitor how interpreters and translators are used	4	1
Monitor the use of culturally competent practices	5	2
Provide guidance specifically designed to support the use of linguistically and culturally competent practices (for example, written guidance or webinars)	24	4
Work with the state's Parent Training and Information Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate	22	2
Number of responses	**49**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Linguistically and culturally competent practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question J4).

Table 2.3.1.10. Challenges state agencies experience in ensuring services are linguistically and culturally competent (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Addressing family reluctance to engage with preschools around special education	14	4
Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status	14	0
Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals	40	3
Having an insufficient number of interpreters	37	4
Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes	25	4
Other	1	0
None of the above	4	2
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Linguistically and culturally competent practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question J5).

Table 2.3.1.11. Number of lead agencies that used the Extended Part C Option, approved by the Office of Special Education Programs, in fiscal year 2020

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	47	6
Yes	3	0
Number of responses	**50**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2004 include a provision that provides the option for states to use Part C funding to provide services for children until they enter kindergarten. This is commonly referred to as the "Extended Part C Option."

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question D5).

Table 2.3.1.12. Issues that affected or are affecting lead agencies' decisions to use the Extended Part C Option

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Insufficient funding	27	2
Insufficient lead agency staff	18	2
Part C lead agency is not able to promote school readiness as required	2	1
Insufficient interagency coordination at the state level	9	0
Insufficient interagency coordination at the local level	4	0
Shortages of staff at the local level	17	2
Other	13	2
None of the above	4	0
Number of responses	**47**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all lead agencies that reported not using the Extended Part C Option, approved by the Office of Special Education Programs in fiscal year 2020 (states: n=47; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question D6).

Table 2.3.1.13. Actions lead agencies take to ensure services are linguistically and culturally competent

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Provide professional development on culturally competent practices	28	4
Include parents/guardians on state advisory committees, task forces, or work groups representing diverse populations	40	2
Solicit periodic feedback from stakeholders and families representing diverse populations	30	1
Monitor how interpreters and translators are used	15	1
Monitor the use of culturally competent practices	7	1
Provide guidance specifically designed to support the use of linguistically and culturally competent practices (for example, written guidance or webinars)	14	1
Work with the state's Parent Training and Information Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate	18	1
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Linguistically and culturally competent practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question E4).

Table 2.3.1.14. Challenges lead agencies experience in ensuring services are linguistically and culturally competent

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals around early intervention services	16	3
Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status	24	2
Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals	39	3
Having an insufficient number of interpreters	32	1
Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes	22	2
Other	3	0
None of the above	2	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Linguistically and culturally competent practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question E5).

Table 2.3.1.15. Challenges districts face in ensuring services are linguistically and culturally competent

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Addressing family reluctance to engage with schools around special education	33	2.7
Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status	20	2.3
Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals	45	2.9
Having an insufficient number of interpreters	31	2.8
Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes	36	2.8
Other	2!	0.7
None of the above	27	2.5
Number of district responses	**436**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B14).

Table 2.3.1.15a. Challenges districts face in ensuring services are linguistically and culturally competent, by district type

Response	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of	Standard error	Percentage of	Standard error	Percentage of	Standard error
Addressing family reluctance to engage with schools around special education	33	2.7	31	3.0	42	6.0
Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status	20	2.3	19	2.6	23	5.3
Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals	45	2.9	47	3.3	32*	5.8
Having an insufficient number of interpreters	31	2.8	32	3.1	26	5.5
Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes	36	2.8	37	3.1	32	5.8
Other	2!	0.7	2!	0.8	.	.
None of the above	27	2.5	27	2.8	26	5.6
Number of district responses	**436**		**332**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B14).

Table 2.3.1.15b. Challenges districts face in ensuring services are linguistically and culturally competent, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Addressing family reluctance to engage with schools around special education	33	2.7	40	4.2	26*	3.5
Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status	20	2.3	27	4.0	13*	2.6
Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals	45	2.9	57	4.4	34*	3.9
Having an insufficient number of interpreters	31	2.8	38	4.4	25*	3.5
Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes	36	2.8	46	4.4	28*	3.6
Other	2!	0.7	.	.	.	.
None of the above	27	2.5	15	3.0	38*	3.9
Number of district responses	**436**		**216**		**220**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B14).

Table 2.3.1.15c. Challenges districts face in ensuring services are linguistically and culturally competent, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Addressing family reluctance to engage with schools around special education	33	2.7	42	5.2	29*	3.2
Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status	20	2.3	27	4.7	17	2.7
Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals	45	2.9	45	5.2	45	3.5
Having an insufficient number of interpreters	31	2.8	29	4.7	32	3.3
Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes	36	2.8	35	5.1	36	3.4
Other	2!	0.7	.	.	.	.
None of the above	27	2.5	22	4.4	29	3.1
Number of district responses	**436**		**154**		**282**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question B14).

Table 2.3.1.16. School years in which states identified districts as having significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or least restrictive environment placement

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
2014-2015	1!	0.4
2015-2016	.	.
2016-2017	2!	0.7
2017-2018	2!	0.8
2018-2019	2!	0.7
The district has not been identified as having significant disproportionality in LRE placement for school-age children in the past five school years	81	2.3
Don't know if the district has been identified as having significant disproportionality in LRE placement for school-age children in the past five school years	15	2.1
Number of district responses	**436**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Significant disproportionality in least restrictive environment placement occurs when districts place in more restrictive settings children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

LRE = least restrictive environment.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C4).

Table 2.3.1.16a. School years in which states identified districts as having significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or least restrictive environment placement, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
2014-2015	1!	0.4	.	.	.	.
2015-2016	.	.	.	.	0	.
2016-2017	2!	0.7	2!	0.8	0*	.
2017-2018	2!	0.8	2!	0.9	0*	.
2018-2019	2!	0.7	2!	0.8	0*	.
The district has not been identified as having significant disproportionality in LRE placement for school-age children in the past five school years	81	2.3	80	2.6	82	4.6
Don't know if the district has been identified as having significant disproportionality in LRE placement for school-age children in the past five school years	15	2.1	15	2.3	16	4.3
Number of district responses	**436**		**332**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Significant disproportionality in least restrictive environment placement occurs when districts place in more restrictive settings children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

LRE = least restrictive environment.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C4).

Table 2.3.1.16b. School years in which states identified districts as having significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or least restrictive environment placement, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
2014-2015	1!	0.4	.	.	.	.
2015-2016	.	.	.	.	.	.
2016-2017	2!	0.7	2!	1.2	.	.
2017-2018	2!	0.8	4!	1.5	.	.
2018-2019	2!	0.7	2!	0.6	.	.
The district has not been identified as having significant disproportionality in LRE placement for school-age children in the past five school years	81	2.3	80	3.4	81	3.1
Don't know if the district has been identified as having significant disproportionality in LRE placement for school-age children in the past five school years	15	2.1	15	3.0	16	2.9
Number of district responses	**436**		**214**		**222**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Significant disproportionality in least restrictive environment placement occurs when districts place in more restrictive settings children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

LRE = least restrictive environment.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C4).

Table 2.3.1.16c. School years in which states identified districts as having significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or least restrictive environment placement, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
2014-2015	1!	0.4	.	.	.	.
2015-2016	.	.	.	.	.	.
2016-2017	2!	0.7	.	.	.	.
2017-2018	2!	0.8	2!	0.8	2!	1.0
2018-2019	2!	0.7	.	.	.	.
The district has not been identified as having significant disproportionality in LRE placement for school-age children in the past five school years	81	2.3	84	3.6	80	2.9
Don't know if the district has been identified as having significant disproportionality in LRE placement for school-age children in the past five school years	15	2.1	10	3.0	17	2.6
Number of district responses	**436**		**155**		**281**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Significant disproportionality in least restrictive environment placement occurs when districts place in more restrictive settings children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

LRE = least restrictive environment.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C4).

Table 2.3.1.17. Actions districts took in the past five school years to address or prevent significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or least restrictive environment placement, by funding type

Response category	Percentage of districts that funded this action through CCEIS (mandatory) funds	Percentage of districts that funded this action through voluntary CEIS funds	Percentage of districts that funded this action through other funds	Percentage of districts that did not do this
Conducted a review of district policies and procedures related to IEPs (SE)	12! (4.2)	.	79 (11.4)	.
Reviewed practices used to facilitate parent/guardian involvement in LRE placement decisions (SE)	.	0 (.)	62! (23.1)	.
Provided funding for additional staff, such as reading specialists or mental health specialists (SE)	.	.	59 (12.4)	.
Reviewed supplementary aids and services provided to support LRE placements (SE)	11! (3.6)	0 (.)	89 (6.2)	.
Implemented general education/special education team teaching (SE)	.	0 (.)	66! (21.1)	.
Increased frequency of analysis of assessment data (SE)	.	0 (.)	81 (19.2)	.
Required progress monitoring in primary grades (SE)	.	.	50! (23.3)	47! (22.9)
Developed a specific plan for school staff to address significant disproportionality in LRE placement (SE)	.	.	52 (7.2)	43 (8.6)
Provided targeted supports to all schools (SE)	10! (3.1)	.	60 (8.6)	32 (8.5)
Provided targeted supports only to schools with evidence of significant disproportionality, or near-significant disproportionality (SE)	.	.	34! (11.4)	.
Provided targeted supports for elementary schools (SE)	.	.	35 (6.9)	44! (21.3)
Provided targeted supports for middle schools (SE)	11! (3.6)	.	29! (11.8)	63 (12.5)
Provided targeted supports for high schools (SE)	9 (2.2)	0 (.)	42 (12.1)	53 (12.3)
Provided or supported interventions to address issues in literacy (SE)	.	.	74 (6.1)	.

Table 2.3.1.17. Actions districts took in the past five school years to address or prevent significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or least restrictive environment placement, by funding type (continued)

Response category	Percentage of districts that funded this action through CCEIS (mandatory) funds	Percentage of districts that funded this action through voluntary CEIS funds	Percentage of districts that funded this action through other funds	Percentage of districts that did not do this
Provided or supported interventions to address issues in math (SE)	.	0 (.)	66 (12.1)	34! (12.1)
Provided or supported interventions to address issues in science (SE)	.	0 (.)	39 (8.3)	61 (8.3)
Provided or supported behavioral supports (SE)	12! (4.2)	.	63 (4.8)	30 (2.9)
Initiated Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (SE)	.	0 (.)	71 (20.8)	.
Initiated other specific interventions (SE)	0 (.)	0 (.)	.	87 (1.0)
Other (SE)	.	0 (.)	31! (12.9)	74 (11.6)
Number of district responses	**18**			

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported being identified by the state as having significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or least restrictive environment placement, in the past five school years (2014–2015 through 2018–2019) (n=18). Respondents were asked to include all actions that were used in the district, even if they were not used in all situations. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

CCEIS = Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services; CEIS = Coordinated Early Intervening Services; IEP = Individualized Education Program; LRE = least restrictive environment; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C5).

Table 2.3.1.18. Professional development districts provided in the past five school years to address or prevent significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or least restrictive environment placement, by funding type

Response category	Percentage of districts that provided this professional development through CCEIS (mandatory) funds	Percentage of districts that provided this professional development through voluntary CEIS funds	Percentage of districts that provided this professional development through other funds	Percentage of districts that did not provide this professional development
Training about instructional strategies for meeting the diverse needs of students in a classroom (SE)	.	.	86 (19.5)	.
Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for general education teachers (SE)	9 (2.2)	0 (.)	64! (23.1)	.
Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for special education teachers (SE)	.	.	82 (12.1)	.
Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for school administrative staff (SE)	.	0 (.)	69! (23.1)	.
Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for other school staff (SE)	9 (2.2)	0 (.)	62! (23.1)	.
Other (SE)	.	.	19 (4.0)	78 (6.1)
Number of district responses	**18**			

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported being identified by the state as having significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or least restrictive environment placement, in the past five school years (2014-2015 through 2018-2019) (n=18). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

CCEIS = Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services; CEIS = Coordinated Early Intervening Services; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C6).

Table 2.3.1.19. Descriptions of districts and charter schools that operate as part of the district (school-age children)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Traditional public school district that does not include any charter schools	76	1.7
Traditional public school district that does include charter schools	11	1.7
Consists of only charter school(s)	13	1.4
Number of district responses	**438**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H7).

Table 2.3.1.19a. Descriptions of districts and charter schools that operate as part of the district, by district size (school-age children)

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Traditional public school district that does not include any charter schools	76	1.7	84	2.8	70*	2.7
Traditional public school district that does include charter schools	11	1.7	14	2.8	8*	2.0
Consists of only charter school(s)	13	1.4	2	0.6	23*	2.3
Number of district responses	**438**		**216**		**222**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H7).

Table 2.3.1.19b. Descriptions of districts and charter schools that operate as part of the district, by district rurality (school-age children)

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Traditional public school district that does not include any charter schools	76	1.7	47	3.4	86*	2.1
Traditional public school district that does include charter schools	11	1.7	16	3.8	9	1.9
Consists of only charter school(s)	13	1.4	37	4.2	5*	1.1
Number of district responses	**438**		**155**		**283**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H7).

Table 2.3.1.20. Authorizers for charter schools that operate as part of the district (school-age children)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district authorizes all charter schools that operate as part of the district	39	7.5
Another entity authorizes all charter schools that operate as part of the district	47	8.1
Some charter schools that operate as part of the district are authorized by the district and some are authorized by another entity	.	.
Number of district responses	**58**	

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that described their district as a traditional public school district that does include charter schools (n=62). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H8).

Table 2.3.1.21. Percentage of districts with charter schools in their geographic area that operate independently from the district

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	81	2.0
Yes	19	2.0
Number of district responses	**436**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H11).

Table 2.3.1.21a. Percentage of districts with charter schools in their geographic area that operate independently from the district, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	81	2.0	87	2.0	45*	6.2
Yes	19	2.0	13	2.0	55*	6.2
Number of district responses	**436**		**333**		**103**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H11).

Table 2.3.1.21b. Percentage of districts with charter schools in their geographic area that operate independently from the district, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	81	2.0	77	3.5	85	2.1
Yes	19	2.0	23	3.5	15	2.1
Number of district responses	**436**		**216**		**220**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H11).

Table 2.3.1.21c. Percentage of districts with charter schools in their geographic area that operate independently from the district, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	81	2.0	61	4.6	89*	2.2
Yes	19	2.0	39	4.6	11*	2.2
Number of district responses	**436**		**153**		**283**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H11).

Table 2.3.1.22. Percentage of districts with public virtual schools that operate as part of the district

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	84	2.0
Yes	16	2.0
Number of district responses	**436**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H14).

Table 2.3.1.22a. Percentage of districts with public virtual schools that operate as part of the district, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	84	2.0	82	2.3	93*	2.8
Yes	16	2.0	18	2.3	7!*	2.8
Number of district responses	**436**		**332**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H14).

Table 2.3.1.22b. Percentage of districts with public virtual schools that operate as part of the district, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	84	2.0	74	3.6	91*	2.2
Yes	16	2.0	26	3.6	9*	2.2
Number of district responses	**436**		**215**		**221**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H14).

Table 2.3.1.22c. Percentage of districts with public virtual schools that operate as part of the district, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	84	2.0	86	3.0	83	2.6
Yes	16	2.0	14	3.0	17	2.6
Number of district responses	**436**		**155**		**281**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H14).

Table 2.3.1.23. Percentage of districts with students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private school

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	62	2.4
Yes	38	2.4
Number of district responses	**435**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Respondents were asked to exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H16).

Table 2.3.1.23a. Percentage of districts with students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private school, by district type

	All		Traditional districts	
Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	62	2.4	57	2.8
Yes	38	2.4	43	2.8
Number of district responses	**435**		**332**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Charter district data has been suppressed due to disclosure risk. Respondents were asked to exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H16).

Table 2.3.1.23b. Percentage of districts with students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private school, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	62	2.4	37	4.0	83*	3.0
Yes	38	2.4	63	4.0	17*	3.0
Number of district responses	**435**		**216**		**219**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Respondents were asked to exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H16).

Table 2.3.1.23c. Percentage of districts with students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private school, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	62	2.4	54	4.3	65*	2.9
Yes	38	2.4	46	4.3	35*	2.9
Number of district responses	**435**		**154**		**281**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Respondents were asked to exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H16).

Table 2.3.1.24. Descriptions of districts and charter schools that operate as part of the district (preschool-age children)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Traditional public school district that does not include any charter schools	87	1.8
Traditional public school district that does include charter schools	10	1.8
Consists of only charter school(s)	3	0.7
Number of district responses	**320**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F5).

Table 2.3.1.24a. Descriptions of districts and charter schools that operate as part of the district, by district size (preschool-age children)

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Traditional public school district that does not include any charter schools	87	1.8	89	2.2	85	3.1
Traditional public school district that does include charter schools	10	1.8	10	2.2	11	2.9
Consists of only charter school(s)	3	0.7	1!	0.5	4!	1.5
Number of district responses	**320**		**192**		**128**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F5).

Table 2.3.1.24b. Descriptions of districts and charter schools that operate as part of the district, by district rurality (preschool-age children)

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Traditional public school district that does not include any charter schools	87	1.8	73	5.0	91*	2.0
Traditional public school district that does include charter schools	10	1.8	17	4.5	9	1.9
Consists of only charter school(s)	3	0.7	10!	3.1	.	.
Number of district responses	**320**		**89**		**231**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F5).

Table 2.3.1.25. Authorizers for charter schools that operate as part of the district (preschool-age children)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district authorizes all charter schools that operate as part of the district	36	9.0
Another entity authorizes all charter schools that operate as part of the district	56	8.9
Some charter schools that operate as part of the district are authorized by the district and some are authorized by another entity	8	2.3
Number of district responses	**45**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that described their district as a traditional public school district that includes charter schools (n=50). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F6).

Table 2.3.1.26. Percentage of districts with charter schools within their geographic area that operate independently from the district

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	88	1.8
Yes	12	1.8
Number of district responses	**317**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F9).

Table 2.3.1.26a. Percentage of districts with charter schools within their geographic area that operate independently from the district, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	88	1.8	90	1.8	31!*	13.2
Yes	12	1.8	10	1.8	69*	13.2
Number of district responses	**317**		**293**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F9).

Table 2.3.1.26b. Percentage of districts with charter schools within their geographic area that operate independently from the district, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	88	1.8	83	2.9	93*	2.3
Yes	12	1.8	17	2.9	7!*	2.3
Number of district responses	**317**		**189**		**128**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F9).

Table 2.3.1.26c. Percentage of districts with charter schools within their geographic area that operate independently from the district, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	88	1.8	68	5.2	93*	1.8
Yes	12	1.8	32	5.2	7*	1.8
Number of district responses	**317**		**88**		**229**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F9).

Table 2.3.1.27. Percentage of districts with children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private preschool

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	59	3.1
Yes	41	3.1
Number of district responses	**319**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Respondents were asked to exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F12).

Table 2.3.1.27a. Percentage of districts with children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private preschool, by district type

	All		Traditional districts	
Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	59	3.1	58	3.2
Yes	41	3.1	42	3.2
Number of district responses	**319**		**295**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Charter district data has been suppressed due to disclosure risk. Respondents were asked to exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F12).

Table 2.3.1.27b. Percentage of districts with children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private preschool, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	59	3.1	41	4.5	79*	4.2
Yes	41	3.1	59	4.5	21*	4.2
Number of district responses	**319**		**192**		**127**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Respondents were asked to exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F12).

Table 2.3.1.27c. Percentage of districts with children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in a private preschool, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	59	3.1	46	6.3	62*	3.6
Yes	41	3.1	54	6.3	38*	3.6
Number of district responses	**319**		**89**		**230**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Respondents were asked to exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F12).

Table 2.3.1.28. Parties in districts responsible for identifying children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district assumes responsibility for identifying these children	86	2.5
The district contracts with another public agency to identify these children	16	2.6
The district contracts with a third party other than a public agency to identify these children	2!	1.0
Number of district responses	**298**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Respondents were asked to exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F13).

Table 2.3.1.28a. Parties in districts responsible for identifying children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district assumes responsibility for identifying these children	86	2.5	86	2.6	76	15.5
The district contracts with another public agency to identify these children	16	2.6	16	2.7	.	.
The district contracts with a third party other than a public agency to identify these children	2!	1.0	.	.	.	.
Number of district responses	**298**		**280**		**18**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Respondents were asked to exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F13).

Table 2.3.1.28b. Parties in districts responsible for identifying children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district assumes responsibility for identifying these children	86	2.5	91	2.6	79*	4.5
The district contracts with another public agency to identify these children	16	2.6	12	2.8	21	4.6
The district contracts with a third party other than a public agency to identify these children	2!	1.0	.	.	4!	2.1
Number of district responses	**298**		**181**		**117**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Respondents were asked to exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F13).

Table 2.3.1.28c. Parties in districts responsible for identifying children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district assumes responsibility for identifying these children	86	2.5	86	5.5	86	2.9
The district contracts with another public agency to identify these children	16	2.6	14!	5.0	17	3.0
The district contracts with a third party other than a public agency to identify these children	2!	1.0	.	.	.	.
Number of district responses	**298**		**80**		**218**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Respondents were asked to exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F13).

Table 2.3.1.29. Percentage of schools that are charter schools

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
No	76	2.2
Yes	24	2.2
Number of school responses	**1,366**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E18).

Table 2.3.1.29a. Percentage of schools that are charter schools, by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
No	76	2.2	77	2.4	64*	5.9	69	4.3
Yes	24	2.2	23	2.4	36*	5.9	31	4.3
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**977**		**178**		**211**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E18).

Table 2.3.1.29b. Percentage of schools that are charter schools, by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
No	76	2.2	78	3.8	75	2.5
Yes	24	2.2	22	3.8	25	2.5
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**656**		**710**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E18).

Table 2.3.1.29c. Percentage of schools that are charter schools, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response category	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
No	76	2.2	73	3.0	81*	2.7
Yes	24	2.2	27	3.0	19*	2.7
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**819**		**526**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for schools eligible for Title I ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E18).

2.3.2. Access to general education programs and supports: Curriculum/activities

Table 2.3.2.1. Student groups for whom states modify general education standards

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
School age-children with significant cognitive disabilities	33	4
School age-children with disabilities, other than significant cognitive disabilities	8	2
Other	8	0
Do not adapt standards for students with disabilities	12	4
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G1).

Table 2.3.2.2. Number of state agencies that provide professional development to districts and schools on engaging school-age children with disabilities in the general education curriculum

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	3	1
Yes	48	8
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G2).

Table 2.3.2.3. Target audiences for state agency-provided professional development on engaging school-age children with disabilities in the general education curriculum

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Superintendents	17	2
Principals	38	7
School administrative officials	32	5
Special education teachers	45	8
General education teachers	43	8
Reading specialists	34	4
Math specialists	30	3
Paraprofessional or instructional learning assistants	32	5
School counselors	19	3
School psychologists	27	4
School or district nurses	10	0
Speech and language therapists/pathologists	29	4
Other	9	2
Number of responses	**48**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported providing professional development to districts and schools on how to engage school-age children with disabilities in the general education curriculum (states: n=48; entities: n=8). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G3).

Table 2.3.2.4. Topics covered in state agency-provided professional development on engaging school-age children with disabilities in the general education curriculum

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Accommodations for different challenges	43	8
Adapted curriculum materials	33	5
Appropriate use of paraprofessionals	29	3
Assistive technology	39	7
Cooperative learning	20	3
Evidence-based teaching strategies	43	7
Development of IEP goals and identification of supports and services	43	8
Instructional models: consultation	23	1
Instructional models: co-teaching	35	5
Instructional models: other	18	2
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support model	41	2
Peer mentors	15	1
Universal Design for Learning	36	4
Other	8	0
Number of responses	**48**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported providing professional development to districts and schools on how to engage school-age children with disabilities in the general education curriculum (states: n=48; entities: n=8). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G4).

Table 2.3.2.5a. Topics on which state agencies provide professional development to district special education staff (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of state agencies that do not provide professional development on this topic	Number of state agencies that provide professional development on this topic, focused on all students with disabilities	Number of state agencies that provide professional development on this topic, focused only on students with the most significant cognitive disabilities
Evidence-based teaching strategies	8	42	1
Teaching grade-level content with appropriate complexity and breadth for students	9	39	3
Methods for determining grade-level content with appropriate complexity and breadth for students	15	30	6
Supporting school-age children with disabilities enrolled by parents/guardians in private schools	33	16	1
Number of state responses	**51**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G5).

Table 2.3.2.5b. Topics on which state-level agencies provide professional development to district special education staff (entities)

Response category	Number of state level agencies that do not provide professional development on this topic	Number of state level agencies that provide professional development on this topic, focused on all students with disabilities	Number of state level agencies that provide professional development on this topic, focused only on students with the most significant cognitive disabilities
Evidence-based teaching strategies	2	7	0
Teaching grade-level content with appropriate complexity and breadth for students	3	6	0
Methods for determining grade-level content with appropriate complexity and breadth for students	3	6	0
Supporting school-age children with disabilities enrolled by parents/guardians in private schools	2	7	0
Number of entity responses	**9**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G5).

Table 2.3.2.6a. Topics on which state agencies provide professional development to district general education staff (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of state agencies that do not provide professional development on this topic	Number of state agencies that provide professional development on this topic, focused on all students with disabilities	Number of state agencies that provide professional development on this topic, focused only on students with the most significant cognitive disabilities
Evidence-based teaching strategies	12	39	0
Teaching grade-level content with appropriate complexity and breadth for students	19	31	1
Methods for determining grade-level content with appropriate complexity and breadth for students	21	28	2
Supporting school-age children with disabilities enrolled by parents/guardians in private schools	37	14	0
Number of state responses	**51**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G6).

Table 2.3.2.6b. Topics on which state-level agencies provide professional development to district general education staff (entities)

Response category	Number of state level agencies that do not provide professional development on this topic	Number of state level agencies that provide professional development on this topic, focused on all students with disabilities	Number of state level agencies that provide professional development on this topic, focused only on students with the most significant cognitive disabilities
Evidence-based teaching strategies	1	8	0
Teaching grade-level content with appropriate complexity and breadth for students	2	7	0
Methods for determining grade-level content with appropriate complexity and breadth for students	4	5	0
Supporting school-age children with disabilities enrolled by parents/guardians in private schools	5	4	0
Number of entity responses	**9**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G6).

Table 2.3.2.7. Number of state agencies that recommend using programs, practices, or curricula to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state does not recommend any programs, practices, or curricula	16	4
The state recommends one specific program, practice, or curriculum	4	1
The state recommends several programs, practices, or curricula	31	4
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G7).

Table 2.3.2.8. Materials and services state agencies offer to districts or providers to promote provision of services in least restrictive environments

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Technical assistance	46	8
Written guidelines	37	6
Workshops	34	4
Mentors or coaches	19	4
Virtual opportunities including webinars or communities of practice	27	3
Additional funding	14	1
Other	4	1
None of the above	1	0
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to consider only services that aim to enable participation in daily routines and activities and allow the child to make progress in developmental areas.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G8).

Table 2.3.2.9. Materials and services state agencies offer to support districts and schools in using Universal Design for Learning for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Technical assistance	39	5
Written guidelines	19	1
Workshops	35	5
Mentors or coaches	21	3
Virtual opportunities including webinars or communities of practice	26	1
Additional funding	9	0
Other	3	1
None of the above	8	2
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G9).

Table 2.3.2.10. Number of states that require all state assessments, including alternate assessments, to be developed using the principles of Universal Design for Learning

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	25	7
Yes	25	2
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G10).

Table 2.3.2.11. Number of state agencies that recommend using programs, practices, or curricula to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state does not recommend any programs, practices, or curricula	15	3
The state recommends one specific program, practice, or curriculum	9	4
The state recommends several programs, practices, or curricula	27	2
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question E4).

Table 2.3.2.12. Materials and services state agencies offer to districts or providers to promote the provision of services in least restrictive environments

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Technical assistance	50	8
Written guidelines	40	6
Workshops	31	7
Mentors or coaches	18	3
Virtual opportunities including webinars or communities of practice	32	4
Additional funding	9	2
Other	5	0
None of the above	1	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to consider only services that aim to enable participation in daily routines and activities and allow the child to make progress in developmental areas.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question E5).

Table 2.3.2.13. Materials and services state agencies offer to support districts and schools in using Universal Design for Learning for preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Technical assistance	26	3
Written guidelines	10	1
Workshops	19	3
Mentors or coaches	9	2
Virtual opportunities including webinars or communities of practice	15	2
Additional funding	3	1
Other	4	0
None of the above	15	4
Number of responses	**50**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question E6).

Table 2.3.2.14. Materials and services lead agencies offered to local early intervention programs in fiscal year 2020 to promote the provision of services in natural environments

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Technical assistance	44	5
Written guidelines	41	3
Workshops or professional development	35	2
Mentors or coaches	17	4
Virtual opportunities including webinars or communities of practice	30	2
Other	4	0
None of the above	1	1
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to consider only services that aim to enable participation in daily routines and activities and allow the child to make progress in developmental areas.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question D1).

Table 2.3.2.15. Strategies lead agencies used in fiscal year 2020 to support local programs in developing social-emotional skills and addressing challenging behaviors or mental health concerns for infants and toddlers with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Provide guidelines for how to assess social-emotional development and address challenging behaviors or mental health concerns as part of IFSP development	24	4
Provide professional development or technical assistance on social-emotional development, challenging behaviors, or mental health concerns	39	3
Review or monitor decisions of local IFSP teams to ensure appropriate services related to social-emotional development, challenging behaviors, or mental health concerns are included	16	2
Provide designated funding to local programs to support social-emotional development and address challenging behaviors or mental health concerns	18	1
Provide coaches to local programs to support social-emotional development and address challenging behaviors or mental health concerns	17	3
Other	13	1
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IFSP = Individualized Family Service Plan.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question D2).

Table 2.3.2.16. Strategies lead agencies use to support local early intervention programs in addressing the needs of infants and toddlers who have emerging health concerns

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Technical assistance	25	3
Written guidelines	12	1
Workshops or professional development	32	3
Mentors or coaches	6	1
Virtual opportunities including webinars or communities of practice	21	2
Other	4	1
None of the above	7	1
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Examples of emerging health concerns include conditions and experiences such as: Adverse Childhood Experiences, fetal alcohol spectrum disorders, neonatal abstinence syndrome, perinatal substance use, toxic stress due to violence, toxic stress due to poverty, and Zika virus.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question D3).

Table 2.3.2.17. Groups of students for whom districts modify their general education curriculum

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
School age-children with significant cognitive disabilities	85	2.2
School age-children with disabilities, other than significant cognitive disabilities	68	2.7
Other	4	1.2
Do not adapt curriculum for students with disabilities	2!	0.8
Number of district responses	**438**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H1).

Table 2.3.2.17a. Groups of students for whom districts modify their general education curriculum, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
School age-children with significant cognitive disabilities	85	2.2	86	2.5	76	5.0
School age-children with disabilities, other than significant cognitive disabilities	68	2.7	69	2.9	57	5.9
Other	4	1.2	4	1.3	.	.
Do not adapt curriculum for students with disabilities	2!	0.8	2!	0.9	.	.
Number of district responses	**438**		**334**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H1).

Table 2.3.2.17b. Groups of students for whom districts modify their general education curriculum, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
School age-children with significant cognitive disabilities	85	2.2	88	2.9	82	3.2
School age-children with disabilities, other than significant cognitive disabilities	68	2.7	61	4.1	73*	3.4
Other	4	1.2	5!	1.8	4!	1.4
Do not adapt curriculum for students with disabilities	2!	0.8	.	.	.	.
Number of district responses	**438**		**216**		**222**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H1).

Table 2.3.2.17c. Groups of students for whom districts modify their general education curriculum, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
School age-children with significant cognitive disabilities	85	2.2	82	4.7	86	2.5
School age-children with disabilities, other than significant cognitive disabilities	68	2.7	60	4.9	70	3.2
Other	4	1.2	5!	1.9	4!	1.4
Do not adapt curriculum for students with disabilities	2!	0.8	.	.	.	.
Number of district responses	**438**		**155**		**283**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H1).

Table 2.3.2.18. Percentage of districts with adapted general education curriculum aligned with state standards

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Alignment has been documented	76	2.5
In the process of conducting a check for alignment	12	2.0
There has been no check for alignment	12	1.9
Number of district responses	**429**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported modifying general education curriculum for a group or groups of students (n=430). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H2).

Table 2.3.2.19. Entities that conducted or are conducting a check for alignment of adapted general education with state standards

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
State	37	2.9
District	73	2.6
Curriculum developer	26	2.6
Other	10	1.8
Number of district responses	**381**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported modifying general education curriculum for a group or groups of students (n=430). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H3).

Table 2.3.2.20. Ways in which districts support teachers to help them ensure school-age children with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum

Response category	Percentage of districts that provide support to help teachers adapt curriculum with appropriate complexity and breadth, including incorporation of UDL principles	Percentage of districts that provide support to help teachers provide accommodations	Percentage of districts that provide support to help teachers manage student behavior	Percentage of districts that do not provide support through this mechanism
Training through a workshop, institute, or online module (SE)	70 (2.7)	87 (1.9)	79 (2.4)	6 (1.3)
Ongoing individualized support (such as consultation, coaching, or mentoring) (SE)	72 (2.6)	86 (2.0)	84 (2.1)	5 (1.2)
Ongoing group support (in the form of special education department meetings or community of practice/professional learning communities) (SE)	66 (2.8)	83 (2.2)	80 (2.3)	11 (1.8)
Release time (including common preparation periods and non-student days) to attend conferences and workshops outside of school (SE)	72 (2.6)	73 (2.6)	76 (2.4)	12 (1.9)
Other (SE)	16 (2.3)	17 (2.3)	15 (2.1)	82 (2.4)
Number of district responses	**437**			

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error; UDL = Universal Design for Learning.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H4).

Table 2.3.2.21. Percentage of districts with a policy to support access to and participation in nonacademic activities for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	24	2.5
Yes	76	2.5
Number of district responses	**434**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H5).

Table 2.3.2.21a. Percentage of districts with a policy to support access to and participation in nonacademic activities for school-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	24	2.5	21	2.7	39*	6.0
Yes	76	2.5	79	2.7	61*	6.0
Number of district responses	**434**		**330**		**104**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H5).

Table 2.3.2.21b. Percentage of districts with a policy to support access to and participation in nonacademic activities for school-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	24	2.5	17	3.2	30*	3.7
Yes	76	2.5	83	3.2	70*	3.7
Number of district responses	**434**		**215**		**219**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H5).

Table 2.3.2.21c. Percentage of districts with a policy to support access to and participation in nonacademic activities for school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	24	2.5	23	4.0	24	3.0
Yes	76	2.5	77	4.0	76	3.0
Number of district responses	**434**		**154**		**280**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H5).

Table 2.3.2.22. Methods districts use to support the participation of school-age children with disabilities in the same nonacademic extracurricular activities as children without disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Provide individualized accommodations to students with disabilities	88	2.3
Provide professional development to personnel supervising nonacademic activities	38	3.4
Offer a specific disability awareness program	14	2.3
Provide assistive technology to help students participate in activities	60	3.4
Assign students without disabilities to be 'buddies' to students with disabilities	56	3.4
Prompt and reinforce students without disabilities to initiate and maintain interactions with students with disabilities	60	3.5
Structure activities that require interaction between students with and without disabilities	60	3.4
Provide or assist students in getting the necessary transportation to these activities	55	3.5
Number of district responses	**315**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having a policy to support access to and participation in nonacademic activities for school-age children with disabilities (n=323). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H6).

Table 2.3.2.23. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reasons, and responsible parties for school-age children with disabilities who attend public charter schools that operate as part of and are authorized by the district

Response category	Percentage of districts in which charter schools have primary responsibility	Percentage of districts with shared responsibility between the charter schools and the district	Percentage of districts with primary responsibility
Identification and evaluation of school-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find) (SE)	31! (13.3)	35! (11.6)	34! (13.0)
Coordination of IEPs (SE)	37! (13.2)	30! (10.1)	33! (13.7)
Development of IEP goals (SE)	38! (13.2)	36! (11.2)	.
Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals (SE)	38! (13.2)	36! (11.2)	.
Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs (SE)	33! (13.2)	26! (9.4)	41! (13.7)
Provision of special education teachers and staff (SE)	42! (13.2)	27! (9.5)	31! (13.6)
Provision of related services staff (SE)	33! (13.0)	26! (10.0)	42! (13.5)
Provision of special education supports within the general education class (SE)	53 (13.2)	19! (8.8)	29! (13.6)
Provision of special education supports within specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations) (SE)	40! (13.1)	23! (8.6)	36! (13.7)
Transportation for school-age children with disabilities (SE)	43 (12.6)	.	40! (13.8)
Required qualifications for educators who serve school-age children with disabilities (SE)	37! (13.0)	19! (8.4)	44! (13.6)
Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting school-age children with disabilities (SE)	29! (13.0)	41 (11.9)	30! (13.4)
Funding for special education and related services (SE)	27! (11.8)	30! (9.7)	42! (12.8)
Determining discipline policy or procedures (SE)	49 (13.3)	34! (11.8)	.
Number of responses	**37**		

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported authorizing all charter schools that operate as part of the district, or authorizing some charter schools that operate as part of the district and another entity authorizing some (n=37). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H9).

Table 2.3.2.24. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reasons, and responsible parties for school-age children with disabilities who attend public charter schools that operate as part of the district but are authorized by another entity

Response category	Percentage of districts in which charter schools have primary responsibility	Percentage of districts with primary responsibility or charter schools and district share responsibility	Percentage of districts that don t know who has responsibility
Identification and evaluation of school-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find) (SE)	45 (9.6)	27! (9.9)	27! (8.8)
Coordination of IEPs (SE)	45 (9.6)	27! (9.9)	27! (8.8)
Development of IEP goals (SE)	45 (9.6)	27! (9.9)	27! (8.8)
Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals (SE)	53 (10.3)	19 (5.6)	27! (8.8)
Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs (SE)	45 (9.6)	27! (9.9)	27! (8.8)
Provision of special education teachers and staff (SE)	61 (7.8)	23! (8.6)	.
Provision of related services staff (SE)	61 (7.8)	23! (8.6)	.
Provision of special education supports within the general education class (SE)	67 (8.3)	.	.
Provision of special education supports within specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations) (SE)	52 (9.7)	.	31! (10.0)
Transportation for school-age children with disabilities (SE)	36! (11.6)	30! (10.1)	34! (11.4)
Required qualifications for educators who serve school-age children with disabilities (SE)	62 (9.8)	20! (9.5)	.
Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting school-age children with disabilities (SE)	65 (8.5)	20! (9.5)	.
Funding for special education and related services (SE)	59 (9.5)	23! (9.0)	.
Determining discipline policy or procedures (SE)	66 (8.5)	.	.
Number of responses	**30**		

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported another entity authorizing all charter schools that operate as part of the district, or the district authorizing some charter schools that operate as part of the district and another entity authorizing some (n=30). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H10).

Table 2.3.2.25. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reasons, and responsible parties for school-age children with disabilities who attend public charter schools that operate independently from a district within its geographic area

Response category	Percentage of districts in which the charter school district has primary responsibility	Percentage of districts with primary responsibility or charter schools and district share responsibility	Percentage of districts that don t know who has responsibility
Identification and evaluation of school-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find) (SE)	78 (5.7)	14! (4.5)	.
Coordination of IEPs (SE)	84 (4.8)	10! (3.6)	.
Development of IEP goals (SE)	90 (4.0)	6! (2.8)	.
Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals (SE)	90 (3.9)	6! (2.6)	.
Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs (SE)	88 (4.2)	8! (3.1)	.
Provision of special education teachers and staff (SE)	90 (3.9)	5! (2.2)	.
Provision of related services staff (SE)	87 (4.4)	8! (3.4)	.
Provision of special education supports within the general education class (SE)	91 (3.8)	.	.
Provision of special education supports within specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations) (SE)	86 (4.3)	7! (3.3)	.
Transportation for school-age children with disabilities (SE)	71 (6.0)	16 (3.9)	13! (5.1)
Required qualifications for educators who serve school-age children with disabilities (SE)	91 (3.8)	.	.
Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting school-age children with disabilities (SE)	89 (4.1)	5! (2.6)	.
Funding for special education and related services (SE)	72 (5.4)	18 (4.8)	10! (4.0)
Determining discipline policy or procedures (SE)	88 (4.0)	5! (2.5)	.
Number of responses	**116**		

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having charter schools within their geographic area that operate independently from their district (n=116). Respondents were asked to focus on charter schools that exist as their own school district within the district's geographic area. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H12).

Table 2.3.2.26. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reason, and responsible parties for school-age children with disabilities in the district

Response category	Percentage of districts in which primary responsibility belongs to charter schools or the charter district	Percentage of districts with shared responsibility between the charter schools/charter district and local school district of residence	Percentage of districts in which the local school district of residence has primary responsibility	Percentage of districts that don t know who has responsibility
Identification and evaluation of school-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find) (SE)	82 (7.1)	.	.	.
Coordination of IEPs (SE)	94 (4.4)	.	.	.
Development of IEP goals (SE)	95 (3.9)	.	.	.
Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals (SE)	97 (3.2)	0 (.)	.	.
Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs (SE)	96 (3.3)	.	.	.
Provision of special education teachers and staff (SE)	95 (3.5)	.	.	.
Provision of related services staff (SE)	94 (4.5)	.	.	.
Provision of special education supports within the general education class (SE)	95 (3.9)	.	.	.
Provision of special education supports within specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations) (SE)	87 (6.2)	.	.	.
Transportation for school-age children with disabilities (SE)	80 (7.6)	.	.	.
Required qualifications for educators who serve school-age children with disabilities (SE)	95 (3.9)	.	.	.
Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting school-age children with disabilities (SE)	94 (4.5)	.	.	.
Funding for special education and related services (SE)	86 (6.4)	.	.	.
Determining discipline policy or procedures (SE)	93 (4.5)	.	.	.
Number of district responses	**99**			

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported being a district that consists of only charter schools (n=99). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H13).

Table 2.3.2.27. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reasons, and responsible parties for school-age children with disabilities who attend public virtual schools that operate as part of the district

Response category	Percentage of districts in which virtual schools have primary responsibility	Percentage of districts with shared responsibility between the virtual schools and the district	Percentage of districts with primary responsibility
Identification and evaluation of school-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find) (SE)	17! (6.1)	31 (6.2)	53 (7.4)
Coordination of IEPs (SE)	17! (6.0)	28 (5.8)	56 (7.6)
Development of IEP goals (SE)	18! (6.2)	26 (5.3)	56 (7.4)
Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals (SE)	20! (6.6)	32 (7.3)	48 (8.8)
Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs (SE)	20! (6.8)	24 (6.5)	56 (8.4)
Provision of special education teachers and staff (SE)	23 (6.8)	25 (6.8)	52 (8.8)
Provision of related services staff (SE)	20! (7.0)	18! (6.6)	62 (8.0)
Provision of special education supports within the general education class (SE)	28 (7.7)	39 (8.4)	33 (8.0)
Required qualifications for educators who serve school-age children with disabilities (SE)	25! (7.6)	23 (6.8)	52 (9.3)
Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting school-age children with disabilities (SE)	34 (8.2)	21 (5.7)	46 (8.9)
Funding for special education and related services (SE)	19! (6.5)	13! (4.8)	68 (7.8)
Determining discipline policy or procedures (SE)	26 (7.3)	19! (6.6)	56 (9.0)
Number of responses	**80**		

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having public virtual schools that operate as part of their district (n=83). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H15).

Table 2.3.2.28. Services districts provided in the 2018–2019 school year to support students with disabilities who were parentally placed in private schools

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Individualized tutoring	9!	3.1
Speech or language therapy	73	4.8
Training to teachers/staff who work with students with disabilities	27	4.9
Support with diagnostic assessments	42	5.7
Provision of supplementary curricular materials	20	4.5
Provision of assistive technology	20	4.8
Other	28	5.8
No services were provided	13!	4.2
Number of district responses	**112**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having students with disabilities parentally placed in private schools that were found eligible for special education services in the 2018-2019 school year (n=112). Respondents were asked to exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H21).

Table 2.3.2.29. Locations where districts provided services in the 2018–2019 school year (school-age children)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
On site at the student's private school	67	5.9
On site at a public school in the district	46	5.7
At an alternative location	6!	2.4
Number of district responses	**100**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported providing services to support students with disabilities who were parentally placed in private schools in the 2018-2019 school year (n=100). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H22).

Table 2.3.2.30. Services districts provided or funded for school-age children with disabilities in the 2017–2018, 2018–2019, or 2019–2020 school years

Response category	Percentage of districts in which district staff provide this service directly	Percentage of districts that fund this service, but non district staff provide	Percentage of districts that do not fund or provide this service
Assistive technology (SE)	65 (2.7)	42 (2.9)	8 (1.8)
Audiology (SE)	13 (1.8)	69 (2.7)	20 (2.4)
Applied behavior analysis (SE)	32 (2.6)	48 (3.0)	31 (2.8)
Other behavior management services (SE)	58 (2.8)	43 (2.9)	15 (2.2)
Orientation and mobility support (SE)	16 (2.0)	67 (2.8)	20 (2.5)
Mental health counseling (SE)	41 (2.8)	47 (2.9)	27 (2.6)
Diagnostic services/psychological assessments (SE)	61 (2.6)	50 (2.8)	4! (1.1)
Training for families, parents, or guardians (SE)	55 (3.0)	34 (2.8)	29 (2.7)
Social work services (SE)	45 (2.7)	28 (2.7)	36 (2.8)
Other family services (SE)	28 (2.7)	28 (2.7)	53 (3.0)
Occupational therapy (SE)	34 (2.6)	67 (2.6)	3 (0.9)
Physical therapy (SE)	25 (2.4)	73 (2.6)	7 (1.4)
Speech and language therapy (SE)	68 (2.5)	44 (2.7)	1! (0.7)
Specialized academic instruction (SE)	89 (1.9)	14 (2.1)	4 (1.2)
Education in a private institution or school (SE)	9 (1.6)	37 (2.7)	55 (2.7)
Number of district responses	**430**		

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H25).

Table 2.3.2.31. Among districts that provided each service for school-age children with disabilities, percentage of districts that ranked activity as their top three (based on amount of money spent)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Assistive technology	7	1.6
Audiology	5!	1.5
Applied behavior analysis	14	2.6
Other behavior management services	19	2.6
Orientation and mobility support	.	.
Mental health counseling	18	2.6
Diagnostic services/psychological assessments	48	3.0
Training for families, parents, or guardians	.	.
Social work services	12	2.4
Other family services	0	.
Occupational therapy	41	2.9
Physical therapy	15	2.3
Speech and language therapy	79	2.3
Specialized academic instruction	47	3.1
Education in a private institution or school	36	4.3
Number of district responses	**417**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported providing or funding services for school-age children with disabilities in the 2017-2018, 2018-2019, or 2019-2020 school years (n=430). Only respondents who indicated their district has services provided directly by district staff (n=), services funded by distict but provided by non-district staff (n=), or services not provided or funded by the district (n=) Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H26).

Table 2.3.2.32. Services districts provided or funded for preschool-age children with disabilities in the past three years

Response category	Percentage of districts in which district staff provide this service directly	Percentage of districts that fund this service, but non district staff provide	Percentage of districts that do not fund or provide this service
Assistive technology (SE)	63 (3.3)	32 (3.2)	12 (2.2)
Audiology (SE)	18 (2.5)	63 (3.2)	23 (2.8)
Applied behavior analysis (SE)	31 (3.0)	42 (3.4)	32 (3.2)
Other behavior management services (SE)	57 (3.3)	35 (3.2)	16 (2.5)
Orientation and mobility support (SE)	21 (2.6)	63 (3.2)	19 (2.6)
Mental health counseling (SE)	31 (3.1)	33 (3.2)	44 (3.4)
Diagnostic services/psychological assessments (SE)	57 (3.1)	36 (3.2)	15 (2.5)
Training for families, parents, or guardians (SE)	53 (3.2)	22 (2.8)	36 (3.2)
Social work services (SE)	37 (3.0)	21 (2.7)	45 (3.1)
Other family services (SE)	25 (2.8)	22 (2.8)	59 (3.3)
Occupational therapy (SE)	40 (3.2)	59 (3.2)	7 (1.7)
Physical therapy (SE)	30 (3.0)	61 (3.2)	11 (2.2)
Speech and language therapy (SE)	71 (2.9)	34 (3.1)	5 (1.4)
Specialized academic instruction (SE)	81 (2.6)	13 (2.3)	11 (2.1)
Education in a private institution or school (SE)	0 (.)	32 (3.2)	68 (3.2)
Number of district responses	**320**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F1).

Table 2.3.2.33. Among districts that provided each service for preschool-age children with disabilities, percentage of districts that ranked activity as their top three (based on amount of money spent)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Assistive technology	7	2.0
Audiology	3!	1.1
Applied behavior analysis	11	2.2
Other behavior management services	15	2.8
Orientation and mobility support	.	.
Mental health counseling	8	2.4
Diagnostic services/psychological assessments	41	3.7
Training for families, parents, or guardians	.	.
Social work services	10	2.8
Other family services	.	.
Occupational therapy	50	3.5
Physical therapy	25	3.1
Speech and language therapy	88	2.3
Specialized academic instruction	53	3.6
Education in a private institution or school	18	4.2
Number of district responses	**295**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported providing or funding services for preschool-age children with disabilities in the past three years (n=307). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F2).

Table 2.3.2.34. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reasons, and responsible parties for preschool-age children with disabilities who attend public charter schools that operate as part of and are authorized by the district

Response category	Percentage of districts in which charter schools have primary responsibility	Percentage of districts with shared responsibility between the charter schools and the district	Percentage of districts with primary responsibility	Percentage of districts that don t know who has responsibility
Identification and evaluation of preschool-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find) (SE)	.	.	45! (20.5)	.
Coordination of IEPs (SE)	.	.	42! (20.1)	.
Development of IEP goals (SE)	.	.	.	.
Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals (SE)	.	.	.	.
Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs (SE)	.	.	.	.
Provision of special education teachers and staff (SE)	.	.	.	.
Provision of related services staff (SE)	.	.	.	.
Provision of special education supports within the general education class (SE)	.	.	.	.
Provision of special education supports within specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations) (SE)	.	.	.	.
Transportation for preschool-age children with disabilities (SE)	.	.	.	.
Required qualifications for educators who serve preschool-age children with disabilities (SE)	.	.	.	.
Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting preschool-age children with disabilities (SE)	.	.	.	.
Funding for special education and related services (SE)	.	.	.	.
Determining discipline policy or procedures (SE)	.	.	.	.
Number of district responses	**27**			

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported authorizing all charter schools that operate as part of the district, or authorizing some charter schools that operate as part of the district and another entity authorizing some (n=27). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F7).

Table 2.3.2.35. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reasons, and responsible parties for preschool-age children with disabilities who attend public charter schools that operate as part of the district but are authorized by another entity

Response category	Percentage of districts in which charter schools have primary responsibility	Percentage of districts with primary responsibility or charter schools and district share responsibility	Percentage of districts that don t know who has responsibility
Identification and evaluation of preschool-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find) (SE)	26! (10.6)	48! (18.1)	.
Coordination of IEPs (SE)	43 (10.7)	45 (13.0)	.
Development of IEP goals (SE)	41 (10.6)	46 (13.0)	.
Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals (SE)	50 (10.6)	37! (13.0)	.
Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs (SE)	41 (10.6)	40! (13.0)	19! (8.7)
Provision of special education teachers and staff (SE)	47 (11.2)	34! (13.5)	19! (8.7)
Provision of related services staff (SE)	46 (11.2)	35! (13.5)	19! (8.7)
Provision of special education supports within the general education class (SE)	48 (11.3)	33! (13.5)	19! (8.7)
Provision of special education supports within specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations) (SE)	44 (10.6)	28! (11.4)	28 (6.5)
Transportation for preschool-age children with disabilities (SE)	37! (16.2)	43! (16.6)	20 (5.3)
Required qualifications for educators who serve preschool-age children with disabilities (SE)	49 (10.6)	27! (11.9)	25! (8.9)
Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting preschool-age children with disabilities (SE)	56 (10.9)	29! (11.9)	.
Funding for special education and related services (SE)	36! (10.7)	46 (13.0)	19! (8.7)
Determining discipline policy or procedures (SE)	56 (10.7)	26! (11.2)	.
Number of responses	**22**		

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported another entity authorizing all charter schools that operate as part of the district, or the district authorizing some charter schools that operate as part of the district and another entity authorizing some (n=22). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F8).

Table 2.3.2.36. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reasons, and responsible parties for preschool-age children with disabilities who attend public charter schools that operate independently from a district within its geographic area

Response category	Percentage of districts in which the charter school district has primary responsibility	Percentage of districts with primary responsibility or charter schools and district share responsibility	Percentage of districts that don t know who has responsibility
Identification and evaluation of preschool-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find) (SE)	44 (8.6)	39 (9.7)	17! (7.0)
Coordination of IEPs (SE)	53 (8.9)	29! (9.4)	18! (6.9)
Development of IEP goals (SE)	53 (8.9)	29! (9.4)	18! (6.9)
Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals (SE)	59 (7.5)	23! (7.9)	18! (6.9)
Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs (SE)	57 (7.7)	25! (8.0)	18! (6.9)
Provision of special education teachers and staff (SE)	60 (7.5)	19! (7.2)	21! (6.3)
Provision of related services staff (SE)	64 (6.8)	18! (7.0)	18! (6.9)
Provision of special education supports within the general education class (SE)	62 (7.0)	17! (6.6)	22 (6.3)
Provision of special education supports within specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations) (SE)	60 (7.2)	18! (6.7)	22 (6.3)
Transportation for preschool-age children with disabilities (SE)	62 (7.6)	19! (6.6)	19! (6.9)
Required qualifications for educators who serve preschool-age children with disabilities (SE)	64 (6.8)	17! (6.9)	19! (7.0)
Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting preschool-age children with disabilities (SE)	63 (7.8)	18! (6.7)	19! (6.9)
Funding for special education and related services (SE)	59 (7.0)	18! (6.7)	23 (6.5)
Determining discipline policy or procedures (SE)	63 (7.2)	16! (6.4)	22 (6.3)
Number of responses	**56**		

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having charter schools within their geographic area that operate independently from their district (n=56). Respondents were asked to focus on charter schools that exist as their own school district within the district's geographic area. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F10).

Table 2.3.2.37. Areas of responsibility, either for policy or contractual reasons, and responsible parties for preschool-age children with disabilities in the district

Response category	Percentage of districts in which primary responsibility belongs to charter schools or the charter district	Percentage of districts with shared responsibility between the charter schools/charter district and the local school district of residence	Percentage of districts in which the local school district of residence has primary responsibility	Percentage of districts that don t know who has responsibility
Identification and evaluation of preschool-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find) (SE)	47! (14.4)	39! (14.6)	.	.
Coordination of IEPs (SE)	63 (14.5)	.	.	0 (.)
Development of IEP goals (SE)	63 (14.5)	.	.	0 (.)
Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals (SE)	64 (14.5)	.	.	0 (.)
Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs (SE)	64 (14.5)	.	.	0 (.)
Provision of special education teachers and staff (SE)	64 (14.5)	.	.	0 (.)
Provision of related services staff (SE)	64 (14.5)	.	.	0 (.)
Provision of special education supports within the general education class (SE)	64 (14.5)	.	.	0 (.)
Provision of special education supports within specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations) (SE)	64 (14.5)	.	.	0 (.)
Transportation for preschool-age children with disabilities (SE)	56 (14.6)	.	.	.
Required qualifications for educators who serve preschool-age children with disabilities (SE)	64 (14.5)	.	.	0 (.)
Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting preschool-age children with disabilities (SE)	64 (14.5)	.	.	0 (.)
Funding for special education and related services (SE)	64 (14.5)	.	.	0 (.)
Determining discipline policy or procedures (SE)	64 (14.5)	.	.	0 (.)
Number of district responses	**23**			

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported being a district that consists of only charter schools (n=23). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F11).

Table 2.3.2.38. Approaches districts use to identify children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Distribute materials to parents/guardians to help in the identification of these children	58	3.5
Work with representatives from private schools to identify these children	64	3.3
Provide staff with guidance specifically designed to support referrals and identification of preschool-age children in private schools (for example, written guidance or webinars)	34	3.3
Work with the state's Parent Training and Information Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate for preschool-age children in private schools	5	1.5
Other	8	1.9
Number of district responses	**299**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Respondents were asked to exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F14).

Table 2.3.2.38a. Approaches districts use to identify children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Distribute materials to parents/guardians to help in the identification of these children	58	3.5	59	3.6	56	16.3
Work with representatives from private schools to identify these children	64	3.3	65	3.4	31!*	15.0
Provide staff with guidance specifically designed to support referrals and identification of preschool-age children in private schools (for example, written guidance or webinars)	34	3.3	35	3.4	.	.
Work with the state's Parent Training and Information Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate for preschool-age children in private schools	5	1.5	5	1.6	.	.
Other	8	1.9	8	1.9	.	.
Number of district responses	**299**		**277**		**22**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Respondents were asked to exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F14).

Table 2.3.2.38b. Approaches districts use to identify children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Distribute materials to parents/guardians to help in the identification of these children	58	3.5	59	4.5	57	5.5
Work with representatives from private schools to identify these children	64	3.3	76	4.1	50*	5.5
Provide staff with guidance specifically designed to support referrals and identification of preschool-age children in private schools (for example, written guidance or webinars)	34	3.3	42	4.5	26*	4.9
Work with the state's Parent Training and Information Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate for preschool-age children in private schools	5	1.5	6!	2.0	.	.
Other	8	1.9	6!	2.1	11!	3.4
Number of district responses	**299**		**182**		**117**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Respondents were asked to exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F14).

Table 2.3.2.38c. Approaches districts use to identify children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Distribute materials to parents/guardians to help in the identification of these children	58	3.5	58	7.1	58	4.0
Work with representatives from private schools to identify these children	64	3.3	72	6.5	62	3.8
Provide staff with guidance specifically designed to support referrals and identification of preschool-age children in private schools (for example, written guidance or webinars)	34	3.3	41	6.0	33	3.8
Work with the state's Parent Training and Information Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate for preschool-age children in private schools	5	1.5	8!	3.4	5!	1.7
Other	8	1.9	9!	3.6	8	2.2
Number of district responses	**299**		**82**		**217**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Respondents were asked to exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F14).

Table 2.3.2.39. Services districts provided in the 2018–2019 school year to support children with disabilities who were parentally placed in private preschools

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Individualized tutoring	7!	3.3
Speech or language therapy	92	3.5
Training to teachers/staff who work with children with disabilities	40	7.1
Support with diagnostic assessments	39	7.1
Provision of supplementary curricular materials	16!	5.4
Provision of assistive technology	14!	4.9
Other	25	5.5
No services were provided	.	.
Number of district responses	**85**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having one or more students with disabilities parentally placed in private preschools that were found eligible for special education services in the 2018–2019 school year (n=85). Respondents were asked to exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F17).

Table 2.3.2.40. Locations where districts provided services in the 2018–2019 school year (preschool-age children)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
On site at the child's private preschool	70	6.5
On site at a public school in the district	58	7.2
At an alternative location	8!	3.5
Number of district responses	**82**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported providing services to support children with disabilities who were parentally placed in private preschools in the 2018–2019 school year (n=83). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F18).

Table 2.3.2.41. Services available for students with disabilities at school

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
General education classroom with accommodations	99	0.3
Part-time special education resource classroom, with limited general class time	79	1.6
Special education self-contained classroom	60	2.1
One-on-one instruction	42	2.0
Number of school responses	**1,366**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E1).

Table 2.3.2.41a. Services available for students with disabilities at school, by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
General education classroom with accommodations	99	0.3	99	0.3	98	1.4	100	0.1
Part-time special education resource classroom, with limited general class time	79	1.6	79	1.7	74	4.3	85	3.2
Special education self-contained classroom	60	2.1	60	2.3	52	4.5	69	4.3
One-on-one instruction	42	2.0	41	2.1	41	4.2	43	4.4
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**977**		**178**		**211**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E1).

Table 2.3.2.41b. Services available for students with disabilities at school, by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
General education classroom with accommodations	99	0.3	100	0.4	99	0.4
Part-time special education resource classroom, with limited general class time	79	1.6	81	2.7	78	1.9
Special education self-contained classroom	60	2.1	63	3.7	58	2.4
One-on-one instruction	42	2.0	40	3.2	43	2.3
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**656**		**710**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E1).

Table 2.3.2.41c. Services available for students with disabilities at school, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response category	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
General education classroom with accommodations	99	0.3	99	0.4	99	0.5
Part-time special education resource classroom, with limited general class time	79	1.6	79	2.1	81	2.6
Special education self-contained classroom	60	2.1	60	2.7	61	3.1
One-on-one instruction	42	2.0	40	2.6	43	2.8
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**819**		**526**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E1).

Table 2.3.2.42. Accommodations or modifications available to students with Individualized Education Programs when in general education classrooms

Response category	Percentage of schools in which this accommodation or modification is available to students with disabilities, if stipulated in IEP	Percentage of schools in which this accommodation or modification is available to all students with disabilities, regardless of IEP	Percentage of schools in which this accommodation or modification is not available to students or not stipulated in any IEPs
Allow students additional time to complete assignments (SE)	59 (2.1)	40 (2.1)	1! (0.3)
Allow students additional time to take tests (SE)	65 (2.1)	34 (2.1)	1 (0.3)
Allow students to take more breaks (SE)	62 (2.0)	37 (2.0)	1! (0.3)
Provide feedback to students more frequently than usual (SE)	35 (2.1)	60 (2.2)	5 (1.1)
Provide students with shorter assignments (SE)	79 (1.7)	19 (1.6)	2! (0.7)
Provide students with slower-paced instructions (SE)	61 (2.0)	34 (1.9)	5 (0.8)
Provide physical adaptations (such as preferential seating, special desks) (SE)	53 (2.0)	46 (2.0)	1! (0.3)
Equip students with either a home set or online version of class materials (SE)	52 (2.0)	33 (1.8)	15 (1.5)
Use modified grading standards (SE)	72 (1.9)	12 (1.3)	16 (1.7)
Use modified tests (SE)	80 (1.6)	12 (1.2)	8 (1.2)
Read test(s) aloud to students (SE)	83 (1.5)	15 (1.4)	2 (0.4)
Number of responses	**1,366**		

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E2).

Table 2.3.2.43. Additional supports and assistance available to students with Individualized Education Programs when in general education classrooms

Response category	Percentage of schools in which this type of support is available to students with disabilities, if stipulated in IEP	Percentage of schools in which this type of support is available to all students with disabilities, regardless of IEP	Percentage of schools in which this accommodation or modification is not available to students or not stipulated in any IEPs
Individual behavior management program (SE)	63 (2.0)	35 (2.0)	2 (0.5)
Teacher aides or instructional assistants (paraprofessionals) assigned to individual students (SE)	75 (1.6)	14 (1.4)	11 (1.1)
Teacher aides or instructional assistants (paraprofessionals) assigned to classroom (SE)	52 (2.0)	37 (2.1)	10 (1.1)
Progress monitoring provided by special education teacher or other service provider (SE)	40 (1.9)	58 (1.9)	1 (0.4)
Assistance with study skills or learning strategies (SE)	27 (1.7)	70 (1.7)	3 (0.5)
Tutoring by special education teacher, either during or after the school day (SE)	34 (1.8)	41 (2.0)	25 (1.9)
Reader or interpreter (SE)	76 (1.6)	13 (1.2)	10 (1.2)
Scribe or note-taker (SE)	82 (1.6)	7 (1.0)	11 (1.5)
Assistive technology (SE)	83 (1.5)	14 (1.3)	4 (0.9)
Peer or cross-age tutor (SE)	24 (1.8)	44 (2.0)	31 (1.9)
Peer or cross-age buddy (SE)	21 (1.7)	51 (2.3)	28 (2.1)
Other (SE)	10 (1.1)	14 (1.4)	76 (1.7)
Number of responses	**1,366**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E3).

Table 2.3.2.44. Resources available to general education teachers in school when special education students are included in their classes

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Adult volunteers	21	1.6
Consultation by special education staff	94	0.9
Co-teaching/team teaching with a special education teacher	67	2.1
In-service training based on the needs of special education students	65	2.1
Adjustments to student load or class size	35	2.3
Specialized materials to use with special education students	65	2.3
Teacher aides, instructional assistants, or aides for individual students	76	2.0
Other	3	0.8
Number of school responses	**1,365**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E4).

Table 2.3.2.44a. Resources available to general education teachers in school when special education students are included in their classes, by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Adult volunteers	21	1.6	21	1.7	19	3.3	21	3.5
Consultation by special education staff	94	0.9	94	0.9	93	2.1	95	1.9
Co-teaching/team teaching with a special education teacher	67	2.1	67	2.2	59	5.3	75	3.8
In-service training based on the needs of special education students	65	2.1	65	2.2	59	4.6	73	3.9
Adjustments to student load or class size	35	2.3	35	2.5	35	4.3	36	4.5
Specialized materials to use with special education students	65	2.3	65	2.5	64	4.3	67	4.2
Teacher aides, instructional assistants, or aides for individual students	76	2.0	77	2.1	70	3.8	72	4.2
Other	3	0.8	4	0.8	3!	1.2	.	.
Number of school responses	**1,365**		**976**		**178**		**211**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E4).

Table 2.3.2.44b. Resources available to general education teachers in school when special education students are included in their classes, by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Adult volunteers	21	1.6	19	2.5	23	2.1
Consultation by special education staff	94	0.9	94	1.5	94	1.0
Co-teaching/team teaching with a special education teacher	67	2.1	67	3.6	68	2.4
In-service training based on the needs of special education students	65	2.1	61	3.6	69	2.2
Adjustments to student load or class size	35	2.3	31	4.2	38	2.4
Specialized materials to use with special education students	65	2.3	60	4.3	69	2.2
Teacher aides, instructional assistants, or aides for individual students	76	2.0	75	3.5	77	2.1
Other	3	0.8	4!	1.5	3	0.7
Number of school responses	**1,365**		**656**		**709**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E4).

Table 2.3.2.44c. Resources available to general education teachers in school when special education students are included in their classes, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response category	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Adult volunteers	21	1.6	20	2.1	22	2.4
Consultation by special education staff	94	0.9	94	1.3	95	1.1
Co-teaching/team teaching with a special education teacher	67	2.1	68	2.6	66	3.3
In-service training based on the needs of special education students	65	2.1	64	2.6	67	3.1
Adjustments to student load or class size	35	2.3	34	2.4	36	4.2
Specialized materials to use with special education students	65	2.3	63	2.7	67	3.7
Teacher aides, instructional assistants, or aides for individual students	76	2.0	75	2.5	78	3.1
Other	3	0.8	3!	1.3	3	0.9
Number of school responses	**1,365**		**818**		**526**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E4).

Table 2.3.2.45. Ways in which schools help teachers ensure students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum

Response category	Percentage of schools that provide support to help teachers adapt curriculum with appropriate complexity and breadth, including incorporation of UDL principles	Percentage of schools that provide support to help teachers provide accommodations	Percentage of schools that provide support to help teachers manage student behavior	Percentage of schools that do not provide support through this mechanism
Training through a workshop, institute, or online module (SE)	60 (2.2)	76 (1.9)	72 (2.0)	16 (1.6)
Ongoing individualized support (such as consultation, coaching, or mentoring) (SE)	68 (2.0)	86 (1.5)	81 (1.6)	8 (1.2)
Ongoing group support (in the form of special education department meetings or community of practice/professional learning communities) (SE)	66 (2.1)	81 (1.5)	74 (2.0)	14 (1.4)
Release time (including common preparation periods and non-student days) to attend conferences and workshops outside of school (SE)	67 (2.1)	68 (2.1)	65 (1.8)	20 (1.7)
Other (SE)	13 (1.4)	15 (1.5)	14 (1.4)	84 (1.5)
Number of school responses	**1,363**			

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error; UDL = Universal Design for Learning.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E5).

Table 2.3.2.46. Ways in which schools help teachers ensure prekindergarten students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum

Response category	Percentage of schools that provide support to help teachers adapt curriculum with appropriate complexity and breadth, including incorporation of UDL principles	Percentage of schools that provide support to help teachers provide accommodations	Percentage of schools that provide support to help teachers manage student behavior	Percentage of schools that do not provide support this way
Training through a workshop, institute, or online module (SE)	65 (2.8)	74 (2.9)	73 (2.9)	17 (2.6)
Ongoing individualized support (such as consultation, coaching, or mentoring) (SE)	65 (2.7)	81 (2.7)	79 (2.5)	14 (2.0)
Ongoing group support (in the form of special education department meetings or community of practice/professional learning communities) (SE)	66 (2.6)	75 (2.8)	74 (2.5)	18 (2.2)
Release time (including common preparation periods and non-student days) to attend conferences and workshops outside of school (SE)	66 (2.7)	70 (3.0)	69 (2.9)	21 (2.4)
Other (SE)	9 (2.2)	9 (2.1)	9 (2.1)	90 (2.2)
Number of school responses	**519**			

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering prekindergarten (n=521). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error; UDL = Universal Design for Learning.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E6).

Table 2.3.2.47. Teachers who teach core subject areas to students with disabilities who are receiving services in separate classes (i.e., special education-only settings)

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Dual certified teachers	27	1.8
General education teachers, not certified in special education	14	1.8
Special education teacher, in consultation with general education teacher	56	2.3
Special education and general education teacher co-teach	26	2.0
Special education teacher provides individual/small group instruction	77	1.9
Paraprofessional provides individual/small group instruction	39	2.3
Number of school responses	**1,285**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E7).

Table 2.3.2.47a. Teachers who teach core subject areas to students with disabilities who are receiving services in separate classes (i.e., special education-only settings), by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Dual certified teachers	27	1.8	27	1.9	24	4.4	27	4.1
General education teachers, not certified in special education	14	1.8	14	1.9	10	2.5	17	3.5
Special education teacher, in consultation with general education teacher	56	2.3	56	2.5	41*	3.7	51	4.7
Special education and general education teacher co-teach	26	2.0	26	2.2	17*	2.8	24	4.0
Special education teacher provides individual/small group instruction	77	1.9	77	2.0	76	4.1	78	3.8
Paraprofessional provides individual/small group instruction	39	2.3	39	2.5	42	4.3	46	4.5
Number of school responses	**1,285**		**916**		**166**		**203**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E7).

Table 2.3.2.47b. Teachers who teach core subject areas to students with disabilities who are receiving services in separate classes (i.e., special education-only settings), by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Dual certified teachers	27	1.8	33	3.0	22*	1.9
General education teachers, not certified in special education	14	1.8	16	3.5	11	1.4
Special education teacher, in consultation with general education teacher	56	2.3	58	4.1	54	2.5
Special education and general education teacher co-teach	26	2.0	26	3.5	26	2.3
Special education teacher provides individual/small group instruction	77	1.9	76	3.2	77	2.2
Paraprofessional provides individual/small group instruction	39	2.3	42	4.2	36	2.3
Number of school responses	**1,285**		**622**		**663**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E7).

Table 2.3.2.47c. Teachers who teach core subject areas to students with disabilities who are receiving services in separate classes (i.e., special education-only settings), by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response category	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Dual certified teachers	27	1.8	28	2.5	26	2.5
General education teachers, not certified in special education	14	1.8	13	2.1	15	3.2
Special education teacher, in consultation with general education teacher	56	2.3	53	2.6	60	3.8
Special education and general education teacher co-teach	26	2.0	26	2.5	26	3.3
Special education teacher provides individual/small group instruction	77	1.9	76	2.3	77	3.1
Paraprofessional provides individual/small group instruction	39	2.3	37	2.6	41	4.2
Number of school responses	**1,285**		**776**		**490**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E7).

Table 2.3.2.48. Core subject area curricula schools use for students with disabilities who receive core-subject area instruction in self-contained classes or schools

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
General education curriculum, without specific adaptions	26	2.4
General education curriculum with adaptations for disability type	54	2.1
General education curriculum with adaptations for intensity of need	58	2.4
General education curriculum with individualized instructional supports	67	2.0
Specialized curriculum, without specific adaptations	25	1.8
Specialized curriculum with adaptations for disability type	50	2.3
Specialized curriculum with adaptations for intensity of need	56	2.3
Specialized curriculum with individualized instructional supports	58	2.2
Number of school responses	**1,253**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E8).

Table 2.3.2.48a. Core subject area curricula schools use for students with disabilities who receive core-subject area instruction in self-contained classes or schools, by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
General education curriculum, without specific adaptions	26	2.4	26	2.5	20	3.4	29	4.4
General education curriculum with adaptations for disability type	54	2.1	54	2.3	50	4.7	60	4.7
General education curriculum with adaptations for intensity of need	58	2.4	58	2.5	60	4.3	56	4.7
General education curriculum with individualized instructional supports	67	2.0	67	2.1	62	4.5	69	4.4
Specialized curriculum, without specific adaptations	25	1.8	25	2.0	26	3.9	31	4.6
Specialized curriculum with adaptations for disability type	50	2.3	50	2.4	47	4.9	68*	4.3
Specialized curriculum with adaptations for intensity of need	56	2.3	55	2.4	51	5.1	65	4.4
Specialized curriculum with individualized instructional supports	58	2.2	57	2.3	56	5.4	74*	4.0
Number of school responses	**1,253**		**900**		**159**		**194**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E8).

Table 2.3.2.48b. Core subject area curricula schools use for students with disabilities who receive core-subject area instruction in self-contained classes or schools, by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
General education curriculum, without specific adaptions	26	2.4	31	4.4	22	1.9
General education curriculum with adaptations for disability type	54	2.1	55	3.6	53	2.4
General education curriculum with adaptations for intensity of need	58	2.4	53	4.3	61	2.4
General education curriculum with individualized instructional supports	67	2.0	67	3.3	67	2.3
Specialized curriculum, without specific adaptations	25	1.8	24	3.2	27	2.1
Specialized curriculum with adaptations for disability type	50	2.3	50	4.0	50	2.5
Specialized curriculum with adaptations for intensity of need	56	2.3	55	4.0	57	2.4
Specialized curriculum with individualized instructional supports	58	2.2	56	3.9	59	2.3
Number of school responses	**1,253**		**604**		**649**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E8).

Table 2.3.2.48c. Core subject area curricula schools use for students with disabilities who receive core-subject area instruction in self-contained classes or schools, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of	Standard error	Percentage of	Standard error	Percentage of	Standard error
General education curriculum, without specific adaptions	26	2.4	25	2.4	27	4.7
General education curriculum with adaptations for disability type	54	2.1	51	2.6	59	3.8
General education curriculum with adaptations for intensity of need	58	2.4	52	2.7	65*	3.6
General education curriculum with individualized instructional supports	67	2.0	66	2.5	69	3.4
Specialized curriculum, without specific adaptations	25	1.8	24	2.1	26	3.2
Specialized curriculum with adaptations for disability type	50	2.3	47	2.7	55	3.8
Specialized curriculum with adaptations for intensity of need	56	2.3	51	2.8	62*	3.5
Specialized curriculum with individualized instructional supports	58	2.2	54	2.6	64*	3.6
Number of school responses	**1,253**		**760**		**476**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for schools eligible for Title I ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E8).

Table 2.3.2.49. Methods schools use to support the participation of students with disabilities in the same nonacademic extracurricular activities as students without disabilities

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Provide individualized accommodations to students with disabilities	81	1.8
Provide professional development to personnel supervising nonacademic activities	38	2.5
Offer a specific disability awareness program	17	1.7
Provide assistive technology to help students participate in activities	53	2.2
Assign students without disabilities to be 'buddies' to students with disabilities	47	2.4
Prompt and reinforce students without disabilities to initiate and maintain interactions with students with disabilities	55	2.2
Structure activities that require interaction between students with and without disabilities	62	2.1
Provide or assist students in getting the necessary transportation to these activities	41	2.1
Number of school responses	**1,284**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E9).

Table 2.3.2.49a. Methods schools use to support the participation of students with disabilities in the same nonacademic extracurricular activities as students without disabilities, by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Provide individualized accommodations to students with disabilities	81	1.8	81	1.9	76	3.9	85	3.3
Provide professional development to personnel supervising nonacademic activities	38	2.5	38	2.6	32	3.8	35	4.6
Offer a specific disability awareness program	17	1.7	17	1.8	18	2.9	23	4.1
Provide assistive technology to help students participate in activities	53	2.2	53	2.3	46	4.7	58	4.5
Assign students without disabilities to be 'buddies' to students with disabilities	47	2.4	46	2.5	41	4.0	59*	4.5
Prompt and reinforce students without disabilities to initiate and maintain interactions with students with disabilities	55	2.2	55	2.3	47	4.5	60	4.5
Structure activities that require interaction between students with and without disabilities	62	2.1	62	2.2	52*	3.8	67	4.3
Provide or assist students in getting the necessary transportation to these activities	41	2.1	41	2.2	31*	3.6	50	4.7
Number of school responses	**1,284**		**918**		**169**		**197**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E9).

Table 2.3.2.49b. Methods schools use to support the participation of students with disabilities in the same nonacademic extracurricular activities as students without disabilities, by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Provide individualized accommodations to students with disabilities	81	1.8	81	3.2	81	2.0
Provide professional development to personnel supervising nonacademic activities	38	2.5	35	4.4	41	2.5
Offer a specific disability awareness program	17	1.7	15	2.5	19	2.3
Provide assistive technology to help students participate in activities	53	2.2	54	3.7	53	2.5
Assign students without disabilities to be 'buddies' to students with disabilities	47	2.4	42	3.9	51	2.6
Prompt and reinforce students without disabilities to initiate and maintain interactions with students with disabilities	55	2.2	57	3.8	54	2.5
Structure activities that require interaction between students with and without disabilities	62	2.1	62	3.5	62	2.5
Provide or assist students in getting the necessary transportation to these activities	41	2.1	40	3.6	41	2.4
Number of school responses	**1,284**		**616**		**668**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E9).

Table 2.3.2.49c. Methods schools use to support the participation of students with disabilities in the same nonacademic extracurricular activities as students without disabilities, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response category	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Provide individualized accommodations to students with disabilities	81	1.8	80	2.7	83	2.5
Provide professional development to personnel supervising nonacademic activities	38	2.5	39	2.9	37	4.3
Offer a specific disability awareness program	17	1.7	17	2.3	18	2.5
Provide assistive technology to help students participate in activities	53	2.2	50	2.6	58	3.5
Assign students without disabilities to be 'buddies' to students with disabilities	47	2.4	46	2.8	47	4.0
Prompt and reinforce students without disabilities to initiate and maintain interactions with students with disabilities	55	2.2	51	2.8	61*	3.5
Structure activities that require interaction between students with and without disabilities	62	2.1	58	2.7	66	3.3
Provide or assist students in getting the necessary transportation to these activities	41	2.1	38	2.6	45	3.3
Number of school responses	**1,284**		**767**		**499**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for schools eligible for Title I ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E9).

Table 2.3.2.50. Service options available for prekindergarten students with disabilities at schools

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Classes primarily for students with disabilities	31	3.7
General education/inclusion program with special services provided in general education classroom	81	2.4
General and special education co-taught classes	20	2.3
Part-time resource or therapy room for students in special education	38	3.3
Other	5	1.4
Number of school responses	**514**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering prekindergarten (n=521). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E10).

Table 2.3.2.51. Ways in which students with and without disabilities are brought together in schools' prekindergarten classes

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Students with and without disabilities are seldom in contact with one another	5!	2.3
Classes for students with and without disabilities share common spaces (for example, playground and/or lunch room) only	17	2.1
Students with disabilities spend part of the day in a classroom primarily for non-disabled students	12	2.1
Students with disabilities spend the entire day in a classroom primarily for non-disabled students	54	3.0
Students without disabilities spend part of the day in the classroom for students with disabilities	3!	1.3
Do not currently have both students with and without disabilities enrolled in the school	8	1.6
Number of school responses	**518**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering prekindergarten (n=521). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E11).

Table 2.3.2.52. Percentage of schools that host extended-day programs that prekindergarten students with disabilities can attend

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
No	81	2.5
Yes	19	2.5
Number of school responses	**517**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering prekindergarten (n=521). Respondents were asked to consider extended day programs that are provided by their school and extended day programs that are offered at their school but run by another provider. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E12).

Table 2.3.2.53. Extended-day options available for prekindergarten students with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Before preschool program	41	6.7
After preschool program	95	2.1
Number of school responses	**104**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported hosting extended day programs that prekindergarten students with disabilities can attend (n=107). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E13).

Table 2.3.2.54. Areas of responsibility and responsible parties, either for policy or contractual reasons, for students with disabilities in charter schools

Response category	Percentage of charter schools in which the school or charter school district has primary responsibility	Percentage of charter schools with shared responsibility between the charter school/charter school district and the student s local school district of residence	Percentage of charter schools in which the student s local school district of residence has primary responsibility
Identification and evaluation of school-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find) (SE)	84 (2.8)	13 (2.6)	3! (0.9)
Coordination of IEPs (SE)	89 (2.2)	10 (2.1)	1! (0.5)
Development of IEP goals (SE)	91 (2.0)	8 (1.9)	1! (0.5)
Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals (SE)	94 (1.6)	4! (1.4)	2! (0.6)
Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs (SE)	87 (2.4)	10 (2.1)	3! (0.9)
Provision of special education teachers and staff (SE)	91 (1.9)	8 (1.8)	1! (0.6)
Provision of related services staff (SE)	82 (2.8)	11 (2.1)	7 (1.8)
Placements inside the general education class (SE)	94 (1.6)	5 (1.4)	1! (0.6)
Placements in specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations (SE)	75 (4.0)	20 (3.8)	5 (1.5)
Transportation for students with disabilities (SE)	74 (4.3)	12 (3.4)	14 (2.7)
Required qualifications for educators who serve school-age children with disabilities (SE)	86 (2.6)	11 (2.2)	3! (1.1)
Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting students with disabilities (SE)	85 (2.7)	13 (2.6)	2! (0.6)
Funding for special education and related services (SE)	73 (4.1)	17 (3.1)	10 (2.9)
Determining discipline policy or procedures (SE)	85 (2.6)	12 (2.4)	3! (1.2)
Number of responses	**357**		

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported being charter schools (n=358). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E19).

2.3.3. Access to general education programs and supports: Assistive technology

Table 2.3.3.1. Ways in which state agencies support district and school use of assistive technology to serve school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Offer information about AT to families, such as through AT fairs	17	4
Provide designated funding to support AT devices and use	23	3
Provide lists of AT devices to districts for consideration	18	1
Provide guidelines for how to assess AT needs as part of IEP development	32	6
Provide specific guidelines for AT use	23	5
Provide professional development to general education teachers on use of AT	26	5
Provide professional development to special education teachers on use of AT	36	7
Provide professional development to Specialized Instructional Support Staff on use of AT	29	5
Review or monitor IEPs to determine extent of AT use	21	7
Provide or lend AT devices or software to districts	30	5
Monitor use of AT to ensure effective implementation	8	5
Hire or contract with AT experts to promote effective implementation strategies	32	3
None of the above	1	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

AT = assistive technology; IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G11).

Table 2.3.3.2. Ways in which state agencies support local agencies' or programs' use of individualized assistive technology to serve preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Offer information about AT to families, such as through AT fairs	16	2
Provide designated funding to support AT devices and use	7	5
Provide lists of AT devices to districts for consideration	13	2
Provide guidelines for how to assess AT needs as part of IEP development	24	3
Provide specific guidelines for AT use	15	3
Provide professional development to general education teachers on use of AT	20	4
Provide professional development to special education teachers on use of AT	23	6
Provide professional development to Specialized Instructional Support Staff on use of AT	13	3
Review or monitor IEPs to determine extent of AT use	14	4
Provide or lend AT devices or software to districts	19	4
Monitor use of AT to ensure effective implementation	6	4
Hire or contract with AT experts to promote effective implementation strategies	17	3
None of the above	9	1
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

AT = assistive technology; IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question E7).

Table 2.3.3.3. Actions lead agencies take to support local early intervention programs' use of individualized assistive technology to serve infants and toddlers with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Offer information about AT to families, such as through AT fairs	10	1
Provide designated funding to support AT devices and use	21	2
Provide lists of AT devices to providers for consideration	15	0
Provide guidelines for how to assess AT needs as part of IFSP development	21	1
Provide specific guidelines for AT use	21	1
Provide professional development to early intervention service providers on use of AT	21	1
Review or monitor IFSPs to determine extent of AT use	21	1
Provide or lend AT devices or software to local providers	21	0
Monitor use of AT to ensure effective implementation	16	0
Hire or contract with AT experts to promote effective implementation strategies	13	0
None of the above	8	2
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

AT = assistive technology; IFSP = Individualized Family Service Plan.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question D4).

Table 2.3.3.4. Actions districts take to support school use of assistive technology for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Offer information about AT to families, such as through AT fairs	15	2.2
Provide designated funding to support AT devices and use	45	2.9
Provide a list of AT for students with different challenges to IEP teams for consideration	26	2.5
Require IEP teams to assess the AT needs of individual students	69	2.7
Provide professional development to general education teachers on use of AT	42	2.9
Provide professional development to special education teachers on use of AT	64	2.8
Provide professional development to specialized instructional support personnel on use of AT	32	2.7
Review IEPs to determine the extent of AT use	71	2.7
Monitor use of AT to ensure effective implementation	62	2.8
Hire or contract with AT experts to promote effective implementation strategies	40	2.9
Other	6	1.6
Number of district responses	**434**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology; IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H23).

Table 2.3.3.4a. Actions districts take to support school use of assistive technology for school-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Offer information about AT to families, such as through AT fairs	15	2.2	17	2.4	7!*	3.2
Provide designated funding to support AT devices and use	45	2.9	46	3.2	39	6.0
Provide a list of AT for students with different challenges to IEP teams for consideration	26	2.5	26	2.8	24	5.2
Require IEP teams to assess the AT needs of individual students	69	2.7	71	3.0	63	6.0
Provide professional development to general education teachers on use of AT	42	2.9	43	3.2	34	5.8
Provide professional development to special education teachers on use of AT	64	2.8	67	3.1	42*	6.1
Provide professional development to specialized instructional support personnel on use of AT	32	2.7	35	3.1	13!*	4.1
Review IEPs to determine the extent of AT use	71	2.7	70	3.0	77	5.2
Monitor use of AT to ensure effective implementation	62	2.8	63	3.1	51	6.2
Hire or contract with AT experts to promote effective implementation strategies	40	2.9	43	3.2	17*	4.7
Other	6	1.6	7	1.9	.	.
Number of district responses	**434**		**331**		**103**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology; IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H23).

Table 2.3.3.4b. Actions districts take to support school use of assistive technology for school-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Offer information about AT to families, such as through AT fairs	15	2.2	17	3.3	14	2.9
Provide designated funding to support AT devices and use	45	2.9	54	4.3	37*	3.9
Provide a list of AT for students with different challenges to IEP teams for consideration	26	2.5	26	3.6	25	3.6
Require IEP teams to assess the AT needs of individual students	69	2.7	74	3.7	66	3.8
Provide professional development to general education teachers on use of AT	42	2.9	41	4.1	42	4.1
Provide professional development to special education teachers on use of AT	64	2.8	74	3.7	55*	4.0
Provide professional development to specialized instructional support personnel on use of AT	32	2.7	40	4.2	26*	3.6
Review IEPs to determine the extent of AT use	71	2.7	68	4.0	74	3.6
Monitor use of AT to ensure effective implementation	62	2.8	68	3.8	56*	4.0
Hire or contract with AT experts to promote effective implementation strategies	40	2.9	46	4.2	35*	3.9
Other	6	1.6	10!	3.0	.	.
Number of district responses	**434**		**216**		**218**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology; IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H23).

Table 2.3.3.4c. Actions districts take to support school use of assistive technology for school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Offer information about AT to families, such as through AT fairs	15	2.2	17	4.4	15	2.5
Provide designated funding to support AT devices and use	45	2.9	58	4.8	40*	3.5
Provide a list of AT for students with different challenges to IEP teams for consideration	26	2.5	33	4.7	23	3.0
Require IEP teams to assess the AT needs of individual students	69	2.7	68	4.8	70	3.2
Provide professional development to general education teachers on use of AT	42	2.9	51	5.2	39	3.5
Provide professional development to special education teachers on use of AT	64	2.8	66	4.7	63	3.4
Provide professional development to specialized instructional support personnel on use of AT	32	2.7	37	4.9	31	3.3
Review IEPs to determine the extent of AT use	71	2.7	78	4.3	69	3.3
Monitor use of AT to ensure effective implementation	62	2.8	65	4.6	60	3.4
Hire or contract with AT experts to promote effective implementation strategies	40	2.9	46	5.0	38	3.4
Other	6	1.6	.	.	7	2.1
Number of district responses	**434**		**153**		**281**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology; IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H23).

Table 2.3.3.5. Percentage of districts that allow school-age children with disabilities to use district- or school-provided assistive technology outside of district buildings and classrooms

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district restricts the use of all AT to district buildings and classrooms	15	2.1
The district permits all AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)	32	2.9
The district permits some AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)	53	3.1
Number of district responses	**427**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H24).

Table 2.3.3.5a. Percentage of districts that allow school-age children with disabilities to use district- or school-provided assistive technology outside of district buildings and classrooms, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district restricts the use of all AT to district buildings and classrooms	15	2.1	11	2.2	44*	6.4
The district permits all AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)	32	2.9	35	3.3	19*	4.9
The district permits some AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)	53	3.1	55	3.5	38*	6.2
Number of district responses	**427**		**326**		**101**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H24).

Table 2.3.3.5b. Percentage of districts that allow school-age children with disabilities to use district- or school-provided assistive technology outside of district buildings and classrooms, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district restricts the use of all AT to district buildings and classrooms	15	2.1	8!	2.6	22*	3.3
The district permits all AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)	32	2.9	36	4.3	29	4.0
The district permits some AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)	53	3.1	56	4.5	49	4.3
Number of district responses	**427**		**215**		**212**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H24).

Table 2.3.3.5c. Percentage of districts that allow school-age children with disabilities to use district- or school-provided assistive technology outside of district buildings and classrooms, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district restricts the use of all AT to district buildings and classrooms	15	2.1	17	3.1	15	2.6
The district permits all AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)	32	2.9	34	5.3	32	3.5
The district permits some AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)	53	3.1	49	5.6	54	3.7
Number of district responses	**427**		**151**		**276**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H24).

Table 2.3.3.6. Actions districts take to support the use of assistive technology for preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Offer information about AT to families, such as through AT fairs	13	2.3
Provide designated funding to support AT devices and use	34	3.2
Provide a list of AT for students with different challenges to IEP teams for consideration	21	2.7
Require IEP teams to assess the AT needs of individual students	69	3.2
Provide professional development to general education teachers on use of AT	36	3.3
Provide professional development to special education teachers on use of AT	56	3.5
Provide professional development to specialized instructional support personnel on use of AT	31	3.0
Review IEPs to determine the extent of AT use	66	3.2
Monitor use of AT to ensure effective implementation	56	3.4
Hire or contract with AT experts to promote effective implementation strategies	36	3.2
Other	8	2.0
Number of district responses	**315**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology; IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F19).

Table 2.3.3.6a. Actions districts take to support the use of assistive technology for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Offer information about AT to families, such as through AT fairs	13	2.3	13	2.4	.	.
Provide designated funding to support AT devices and use	34	3.2	34	3.3	.	.
Provide a list of AT for students with different challenges to IEP teams for consideration	21	2.7	22	2.8	.	.
Require IEP teams to assess the AT needs of individual students	69	3.2	69	3.2	50!	15.7
Provide professional development to general education teachers on use of AT	36	3.3	36	3.4	38!	15.4
Provide professional development to special education teachers on use of AT	56	3.5	57	3.5	31!	14.9
Provide professional development to specialized instructional support personnel on use of AT	31	3.0	32	3.1	.	.
Review IEPs to determine the extent of AT use	66	3.2	67	3.3	33!*	14.5
Monitor use of AT to ensure effective implementation	56	3.4	57	3.5	31!	14.5
Hire or contract with AT experts to promote effective implementation strategies	36	3.2	37	3.3	.	.
Other	8	2.0	8	2.0	.	.
Number of district responses	**315**		**291**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology; IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F19).

Table 2.3.3.6b. Actions districts take to support the use of assistive technology for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Offer information about AT to families, such as through AT fairs	13	2.3	12	2.9	14	3.6
Provide designated funding to support AT devices and use	34	3.2	37	4.4	30	4.8
Provide a list of AT for students with different challenges to IEP teams for consideration	21	2.7	19	3.4	24	4.4
Require IEP teams to assess the AT needs of individual students	69	3.2	72	4.1	65	5.0
Provide professional development to general education teachers on use of AT	36	3.3	34	4.2	39	5.2
Provide professional development to special education teachers on use of AT	56	3.5	61	4.5	50	5.4
Provide professional development to specialized instructional support personnel on use of AT	31	3.0	36	4.2	25	4.5
Review IEPs to determine the extent of AT use	66	3.2	60	4.4	72	4.8
Monitor use of AT to ensure effective implementation	56	3.4	60	4.4	51	5.3
Hire or contract with AT experts to promote effective implementation strategies	36	3.2	44	4.5	27*	4.7
Other	8	2.0	6!	2.1	10!	3.4
Number of district responses	**315**		**189**		**126**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology; IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F19).

Table 2.3.3.6c. Actions districts take to support the use of assistive technology for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Offer information about AT to families, such as through AT fairs	13	2.3	26	6.8	10*	2.4
Provide designated funding to support AT devices and use	34	3.2	42	6.6	32	3.7
Provide a list of AT for students with different challenges to IEP teams for consideration	21	2.7	27	5.9	20	3.1
Require IEP teams to assess the AT needs of individual students	69	3.2	77	5.3	67	3.7
Provide professional development to general education teachers on use of AT	36	3.3	33	5.6	37	3.9
Provide professional development to special education teachers on use of AT	56	3.5	54	6.4	56	4.0
Provide professional development to specialized instructional support personnel on use of AT	31	3.0	40	6.3	28	3.5
Review IEPs to determine the extent of AT use	66	3.2	55	6.4	69	3.7
Monitor use of AT to ensure effective implementation	56	3.4	70	5.9	52*	4.0
Hire or contract with AT experts to promote effective implementation strategies	36	3.2	60	6.8	31*	3.7
Other	8	2.0	9!	3.4	8	2.3
Number of district responses	**315**		**87**		**228**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology; IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F19).

Table 2.3.3.7. Percentage of districts that allow preschool-age children with disabilities to use district- or school-provided assistive technology outside of district buildings and classrooms

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district restricts the use of all AT to district buildings and classrooms	19	2.9
The district permits all AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)	31	3.3
The district permits some AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)	50	3.6
Number of district responses	**308**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F20).

Table 2.3.3.7a. Percentage of districts that allow preschool-age children with disabilities to use district- or school-provided assistive technology outside of district buildings and classrooms, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district restricts the use of all AT to district buildings and classrooms	19	2.9	18	2.9	45!	15.7
The district permits all AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)	31	3.3	32	3.4	.	.
The district permits some AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)	50	3.6	50	3.7	50!	15.7
Number of district responses	**308**		**284**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F20).

Table 2.3.3.7b. Percentage of districts that allow preschool-age children with disabilities to use district- or school-provided assistive technology outside of district buildings and classrooms, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district restricts the use of all AT to district buildings and classrooms	19	2.9	16	3.7	22	4.5
The district permits all AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)	31	3.3	33	4.4	29	5.0
The district permits some AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)	50	3.6	51	4.7	49	5.5
Number of district responses	**308**		**187**		**121**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F20).

Table 2.3.3.7c. Percentage of districts that allow preschool-age children with disabilities to use district- or school-provided assistive technology outside of district buildings and classrooms, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district restricts the use of all AT to district buildings and classrooms	19	2.9	12!	4.8	21	3.4
The district permits all AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)	31	3.3	46	7.4	27*	3.6
The district permits some AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)	50	3.6	42	7.2	52	4.1
Number of district responses	**308**		**85**		**223**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F20).

Table 2.3.3.8. Percentage of districts that allow preschool-age children with disabilities to take district- or school-provided assistive technology devices with them when they transition into elementary school

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Children are not allowed to take devices with them	8	1.9
Children can take all AT devices with them	62	3.4
Children can take some AT devices with them	30	3.2
Number of district responses	**307**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F21).

Table 2.3.3.8a. Percentage of districts that allow preschool-age children with disabilities to take district- or school-provided assistive technology devices with them when they transition into elementary school, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Children are not allowed to take devices with them	8	1.9	7	1.8	63*	14.5
Children can take all AT devices with them	62	3.4	63	3.5	26!*	12.9
Children can take some AT devices with them	30	3.2	30	3.3	.	.
Number of district responses	**307**		**284**		**23**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F21).

Table 2.3.3.8b. Percentage of districts that allow preschool-age children with disabilities to take district- or school-provided assistive technology devices with them when they transition into elementary school, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Children are not allowed to take devices with them	8	1.9	.	.	15	3.8
Children can take all AT devices with them	62	3.4	67	4.4	56	5.4
Children can take some AT devices with them	30	3.2	30	4.3	29	4.9
Number of district responses	**307**		**185**		**122**	

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F21).

Table 2.3.3.8c. Percentage of districts that allow preschool-age children with disabilities to take district- or school-provided assistive technology devices with them when they transition into elementary school, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Children are not allowed to take devices with them	8	1.9	9!	3.9	8	2.2
Children can take all AT devices with them	62	3.4	73	5.9	60	4.0
Children can take some AT devices with them	30	3.2	18	5.1	32*	3.8
Number of district responses	**307**		**82**		**225**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F21).

Table 2.3.3.9. School-provided assistive technology that students with Individualized Education Programs have access to in schools

Response category	Percentage of schools in which this type of assistive technology is not available	Percentage of schools in which this type of assistive technology is available but not currently used	Percentage of schools in which this type of assistive technology is available and used
Augmentative and alternative communication device (SE)	28 (1.9)	32 (1.9)	40 (2.0)
Adapted keyboard (SE)	30 (2.0)	41 (1.9)	29 (1.9)
Adapted paper (SE)	25 (1.9)	27 (1.8)	48 (2.2)
Adapted pencil (SE)	22 (1.7)	27 (1.5)	51 (2.0)
Adapted, adaptive, or ability switches (SE)	44 (2.2)	32 (1.8)	25 (1.7)
Audio books (SE)	7 (1.1)	15 (1.4)	78 (1.9)
Closed captioning (SE)	24 (1.8)	45 (2.0)	31 (1.8)
Hearing assistive technologies (SE)	28 (1.9)	30 (1.7)	42 (2.1)
Increased font size on materials (SE)	4 (0.9)	29 (1.8)	67 (1.9)
Larger grips (SE)	16 (1.5)	24 (1.7)	60 (2.1)
Noise-blocking headphones (SE)	8 (1.2)	16 (1.5)	76 (1.8)
Personalized devices or equipment to support student positioning and mobility (SE)	22 (1.8)	25 (1.8)	54 (2.1)
Physical objects or manipulatives for hands-on learning (SE)	2! (0.7)	7 (1.1)	91 (1.3)
Instructions using only pictures (SE)	20 (1.6)	27 (1.8)	53 (2.1)
Roller-ball mouse (SE)	29 (1.9)	37 (2.0)	34 (1.8)
Slant Board (SE)	31 (2.0)	34 (1.9)	35 (1.9)
Smart Board (SE)	17 (1.7)	7 (1.0)	76 (2.0)
Speech to Text, including real-time transcription (SE)	14 (1.6)	30 (2.0)	56 (2.4)
Tablets, computers, or other digital devices (SE)	1! (0.4)	4 (0.8)	96 (0.9)
Talking calculators (SE)	60 (2.3)	27 (1.7)	13 (1.7)
Text to speech (SE)	7 (1.0)	20 (1.8)	73 (2.2)
Word processing programs (SE)	6 (1.0)	15 (1.7)	79 (1.9)
Other (SE)	92 (1.0)	<0.5! (0.2)	8 (0.9)
Number of school responses	**1,363**		

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Only respondents whose schools offer grade levels besides or in addition to prekindergarten were asked to address word processing programs (n=1,347). Adapted, adaptive, or ability switches make it easier for students to interact with computers, speech-generating devices, and other tools and devices. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E14).

Table 2.3.3.10. Actions schools take to monitor the appropriate use of assistive technology for students with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Ensure the recommended AT is being used by the student	85	1.2
Ensure the AT is being used appropriately	83	1.6
Other	7	1.0
Number of school responses	**1,355**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
AT = assistive technology.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E15).

Table 2.3.3.10a. Actions schools take to monitor the appropriate use of assistive technology for students with disabilities, by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Ensure the recommended AT is being used by the student	85	1.2	85	1.3	86	2.9	82	3.5
Ensure the AT is being used appropriately	83	1.6	83	1.7	81	3.2	84	3.2
Other	7	1.0	7	1.0	4!	1.6	7	2.1
Number of school responses	**1,355**		**974**		**172**		**209**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E15).

Table 2.3.3.10b. Actions schools take to monitor the appropriate use of assistive technology for students with disabilities, by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Ensure the recommended AT is being used by the student	85	1.2	87	1.9	83	1.7
Ensure the AT is being used appropriately	83	1.6	84	2.5	83	2.0
Other	7	1.0	8	1.8	6	1.0
Number of school responses	**1,355**		**649**		**706**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E15).

Table 2.3.3.10c. Actions schools take to monitor the appropriate use of assistive technology for students with disabilities, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response category	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Ensure the recommended AT is being used by the student	85	1.2	83	1.7	87	1.9
Ensure the AT is being used appropriately	83	1.6	83	2.0	83	2.6
Other	7	1.0	7	1.5	6	1.2
Number of school responses	**1,355**		**811**		**524**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
AT = assistive technology.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E15).

Table 2.3.3.11. Methods schools use to finance assistive technology

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
District provides all funds towards AT	53	2.2
District provides some funds towards AT, but schools must fund the rest	17	1.4
School can apply for grant to pay for major AT investments, such as hearing assistive technologies	11	1.2
School provides funds for AT purchases	18	1.6
Civic organizations help fund AT	5	0.7
Medicaid or other non-private health insurance funds AT purchases	12	1.1
Parents or guardians, through private insurance, fund AT purchases	11	1.1
Other	6	1.0
Don't know	11	1.1
Number of school responses	**1,356**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E16).

Table 2.3.3.11a. Methods schools use to finance assistive technology, by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
District provides all funds towards AT	53	2.2	54	2.3	42*	4.8	50	4.5
District provides some funds towards AT, but schools must fund the rest	17	1.4	17	1.5	21	3.8	21	3.7
School can apply for grant to pay for major AT investments, such as hearing assistive technologies	11	1.2	11	1.3	14	3.3	12	3.1
School provides funds for AT purchases	18	1.6	18	1.7	29*	4.8	18	3.4
Civic organizations help fund AT	5	0.7	5	0.7	4!	1.7	7!	2.3
Medicaid or other non-private health insurance funds AT purchases	12	1.1	11	1.2	11	2.6	17	3.3
Parents or guardians, through private insurance, fund AT purchases	11	1.1	11	1.2	7!	2.3	16	3.4
Other	6	1.0	6	1.1	6!	2.3	9	2.5
Don't know	11	1.1	11	1.2	9	2.6	11	2.7
Number of school responses	**1,356**		**972**		**174**		**210**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E16).

Table 2.3.3.11b. Methods schools use to finance assistive technology, by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
District provides all funds towards AT	53	2.2	55	3.8	52	2.5
District provides some funds towards AT, but schools must fund the rest	17	1.4	15	2.2	18	1.8
School can apply for grant to pay for major AT investments, such as hearing assistive technologies	11	1.2	12	2.1	11	1.4
School provides funds for AT purchases	18	1.6	15	2.7	20	1.9
Civic organizations help fund AT	5	0.7	2	0.7	7*	1.1
Medicaid or other non-private health insurance funds AT purchases	12	1.1	10	1.8	13	1.4
Parents or guardians, through private insurance, fund AT purchases	11	1.1	9	1.6	13	1.5
Other	6	1.0	6!	1.7	7	1.2
Don't know	11	1.1	12	1.8	10	1.3
Number of school responses	**1,356**		**650**		**706**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E16).

Table 2.3.3.11c. Methods schools use to finance assistive technology, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response category	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
District provides all funds towards AT	53	2.2	55	2.5	51	3.9
District provides some funds towards AT, but schools must fund the rest	17	1.4	16	1.8	19	2.4
School can apply for grant to pay for major AT investments, such as hearing assistive technologies	11	1.2	11	1.7	11	1.8
School provides funds for AT purchases	18	1.6	17	2.1	19	2.4
Civic organizations help fund AT	5	0.7	4	0.9	6	1.2
Medicaid or other non-private health insurance funds AT purchases	12	1.1	10	1.3	13	2.0
Parents or guardians, through private insurance, fund AT purchases	11	1.1	9	1.3	13	1.9
Other	6	1.0	6	1.4	7	1.3
Don't know	11	1.1	11	1.5	10	1.7
Number of school responses	**1,356**		**815**		**520**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E16).

Table 2.3.3.12. Schools' provision of professional development on the use and benefits of assistive technology, by teacher/aide type

Response category	Percentage of schools that do not provide AT professional development	Percentage of schools that provide AT professional development for all teachers/aides	Percentage of schools that provide AT professional development for some teachers/aides
General education teachers and/or aides (SE)	30 (2.0)	19 (1.5)	52 (1.9)
Special education teachers and/or aides (SE)	21 (1.7)	29 (1.9)	50 (1.9)
Number of school responses	**1,357**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AT = assistive technology; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question E17).

2.3.4. Access to general education programs and supports: Coordination/collaboration

Table 2.3.4.1. Frequency of work with staff from the Part C state lead agency

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Rarely have contact with them (once or twice a year)	0	3
Sometimes have contact with them (between three and six times per year)	5	0
Moderate amount of contact with them (between seven and eleven times per year)	13	0
Work closely with them (at least monthly)	33	5
Number of responses	**51**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agency special education directors who reported having responsibility for a student population besides or in addition to children ages birth through 2 with disabilities (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I1).

Table 2.3.4.2. Topics state agencies regularly address when working with the state Part C coordinator

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Child Find	34	5
Transitions	50	5
Professional development	36	4
Data sharing	40	5
Disputes	16	1
State Performance Plans/Annual Performance Reports required under IDEA	31	5
State Systemic Improvement Plan	24	5
Other	3	0
None of the above	0	0
Number of responses	**51**	**5**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported sometimes having contact, having a moderate amount of contact, or working closely with staff from the Part C state lead agency (states: n=51; entities: n=5). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I2).

Table 2.3.4.3. Frequency of work with staff from the school-age special education program

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Rarely have contact with them (once or twice a year)	1	1
Sometimes have contact with them (between three and six times per year)	2	0
Moderate amount of contact with them (between seven and eleven times per year)	7	1
Work closely with them (at least monthly)	41	6
Number of responses	**51**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agency special education directors who reported having responsibility for a student population besides or in addition to school-age children with disabilities (states: n=51; entities: n=8). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I3).

Table 2.3.4.4. Topics state agencies regularly address when working with the state special education director

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Child Find	43	6
Transitions	41	7
Professional development	45	7
Data sharing	38	7
Disputes	23	3
State Performance Plans/Annual Performance Reports required under IDEA	43	7
State Systemic Improvement Plan	26	6
Other	8	1
None of the above	0	0
Number of responses	**50**	**7**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported sometimes having contact, having a moderate amount of contact, or working closely with staff from the school-age special education program (states: n=50; entities: n=7). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I4).

Table 2.3.4.5. State agencies or programs with which state agencies coordinate to engage parents/guardians of preschool-age children with disabilities in developing Individualized Education Programs

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Child care agency (for example, the Office of Child Care, or the Child Care Development Fund coordinator)	20	2
Early learning agency	20	3
Head Start association or collaboration office	32	6
Health agency	13	6
Home visiting program	14	4
Mental health agency	8	3
Part C lead agency	44	5
Social services agency	9	3
Department of developmental disabilities/services	11	2
Other state agencies or programs	10	0
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I5).

Table 2.3.4.6. Number of state agencies that have developed formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health and social-emotional supports to preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	19	3
Yes	12	4
This is done at the district level	19	1
Number of responses	**50**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I6).

Table 2.3.4.7. Agencies or entities with which state agencies have developed formal agreements to provide direct mental health or social-emotional supports to preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Behavioral/mental health agency	8	2
Developmental disabilities agency	1	1
Early Intervention Part C	4	3
Head Start	4	3
Health agency	3	3
Local or state disability advocacy groups	1	1
Private therapists or therapy organizations (for example, trauma-informed therapists, applied behavior analysis providers)	2	1
Social services	3	2
Other	6	0
Number of responses	**12**	**4**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported developing formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health and social-emotional supports to preschool-age children with disabilities (states: n=12; entities: n=4). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I7).

Table 2.3.4.8. Frequency of work with staff from the state Part B 619 preschool agency

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Rarely have contact with them (once or twice a year)	0	1
Sometimes have contact with them (between three and six times per year)	9	1
Moderate amount of contact with them (between seven and eleven times per year)	12	1
Work closely with them (at least monthly)	26	3
Part C staff also coordinate the Part B 619 preschool program	3	0
Number of responses	**50**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all lead agency early intervention coordinators who reported having responsibility for a student population besides or in addition to preschool-age children with disabilities (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question G1).

Table 2.3.4.9. Topics lead agencies regularly address when working with the state Part B 619 coordinator

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Child Find	30	1
Transitions	46	5
Professional development	35	2
Data sharing	38	3
Disputes	7	0
State Performance Plans/Annual Performance Reports required under IDEA	27	1
State Systemic Improvement Plan	20	1
Other	5	0
None of the above	0	0
Number of responses	**47**	**5**

Note: The sample for this table includes all lead agencies that reported sometimes having contact, having a moderate amount of contact, or working closely with staff from the state Part B 619 preschool agency (states: n=47; entities: n=5). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question G2).

Table 2.3.4.10. Ways in which lead agencies share early intervention data with the state preschool special education program

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
There is an integrated, longitudinal data system for storing data	7	1
Separate data systems are linked as needed using a common identifier or other matching process	10	0
Individual-level data from separate data systems are shared but cannot be linked	13	3
Aggregate data from separate data systems are shared	14	1
The state does not share data but some local providers do	2	1
Other	3	0
Number of responses	**49**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. If data are shared using more than one method, respondents were asked to select the method by which most data are shared.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question G3).

Table 2.3.4.11. Entities responsible for setting the approach for serving preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
State education agency	31	3.2
District (local education agency)	81	2.7
School	27	3.0
Number of district responses	**317**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F3).

Table 2.3.4.11a. Entities responsible for setting the approach for serving preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
State education agency	31	3.2	31	3.2	.	.
District (local education agency)	81	2.7	82	2.7	66	15.0
School	27	3.0	27	3.0	36!	14.3
Number of district responses	**317**		**294**		**23**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F3).

Table 2.3.4.11b. Entities responsible for setting the approach for serving preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
State education agency	31	3.2	31	4.2	31	4.8
District (local education agency)	81	2.7	85	3.3	77	4.3
School	27	3.0	19	3.6	36*	5.0
Number of district responses	**317**		**190**		**127**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F3).

Table 2.3.4.11c. Entities responsible for setting the approach for serving preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
State education agency	31	3.2	24	5.7	33	3.7
District (local education agency)	81	2.7	83	4.7	81	3.1
School	27	3.0	20	5.0	29	3.5
Number of district responses	**317**		**88**		**229**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F3).

Table 2.3.4.12. Actions districts take to support collaboration among the Part B preschool-age special education program and other entities that serve preschool-age children

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Collaborate on planning and development of services for children	63	3.3
Collaborate on delivering services to children	66	3.1
Collaborate on funding and staffing of services for children (for example, braided funding, blended staff, etc.)	18	2.6
Provide joint professional development to staff	33	3.2
Coordinate when requesting information from parents/guardians and other agencies	63	3.3
Coordinate when planning meetings with parents/guardians	74	3.0
Coordinate the collection and use of assessment data	52	3.4
Establish formal interagency agreement(s) or memorandum of understanding	47	3.2
Establish an interagency coordinating body that includes parents/guardians, educators, service providers, community agencies, and other relevant stakeholders	27	3.0
Other	3!	1.0
None of the above	7	1.8
Number of district responses	**318**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Entities that serve preschool-age children include local child care programs, such as Head Start and Early Childhood Education programs. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F4).

Table 2.3.4.12a. Actions districts take to support collaboration among the Part B preschool-age special education program and other entities that serve preschool-age children, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Collaborate on planning and development of services for children	63	3.3	64	3.4	46!	15.3
Collaborate on delivering services to children	66	3.1	67	3.2	43!	15.3
Collaborate on funding and staffing of services for children (for example, braided funding, blended staff, etc.)	18	2.6	18	2.6	.	.
Provide joint professional development to staff	33	3.2	34	3.3	.	.
Coordinate when requesting information from parents/guardians and other agencies	63	3.3	64	3.4	36!	15.0
Coordinate when planning meetings with parents/guardians	74	3.0	76	3.0	.	.
Coordinate the collection and use of assessment data	52	3.4	53	3.4	.	.
Establish formal interagency agreement(s) or memorandum of understanding	47	3.2	49	3.3	.	.
Establish an interagency coordinating body that includes parents/guardians, educators, service providers, community agencies, and other relevant stakeholders	27	3.0	28	3.0	.	.
Other	3!	1.0	3!	1.0	0*	.
None of the above	7	1.8	6	1.8	29!	13.5
Number of district responses	**318**		**294**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Entities that serve preschool-age children include local child care programs, such as Head Start and Early Childhood Education programs. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F4).

Table 2.3.4.12b. Actions districts take to support collaboration among the Part B preschool-age special education program and other entities that serve preschool-age children, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Collaborate on planning and development of services for children	63	3.3	68	4.2	57	5.1
Collaborate on delivering services to children	66	3.1	70	3.8	61	5.0
Collaborate on funding and staffing of services for children (for example, braided funding, blended staff, etc.)	18	2.6	17	3.3	19	4.0
Provide joint professional development to staff	33	3.2	36	4.3	29	4.8
Coordinate when requesting information from parents/guardians and other agencies	63	3.3	68	4.1	58	5.2
Coordinate when planning meetings with parents/guardians	74	3.0	77	3.8	71	4.7
Coordinate the collection and use of assessment data	52	3.4	54	4.4	50	5.2
Establish formal interagency agreement(s) or memorandum of understanding	47	3.2	57	4.4	37*	5.0
Establish an interagency coordinating body that includes parents/guardians, educators, service providers, community agencies, and other relevant stakeholders	27	3.0	31	4.0	23	4.5
Other	3!	1.0	2!	1.1	.	.
None of the above	7	1.8	.	.	11!	3.4
Number of district responses	**318**		**192**		**126**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Entities that serve preschool-age children include local child care programs, such as Head Start and Early Childhood Education programs. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F4).

Table 2.3.4.12c. Actions districts take to support collaboration among the Part B preschool-age special education program and other entities that serve preschool-age children, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Collaborate on planning and development of services for children	63	3.3	58	6.9	64	3.7
Collaborate on delivering services to children	66	3.1	52	6.5	69*	3.5
Collaborate on funding and staffing of services for children (for example, braided funding, blended staff, etc.)	18	2.6	14!	4.8	19	3.0
Provide joint professional development to staff	33	3.2	24	5.5	35	3.7
Coordinate when requesting information from parents/guardians and other agencies	63	3.3	57	6.4	65	3.8
Coordinate when planning meetings with parents/guardians	74	3.0	63	6.6	77	3.4
Coordinate the collection and use of assessment data	52	3.4	45	6.1	54	3.9
Establish formal interagency agreement(s) or memorandum of understanding	47	3.2	36	5.9	50*	3.7
Establish an interagency coordinating body that includes parents/guardians, educators, service providers, community agencies, and other relevant stakeholders	27	3.0	21	5.4	29	3.4
Other	3!	1.0	6!	2.5	.	.
None of the above	7	1.8	12!	4.9	5!	1.9
Number of district responses	**318**		**88**		**230**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Entities that serve preschool-age children include local child care programs, such as Head Start and Early Childhood Education programs. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F4).

2.4.1. Support for transitions: Coordination/collaboration (this includes interagency coordination)

Table 2.4.1.1. Ways in which states share and receive data from other programs or entities to support the post-high school transition for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
There is an integrated, longitudinal data system for storing data	9	0
Separate data systems are linked as needed using a common identifier or other matching process	12	0
Individual-level data from separate data systems are shared but cannot be linked	10	6
Aggregate data from separate data systems are shared	15	2
Other	4	1
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Programs or entities include postsecondary institutions, workforce agencies, vocational rehabilitation agencies, and social services. If data are shared using more than one method, respondents were asked to select the method by which most data are shared.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H3).

Table 2.4.1.2. Ways in which state agencies supported the transition of preschool-age children with disabilities from preschool to kindergarten/elementary school in the 2019–2020 school year (school-age children survey)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Developed or maintained agreements on transition between preschool services and elementary schools	18	3
Developed or maintained policies on transition from preschool to elementary school	26	3
Provided training to districts on transition	40	2
Provided technical assistance to districts on transition	44	3
Developed or disseminated materials for parents/guardians on transition from preschool to elementary school special education	26	2
Developed or maintained an electronic database of individual child records to allow children to be followed from preschool programs to elementary school special education	29	4
Other	2	3
None of the above	2	2
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I1).

Table 2.4.1.3. Ways in which state agencies supported the transition out of high school for school-age children with disabilities in the 2019-2020 school year

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Developed or maintained agreements on transition between agencies providing post-high school or out-of-school services and high schools (such as the office of vocational rehabilitation)	45	6
Developed or maintained policies on transition from high school	37	5
Developed or maintained policies to improve the provision of pre-employment transition services	36	3
Provided technical assistance to high school staff on transition	47	8
Provided training for high school staff	42	8
Developed or disseminated materials for parents/guardians on the transition out of high school	36	7
Provided meetings or workshops for parents/guardians	30	5
Developed or maintained an electronic database of individual student records to allow children to be followed from high school to post-high school programs and jobs	13	3
Provided professional development for postsecondary agency staff (such as vocational rehabilitation and institutes of higher education)	30	4
Provided joint professional development for high school and postsecondary agency staff	30	5
Other	7	0
None of the above	0	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I3).

Table 2.4.1.4. Ways in which state agencies ensure the quality of the Individualized Education Program transition component for school-age children with disabilities preparing to transition from high school

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Conduct on-site monitoring visits at school districts (for example, stakeholder interviews or observation of IEP meetings)	37	7
Identify school districts needing to improve transition processes	42	5
Provide technical assistance to school districts	48	8
Recommend or require that school districts needing improvement implement a quality improvement plan	31	1
Recommend or require that school districts use a transition planning rubric or guidance on best practices for compliance and quality	29	4
Recommend or require that school districts use a transition procedures manual	14	4
Review data on student outcomes by school district	36	5
Review a selection of IEPs from school districts	45	8
Survey parents/guardians about IEP transition outcomes or supports	19	3
Other	2	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I4).

Table 2.4.1.5. Entities or programs with which state agencies have formal agreements to support the coordination of services for school-age children with disabilities transitioning out of high school

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Higher education and training	10	3
State independent living council	3	0
Health agency	9	4
Behavioral/mental health agency	7	3
Social services agency	8	1
State vocational rehabilitation agency	46	6
Developmental disabilities agency	20	1
Local disability advocacy groups, such as The Arc	5	2
Private therapists or therapy organizations (for example, trauma-informed therapists, applied behavior analysis providers)	2	0
Juvenile justice	14	3
Foster care	3	1
Other	4	1
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question J1).

Table 2.4.1.6a. Programs or entities with which state agencies share resources and coordinate services to support the transition out of high school for school-age children with disabilities, by resource/service type (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of state agencies that share data	Number of state agencies that share funding	Number of state agencies that share personnel	Number of state agencies that coordinate service provision	Number of state agencies that share other information (such as IEPs)	Number of state agencies that do not share or coordinate with this program or entity
Postsecondary education and training programs	24	11	5	26	10	13
Independent living agencies	10	0	0	11	5	30
Health care agencies	8	1	0	12	5	33
Mental health agencies	7	2	1	14	5	29
Social service agencies (for example, Department of Developmental Services)	19	8	0	24	10	16
Vocational rehabilitation services (for example, Department of Rehabilitation Services)	30	15	6	40	12	2
Employers or potential employers of students	5	0	1	13	3	33
Juvenile court or probation officers	8	1	1	13	7	30
Number of state responses	**50**					

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question J2).

Table 2.4.1.6b. Programs or entities with which state-level agencies share resources and coordinate services to support the transition out of high school for school-age children with disabilities, by resource/service type (entities)

Response category	Number of state level agencies that share data	Number of state level agencies that share funding	Number of state level agencies that share personnel	Number of state level agencies that coordinate service provision	Number of state level agencies that share other information (such as IEPs)	Number of state level agencies that do not share or coordinate with this program or entity
Postsecondary education and training programs	6	1	2	6	7	1
Independent living agencies	2	0	0	2	5	4
Health care agencies	6	1	1	5	6	2
Mental health agencies	6	0	1	4	6	2
Social service agencies (for example, Department of Developmental Services)	2	0	0	4	6	3
Vocational rehabilitation services (for example, Department of Rehabilitation Services)	4	0	1	6	6	3
Employers or potential employers of students	3	1	0	6	3	2
Juvenile court or probation officers	4	0	1	7	6	1
Number of entity responses	**9**					

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question J2).

Table 2.4.1.7. Ways in which state agencies supported the transition of preschool-age children with disabilities from early intervention services to preschool in the 2019–2020 school year

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Part B preschool funds can be used to provide free appropriate public education to children before their third birthday	10	3
Part C funds can be used to provide free appropriate public education for children past their third birthday	4	2
Developed or maintained agreements on transition between early intervention services and preschool special education	38	6
Developed or maintained policies on transition from early intervention services to preschool special education	39	6
Provided training to local providers on transition	39	4
Provided technical assistance to local providers on transition	42	3
Developed or disseminated materials for parents/guardians on transition from early intervention services to preschool special education	33	2
Provided meetings or workshops for parents/guardians	16	4
Developed or maintained an electronic database of individual child records to allow children to be followed from early intervention services to preschool special education	26	2
Other	3	2
None of the above	0	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question G1).

Table 2.4.1.8. Ways in which state agencies supported the transition of preschool-age children with disabilities from preschool to kindergarten/elementary school in the 2019–2020 school year (preschool-age children survey)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Developed or maintained agreements on transition between agencies providing preschool services and elementary schools	10	6
Developed or maintained policies on transition from preschool to elementary school	18	5
Provided training to local providers on transition	29	5
Provided technical assistance to local providers on transition	34	6
Developed or disseminated materials for parents/guardians on preschool to elementary school transition	17	2
Provided meetings or workshops for parents/guardians	11	5
Developed or maintained an electronic database of individual child records to allow children to be followed from preschool programs to elementary school	22	5
Other	3	2
None of the above	8	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question G2).

Table 2.4.1.9a. Programs or entities with which state agencies share resources and coordinate services to support the transition from preschool to kindergarten/elementary school for preschool-age children with disabilities, by resource/service type (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of state agencies that share data	Number of state agencies that share funding	Number of state agencies that share personnel	Number of state agencies that coordinate service provision	Number of state agencies that share other information (such as IEPs)	Number of state agencies that do not share or coordinate with this program or entity
Child care agencies	17	3	3	12	15	25
Early learning agencies	21	4	7	17	12	19
Part B 611 program	37	27	23	28	33	7
Health care agencies	7	1	1	7	6	37
Mental health agencies	6	0	0	7	3	37
Social service agencies (for example, Department of Developmental Services)	10	2	1	7	5	34
Number of state responses	**51**					

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I8).

Table 2.4.1.9b. Programs or entities with which state-level agencies share resources and coordinate services to support the transition from preschool to kindergarten/elementary school for preschool-age children with disabilities, by resource/service type (entities)

Response category	Number of state level agencies that share data	Number of state level agencies that share funding	Number of state level agencies that share personnel	Number of state level agencies that coordinate service provision	Number of state level agencies that share other information (such as IEPs)	Number of state level agencies that do not share or coordinate with this program or entity
Child care agencies	3	2	1	3	3	4
Early learning agencies	3	0	0	2	4	4
Part B 611 program	8	2	4	5	9	0
Health care agencies	7	1	1	4	5	1
Mental health agencies	5	0	0	4	5	2
Social service agencies (for example, Department of Developmental Services)	5	0	1	4	5	3
Number of entity responses	**9**					

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I8).

Table 2.4.1.10. Ways in which lead agencies collaborate with the state preschool special education program to support local programs in the transition of children with disabilities from Part C to Part B

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Issue joint policies or guidance	45	3
Provide joint trainings for personnel from both programs	36	3
Work together to provide workshops for families approaching transition	15	4
Other	9	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question H1).

Table 2.4.1.11. Ways in which lead agencies ensure transition plan quality within Individualized Family Service Plans

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Conducts on-site monitoring visits of local early intervention programs (for example, stakeholder interviews or observations of IFSP meetings)	27	3
Identifies local early intervention programs needing to improve transition processes	40	1
Provides technical assistance to local early intervention programs	45	3
Recommends or requires that local early intervention programs needing improvement implement a quality improvement plan	31	1
Recommends or requires that local early intervention programs use a transition planning rubric or guidance on best practices for compliance and quality	31	3
Recommends or requires that local early intervention programs use a transition procedures manual	28	1
Reviews data on student outcomes by local early intervention programs	16	0
Reviews a selection of IFSPs from local early intervention programs	35	1
Surveys parents/guardians about IFSP transition outcomes or supports	18	2
Identifies local early intervention programs that need to improve	32	1
None of the above	1	1
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IFSP = Individualized Family Service Plan.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question H2).

Table 2.4.1.12. Ways in which lead agencies supported the transition of children with disabilities from early intervention services to preschool in fiscal year 2020

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Part B preschool funds can be used to provide free appropriate public education to children before their third birthday	6	0
Part C funds can be used to provide free appropriate public education for children past their third birthday	2	0
Developed or maintained agreements on transitions from early intervention services to preschool special education	38	4
Developed or maintained policies on transition from early intervention services to preschool special education	41	2
Provided training to local early intervention providers on transition	34	0
Provided technical assistance to local early intervention providers on transition	42	2
Developed or disseminated materials for parents/guardians on transition from early intervention services to preschool special education	28	1
Developed or maintained an electronic database of individual child records to allow children to be followed from early intervention services to preschool special education	19	2
Other	3	0
None of the above	0	1
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question H3).

Table 2.4.1.13. Actions lead agencies took in fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020 to change transition policies, procedures, and practices for infants and toddlers with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Revised or developed memorandums of understanding and collaboration agreements with other entities, such as Early Head Start, social service agencies, or public health agencies	17	1
Provided targeted professional development, including materials and funds, to local Part C early intervention programs with below-target outcomes	17	1
Updated guidance to local early intervention programs on Part C transition procedures for families receiving Part C services	25	1
Revised policies or requirements of local early intervention programs related to transition supports offered to families	12	2
Increased coordination with state Part B colleagues to assist local programs in improving transition	29	4
Other	4	0
None of the above	9	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question H7).

Table 2.4.1.14. Programs or entities with which districts share resources and coordinate services to support transition out of high school for school-age children with disabilities, by resource/service type

Response category	Percentage of districts that share data	Percentage of districts that share funding	Percentage of districts that share personnel	Percentage of districts that coordinate service provision	Percentage of districts that share other information (such as IEPs)	Percentage of districts that do not share or coordinate with this program or entity
Postsecondary education and training programs (SE)	34 (2.8)	3! (0.9)	5 (1.3)	32 (2.7)	62 (3.0)	25 (2.6)
Independent living agencies (SE)	25 (2.5)	.	2! (0.8)	29 (2.6)	49 (3.0)	39 (2.9)
Health care agencies (SE)	25 (2.6)	.	2! (1.0)	23 (2.6)	40 (3.0)	44 (3.1)
Mental health agencies (SE)	30 (2.8)	3! (1.0)	6 (1.4)	34 (2.9)	55 (3.0)	30 (2.7)
Social service agencies (for example, Department of Developmental Services) (SE)	37 (2.9)	2! (0.7)	2! (0.9)	35 (2.7)	59 (2.9)	25 (2.6)
Vocational rehabilitation services (for example, Department of Rehabilitation Services) (SE)	42 (2.9)	5 (1.3)	5 (1.3)	43 (2.9)	66 (2.9)	22 (2.5)
Employers or potential employers of students (SE)	19 (2.3)	2! (0.8)	8 (1.6)	28 (2.6)	22 (2.5)	52 (3.0)
Juvenile court or probation officers (SE)	33 (2.8)	.	1! (0.7)	24 (2.5)	51 (2.9)	35 (2.8)
Number of district responses	**427**					

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G6).

Table 2.4.1.15. Organizations from which representatives are invited to attend, actually attend, and provide input at transition planning meetings for students with disabilities

Organization type	Percentage of students for which each organization is invited	Percentage of students for which each organization attends	Percentage of students for which each organization provides input
Health care agencies (SE)	24 (2.4)	18 (2.2)	21 (2.1)
Mental health agencies (SE)	22 (2.1)	20 (2.3)	23 (2.1)
Social Security Administration (SE)	6 (1.6)	4! (1.6)	5! (1.6)
Social service agencies (for example, Department of Developmental Services) (SE)	18 (2.1)	15 (2.0)	16 (2.0)
Independent living agencies (SE)	11 (1.7)	10 (1.7)	12 (1.9)
Vocational rehabilitation services (for example, Department of Rehabilitation Services) (SE)	26 (2.5)	18 (1.9)	22 (2.4)
Employers or potential employers of the student (SE)	6 (1.2)	5 (1.3)	6 (1.3)
Postsecondary institutions and agencies (SE)	9 (1.4)	7 (1.3)	8 (1.5)
Number of school responses	**431**		

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade (n=454). Respondents were asked to provide their best estimate. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question D6).

2.4.2. Support for transitions: Family involvement

Table 2.4.2.1. Practices districts use to support students with disabilities and their families during transitions into preschool and elementary school

Response category	Percentage of districts that use this practice to support initial transition into preschool	Percentage of districts that use this practice to support initial transition into elementary school
A primary contact person is identified to support transition services for students and their families (SE)	86 (2.4)	83 (2.5)
Continuity and alignment exist between curricula across special education programs and schools (SE)	65 (3.2)	82 (2.7)
Families' needs related to the transition are assessed (SE)	76 (2.9)	67 (3.2)
Individualized transition activities for each child and family are developed (SE)	70 (3.1)	69 (3.2)
Child and family transition meetings are conducted, separately or as part of an IEP meeting (SE)	84 (2.4)	83 (2.6)
Home visits with families are conducted (SE)	67 (3.1)	17 (2.5)
Families are provided with enrollment packets that include information about the special education program and/or required forms to complete (SE)	82 (2.5)	77 (2.9)
Timelines and roles for special education eligibility processes, such as assessments and evaluations, are clearly specified (SE)	86 (2.4)	84 (2.5)
Timelines and roles for enrollment processes are clearly specified and communicated to parents/guardians (SE)	87 (2.2)	86 (2.4)
Timelines and roles for referral processes, such as universal intake forms and memoranda of understanding, are clearly specified (SE)	82 (2.6)	71 (3.1)
Special education staff from the "receiving" program attend the transition meeting at the "sending" program (SE)	76 (2.9)	78 (2.8)
Staff roles and responsibilities to support student transitions are clearly specified (SE)	82 (2.6)	81 (2.7)
Staff to staff communication is supported within and across special education programs and schools (SE)	81 (2.5)	91 (2.0)
Transition activities, such as open houses and program visitations, are regularly scheduled (SE)	75 (2.8)	88 (2.3)
Other (SE)	11 (2.1)	11 (2.0)
Number of district responses	**320**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question E1).

Table 2.4.2.2. Policies, procedures, and practices schools use to support students with disabilities and their families during transitions into prekindergarten special education programs

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
A primary contact person is identified to support transition services for students and their families	79	2.5
Families' needs related to transition are assessed	61	3.6
Child and family transition meetings are conducted, separately or as part of an IEP meeting	75	3.7
Home visits with families are conducted	37	3.4
Individualized transition activities for each student and family are developed	46	3.4
Timelines and roles for special education eligibility processes, such as assessments and evaluations, are clearly specified	76	3.5
Timelines and roles for enrollment processes are clearly specified and communicated to parents	75	2.8
Timelines and roles for referral processes, such as universal intake forms and memoranda of understanding, are clearly specified	62	3.6
Staff roles and responsibilities to support student transitions are clearly specified	68	3.0
Transition activities, such as open houses and program visitations, are regularly scheduled	68	3.7
Other	4	1.1
None of the above	5!	1.7
Number of school responses	**521**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering prekindergarten (n=521). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question D1).

Table 2.4.2.3. Practices schools use to support students with disabilities and their families during the initial transition into elementary school

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
A primary contact person is identified to support transition services for students and their families	77	2.1
Families' needs related to transition are assessed	57	2.7
Child and family transition meetings are conducted, separately or as part of an IEP meeting	75	2.1
Home visits with families are conducted	19	3.1
Individualized transition activities for each student and family are developed	41	2.2
The school ensures continuity and alignment between curricula across special education programs and schools	67	2.5
Timelines and roles for enrollment processes are clearly specified and communicated to parents	76	2.1
Staff roles and responsibilities to support student transitions are clearly specified	65	2.6
Staff to staff communication is supported within and across special education programs and schools	74	2.2
Transition activities, such as open houses and program visitations, are regularly scheduled	75	2.2
Other	4	0.8
None of the above	5	1.1
Number of school responses	**896**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering kindergarten, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, or 5th grade (n=896). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question D2).

2.4.3. Support for transitions: Transition services/supports

Table 2.4.3.1. Ages by which state agencies require post-high school transition planning to begin for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Age 13 or younger	1	0
Age 14	29	4
Age 15	3	0
Age 16	18	5
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I2).

Table 2.4.3.2. Number of states that require Individualized Education Programs to include a transition component for children with disabilities entering elementary school

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	41	7
Yes	10	1
Number of responses	**51**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question G3).

Table 2.4.3.3. Ways in which districts ensure the quality of Individualized Education Program transition components for school-age children with disabilities who are preparing to transition from high school

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Conduct on-site monitoring visits at school districts (for example, stakeholder interviews or observation of IEP meetings)	26	2.5
Identify schools that need to improve transition process	15	1.9
Recommend or require that schools needing improvement implement a quality improvement plan	10	1.7
Provide technical assistance on approaches for developing quality IEP transition components	51	2.7
Review a selection of IEPs for quality	59	2.7
Survey parents/guardians about IEP transition outcomes or supports	41	2.9
Use a transition planning rubric or guidance on best practices that focuses on compliance only	28	2.5
Use a transition planning rubric or guidance on best practices that focuses on compliance and quality indicators	44	2.9
Use a transition procedures manual	27	2.5
Other	6	1.3
None of the above	18	2.2
Number of district responses	**436**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G1).

Table 2.4.3.3a. Ways in which districts ensure the quality of Individualized Education Program transition components for school-age children with disabilities who are preparing to transition from high school, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Conduct on-site monitoring visits at school districts (for example, stakeholder interviews or observation of IEP meetings)	26	2.5	27	2.8	17*	4.3
Identify schools that need to improve transition process	15	1.9	16	2.1	12!	3.6
Recommend or require that schools needing improvement implement a quality improvement plan	10	1.7	10	1.9	7!	2.9
Provide technical assistance on approaches for developing quality IEP transition components	51	2.7	54	3.0	30*	5.5
Review a selection of IEPs for quality	59	2.7	63	3.0	37*	5.8
Survey parents/guardians about IEP transition outcomes or supports	41	2.9	43	3.3	29*	5.4
Use a transition planning rubric or guidance on best practices that focuses on compliance only	28	2.5	29	2.8	21	4.9
Use a transition planning rubric or guidance on best practices that focuses on compliance and quality indicators	44	2.9	46	3.2	29*	5.4
Use a transition procedures manual	27	2.5	28	2.8	23	5.1
Other	6	1.3	6	1.5	7!	3.2
None of the above	18	2.2	14	2.4	42*	5.9
Number of district responses	**436**		**332**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G1).

Table 2.4.3.3b. Ways in which districts ensure the quality of Individualized Education Program transition components for school-age children with disabilities who are preparing to transition from high school, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Conduct on-site monitoring visits at school districts (for example, stakeholder interviews or observation of IEP meetings)	26	2.5	31	3.8	22	3.2
Identify schools that need to improve transition process	15	1.9	16	2.6	14	2.8
Recommend or require that schools needing improvement implement a quality improvement plan	10	1.7	9	2.4	10	2.4
Provide technical assistance on approaches for developing quality IEP transition components	51	2.7	68	4.0	36*	3.8
Review a selection of IEPs for quality	59	2.7	74	3.7	47*	4.0
Survey parents/guardians about IEP transition outcomes or supports	41	2.9	41	4.3	41	4.0
Use a transition planning rubric or guidance on best practices that focuses on compliance only	28	2.5	30	3.7	27	3.5
Use a transition planning rubric or guidance on best practices that focuses on compliance and quality indicators	44	2.9	47	4.1	40	3.9
Use a transition procedures manual	27	2.5	32	3.9	23	3.3
Other	6	1.3	8	2.2	5	1.5
None of the above	18	2.2	8!	2.6	26*	3.5
Number of district responses	**436**		**216**		**220**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G1).

Table 2.4.3.3c. Ways in which districts ensure the quality of Individualized Education Program transition components for school-age children with disabilities who are preparing to transition from high school, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Conduct on-site monitoring visits at school districts (for example, stakeholder interviews or observation of IEP meetings)	26	2.5	24	3.7	27	3.1
Identify schools that need to improve transition process	15	1.9	18	3.5	14	2.3
Recommend or require that schools needing improvement implement a quality improvement plan	10	1.7	8!	2.6	10	2.1
Provide technical assistance on approaches for developing quality IEP transition components	51	2.7	50	4.5	51	3.3
Review a selection of IEPs for quality	59	2.7	53	5.2	61	3.3
Survey parents/guardians about IEP transition outcomes or supports	41	2.9	34	5.5	44	3.5
Use a transition planning rubric or guidance on best practices that focuses on compliance only	28	2.5	28	4.2	28	3.1
Use a transition planning rubric or guidance on best practices that focuses on compliance and quality indicators	44	2.9	39	5.3	45	3.4
Use a transition procedures manual	27	2.5	27	4.1	28	3.0
Other	6	1.3	5!	2.1	7	1.6
None of the above	18	2.2	27	4.2	15*	2.6
Number of district responses	**436**		**154**		**282**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G1).

Table 2.4.3.4. Programs and supports districts provide to prepare school-age children with disabilities for further education, jobs, and independent living

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Advanced Placement or other courses (including dual enrollment programs) that earn college credit	65	2.7
Counseling on federal or state benefits (such as Medicaid or Supplemental Security Income)	33	2.7
Career and technical education courses	71	2.4
Career awareness instruction	73	2.6
Counseling on postsecondary career and technical education and employment training program options	66	2.6
Counseling on postsecondary education, including course guidance	64	2.8
Independent living/self-care skills instruction	69	2.6
Self-advocacy/self-determination instruction	64	2.8
Supported employment in community settings in which students with and without disabilities work	52	2.8
Test-taking strategies and study skills instruction	64	2.7
Work-based learning experiences in community settings in which students with and without disabilities work	63	2.7
Workplace readiness training	57	2.8
Other	5	1.3
None of the above	11	1.8
Number of district responses	**436**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Respondents were asked to include programs offered through their district, as well as programs and supports their district makes available through coordination with other partners. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G2).

Table 2.4.3.4a. Programs and supports districts provide to prepare school-age children with disabilities for further education, jobs, and independent living, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Advanced Placement or other courses (including dual enrollment programs) that earn college credit	65	2.7	70	3.0	31*	5.5
Counseling on federal or state benefits (such as Medicaid or Supplemental Security Income)	33	2.7	36	3.1	14*	4.0
Career and technical education courses	71	2.4	78	2.6	30*	5.4
Career awareness instruction	73	2.6	76	2.8	50*	6.0
Counseling on postsecondary career and technical education and employment training program options	66	2.6	71	2.9	34*	5.7
Counseling on postsecondary education, including course guidance	64	2.8	68	3.1	40*	5.9
Independent living/self-care skills instruction	69	2.6	77	2.8	23*	4.9
Self-advocacy/self-determination instruction	64	2.8	67	3.1	41*	5.9
Supported employment in community settings in which students with and without disabilities work	52	2.8	57	3.2	18*	4.4
Test-taking strategies and study skills instruction	64	2.7	67	3.0	48*	6.0
Work-based learning experiences in community settings in which students with and without disabilities work	63	2.7	70	3.0	22*	4.8
Workplace readiness training	57	2.8	63	3.1	20*	4.8
Other	5	1.3	5	1.4	.	.
None of the above	11	1.8	8	1.9	30*	5.6
Number of district responses	**436**		**332**		**104**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Respondents were asked to include programs offered through their district, as well as programs and supports their district makes available through coordination with other partners. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G2).

Table 2.4.3.4b. Programs and supports districts provide to prepare school-age children with disabilities for further education, jobs, and independent living, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Advanced Placement or other courses (including dual enrollment programs) that earn college credit	65	2.7	78	3.6	54*	3.9
Counseling on federal or state benefits (such as Medicaid or Supplemental Security Income)	33	2.7	36	4.1	30	3.7
Career and technical education courses	71	2.4	83	3.1	61*	3.8
Career awareness instruction	73	2.6	82	3.4	65*	3.9
Counseling on postsecondary career and technical education and employment training program options	66	2.6	77	3.6	57*	3.9
Counseling on postsecondary education, including course guidance	64	2.8	71	4.0	58*	3.9
Independent living/self-care skills instruction	69	2.6	86	3.0	55*	3.9
Self-advocacy/self-determination instruction	64	2.8	74	3.9	54*	4.0
Supported employment in community settings in which students with and without disabilities work	52	2.8	66	4.2	40*	3.8
Test-taking strategies and study skills instruction	64	2.7	70	3.9	59	4.0
Work-based learning experiences in community settings in which students with and without disabilities work	63	2.7	81	3.5	48*	3.8
Workplace readiness training	57	2.8	70	4.0	46*	3.9
Other	5	1.3	4!	1.7	6!	1.9
None of the above	11	1.8	5!	2.2	16*	2.9
Number of district responses	**436**		**216**		**220**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Respondents were asked to include programs offered through their district, as well as programs and supports their district makes available through coordination with other partners. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G2).

Table 2.4.3.4c. Programs and supports districts provide to prepare school-age children with disabilities for further education, jobs, and independent living, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Advanced Placement or other courses (including dual enrollment programs) that earn college credit	65	2.7	49	5.2	70*	3.1
Counseling on federal or state benefits (such as Medicaid or Supplemental Security Income)	33	2.7	32	4.9	33	3.3
Career and technical education courses	71	2.4	49	4.7	79*	2.8
Career awareness instruction	73	2.6	63	4.5	76*	3.1
Counseling on postsecondary career and technical education and employment training program options	66	2.6	50	4.5	72*	3.2
Counseling on postsecondary education, including course guidance	64	2.8	58	5.1	66	3.4
Independent living/self-care skills instruction	69	2.6	54	5.0	75*	2.9
Self-advocacy/self-determination instruction	64	2.8	59	4.6	65	3.4
Supported employment in community settings in which students with and without disabilities work	52	2.8	48	4.6	53	3.4
Test-taking strategies and study skills instruction	64	2.7	55	4.7	67*	3.3
Work-based learning experiences in community settings in which students with and without disabilities work	63	2.7	56	4.9	66	3.2
Workplace readiness training	57	2.8	44	4.2	62*	3.4
Other	5	1.3	.	.	6	1.7
None of the above	11	1.8	21	3.9	7*	2.0
Number of district responses	**436**		**154**		**282**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Respondents were asked to include programs offered through their district, as well as programs and supports their district makes available through coordination with other partners. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G2).

Table 2.4.3.5. Actions districts took to change transition policies, procedures, and practices for school-age children with disabilities in the 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020 school years

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Revised or developed memorandums of understanding and collaboration agreements with other entities, such as workforce agencies, vocational rehabilitation agencies, or social service agencies	19	2.2
Provided targeted professional development, including materials and funds, to schools with below-target outcomes	24	2.4
Updated guidance on transition procedures for families and former students	27	2.5
Revised transition supports offered to families and former students	24	2.4
Added transition supports offered to families and former students (including hiring additional staff)	19	2.3
Revised practices to better support student attendance and participation in the transition meeting	39	2.7
Analyzed data to identify the relationship between school-based practices and post-high school outcomes to determine areas for improvement and continued implementation	24	2.6
Other	7	1.5
None of the above	26	2.5
Number of district responses	**436**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G7).

Table 2.4.3.5a. Actions districts took to change transition policies, procedures, and practices for school-age children with disabilities in the 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020 school years, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Revised or developed memorandums of understanding and collaboration agreements with other entities, such as workforce agencies, vocational rehabilitation agencies, or social service agencies	19	2.2	21	2.5	12!	3.8
Provided targeted professional development, including materials and funds, to schools with below-target outcomes	24	2.4	26	2.7	13*	3.8
Updated guidance on transition procedures for families and former students	27	2.5	29	2.9	14*	3.9
Revised transition supports offered to families and former students	24	2.4	26	2.7	14!*	4.1
Added transition supports offered to families and former students (including hiring additional staff)	19	2.3	21	2.6	7!*	3.1
Revised practices to better support student attendance and participation in the transition meeting	39	2.7	41	3.1	26*	5.2
Analyzed data to identify the relationship between school-based practices and post-high school outcomes to determine areas for improvement and continued implementation	24	2.6	25	2.9	17	4.5
Other	7	1.5	7	1.7	10!	3.9
None of the above	26	2.5	23	2.8	48*	6.0
Number of district responses	**436**		**332**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G7).

Table 2.4.3.5b. Actions districts took to change transition policies, procedures, and practices for school-age children with disabilities in the 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020 school years, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Revised or developed memorandums of understanding and collaboration agreements with other entities, such as workforce agencies, vocational rehabilitation agencies, or social service agencies	19	2.2	27	3.7	13*	2.5
Provided targeted professional development, including materials and funds, to schools with below-target outcomes	24	2.4	33	3.9	17*	3.0
Updated guidance on transition procedures for families and former students	27	2.5	31	3.8	24	3.3
Revised transition supports offered to families and former students	24	2.4	28	3.7	21	3.1
Added transition supports offered to families and former students (including hiring additional staff)	19	2.3	24	3.4	15	3.1
Revised practices to better support student attendance and participation in the transition meeting	39	2.7	47	4.1	33*	3.8
Analyzed data to identify the relationship between school-based practices and post-high school outcomes to determine areas for improvement and continued implementation	24	2.6	26	3.5	23	3.6
Other	7	1.5	8!	2.6	6	1.8
None of the above	26	2.5	16	3.3	35*	3.7
Number of district responses	**436**		**216**		**220**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G7).

Table 2.4.3.5c. Actions districts took to change transition policies, procedures, and practices for school-age children with disabilities in the 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2019–2020 school years, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Revised or developed memorandums of understanding and collaboration agreements with other entities, such as workforce agencies, vocational rehabilitation agencies, or social service agencies	19	2.2	21	4.0	19	2.7
Provided targeted professional development, including materials and funds, to schools with below-target outcomes	24	2.4	27	4.4	23	2.9
Updated guidance on transition procedures for families and former students	27	2.5	27	4.5	27	3.0
Revised transition supports offered to families and former students	24	2.4	26	4.2	24	2.9
Added transition supports offered to families and former students (including hiring additional staff)	19	2.3	25	5.3	17	2.5
Revised practices to better support student attendance and participation in the transition meeting	39	2.7	42	4.8	39	3.3
Analyzed data to identify the relationship between school-based practices and post-high school outcomes to determine areas for improvement and continued implementation	24	2.6	32	5.6	22	2.8
Other	7	1.5	6!	2.5	7	1.9
None of the above	26	2.5	32	4.4	24	3.1
Number of district responses	**436**		**154**		**282**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G7).

Table 2.4.3.6. Programs and supports schools provide to students with disabilities to prepare them for further education, jobs, and independent living

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Advanced Placement or other courses (including dual enrollment programs) that earn college credit	74	3.2
Counseling on federal or state benefits (such as Medicaid or Supplemental Security Income)	46	3.5
Career and technical education courses	77	3.1
Career awareness instruction	81	2.7
Counseling on postsecondary career and technical education and employment training program options	85	2.5
Counseling on postsecondary education, including course guidance	81	2.7
Independent living/self-care skills instruction	67	3.2
Self-advocacy/self-determination instruction	70	3.2
Social skills instruction	76	3.1
Soft skills development	62	3.4
Student-led IEP process	34	3.1
Supports for participating in an inclusive learning environment	73	3.0
Supports for participating in extracurricular clubs and sports	69	3.0
Supported employment in community settings in which students with and without disabilities work	57	3.6
Test-taking strategies and study skills instruction	71	3.3
Work-based learning experiences in community settings in which students with and without disabilities work	61	3.4
Workplace readiness training	50	3.4
Other	6	1.7
None of the above	.	.
Number of school responses	**454**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade (n=454). Respondents were asked to include programs offered through their school, as well as programs and supports their school makes available to their students through coordination with other partners. Soft skills relate to qualities and behavior that apply across a variety of situations - these skills are critical to the success of students in college as well as in the workplace. Examples of soft skills include communication, teamwork, time management, self-confidence, and creativity. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question D3).

Table 2.4.3.7. Percentage of schools that use a transition planning rubric or guide focused on a set of compliance and quality indicators when developing a transition plan for students with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
No transition planning rubric or guide	30	3.3
A rubric or guide that focuses on compliance only	23	2.7
A rubric or guide that focuses on both compliance and quality indicators	47	3.4
Number of school responses	**452**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade (n=454). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question D4).

Table 2.4.3.8. Individuals who participate in transition planning meetings for students with low and high incidence disabilities

Response category	Percentage of students with low incidence disabilities for which each individual participates	Percentage of students with high incidence disabilities for which each individual participates
General education academic subject teacher(s) (SE)	67 (3.0)	76 (2.7)
General education career and technical teacher or work study coordinator (SE)	50 (3.4)	56 (3.3)
Special education teacher (SE)	82 (2.5)	87 (2.4)
School administrator (for example, principal, special education administrator) (SE)	69 (2.8)	73 (2.8)
School guidance counselor, social worker, or psychologist (SE)	57 (2.9)	62 (2.8)
Related services personnel (for example, speech pathologist, occupational therapist, orientation and mobility) (SE)	57 (2.7)	56 (2.7)
Parent or guardian (SE)	75 (2.5)	79 (2.5)
The student (SE)	69 (2.7)	78 (2.4)
Number of school responses	**441**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade (n=454). Respondents were asked to provide their best estimate. Low incidence disabilities occur less frequently than other disabilities, and school-age children with low incidence disabilities require highly specialized services, equipment, and materials. Students with low incidence disabilities include students who are deaf or hard of hearing, blind or visually impaired, or deafblind, and students with significant cognitive and behavioral disabilities. High incidence disabilities include most students with disabilities, such as students with a specific learning disability, students with emotional disturbance, and students with mild intellectual disability. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question D5).

Table 2.4.3.9. Information schools provide to parents/guardians and school-age children with the most significant cognitive disabilities regarding potential implications of taking Alternate Assessments Based on alternate academic achievement standards in place of standard assessments

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Potential implications for high school graduation	80	2.4
Potential implications for type of diploma	74	2.7
Potential implications for higher education	72	3.0
Potential implications for work opportunities	68	3.2
Other	7	1.7
Number of school responses	**454**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade (n=454). Academic achievement standards gauge the proficiency with which content standards have been attained by individuals or groups of students. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question D7).

2.4.4. Support for transitions: Follow-up after transition

Table 2.4.4.1. Ways in which state agencies obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
State or district data systems	15	2
State or district surveys of providers who support former students after high school	9	3
State or district surveys of former students or their parents/guardians	43	8
Summary reports from other agencies	8	2
Other	2	0
Do not currently obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes	0	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H5).

Table 2.4.4.2. Post-high school outcome data state agencies collect in addition to required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Enrollment in higher education more than one year after leaving high school	21	3
Enrollment in other postsecondary education or training program more than one year after leaving high school	17	3
Completion of higher education, other postsecondary education, or training program	19	2
Any employment more than one year after leaving high school	17	3
Competitive employment more than one year after leaving high school	15	3
Independent living arrangements	6	3
Supervised living arrangements	6	0
Incarceration	4	1
Hospitalization	1	0
Other	5	0
The state agency does not currently collect other transition data, but other state agencies do	10	2
None of the above	9	4
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14 include enrollment in higher education, enrollment in other postsecondary education or training program, competitive employment, and other employment within one year of leaving high school.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H6).

Table 2.4.4.3. Number of lead agencies that examine data on children with disabilities after their transition from early intervention services

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	40	6
Yes	11	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question H4).

Table 2.4.4.4. Data lead agencies examine on children with disabilities after their transition from early intervention services

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Whether child receives services through the Part B special education program	9	0
The setting in which preschool-age special education services are received	6	0
Whether the child participates in early learning programs such as Head Start or pre-K	6	0
Preschool exit data on child outcomes: positive social-emotional skills	7	0
Preschool exit data on child outcomes: acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	5	0
Preschool exit data on child outcomes: the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	7	0
Information on family satisfaction with the transition process	1	0
Other	3	0
Number of responses	**11**	**0**

Note: The sample for this table includes all lead agencies that reported examining data on children with disabilities after their transition from early intervention services (states: n=11; entities: n=0). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question H5).

Table 2.4.4.5. Ways in which lead agencies obtain data on the result of the transition from early intervention services to preschool-age special education services

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
District-reported data about students in preschool-age special education services	4	0
Surveys of families	0	0
Surveys of staff at agencies serving children who have transitioned from the Part C early intervention program	0	0
State longitudinal data systems	6	0
State early intervention data system	8	0
Multiple data systems that are linked as needed using a common identifier or other matching process	5	0
Other	1	0
Number of responses	**11**	**0**

Note: The sample for this table includes all lead agencies that reported examining data on children with disabilities after their transition from early intervention services (states: n=11; entities: n=0). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question H6).

Table 2.4.4.6. Ways in which districts obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
State or district data systems	41	2.8
State or district surveys of providers who support former students after high school	19	2.3
State or district surveys of former students or their parents/guardians	49	2.9
Summary reports from other agencies	12	2.1
Other	3!	1.1
Do not currently obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes	20	2.2
Number of district responses	**435**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G3).

Table 2.4.4.6a. Ways in which districts obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
State or district data systems	41	2.8	44	3.1	25*	5.2
State or district surveys of providers who support former students after high school	19	2.3	21	2.6	7!*	2.9
State or district surveys of former students or their parents/guardians	49	2.9	53	3.3	26*	5.3
Summary reports from other agencies	12	2.1	14	2.4	.	.
Other	3!	1.1	2!	1.1	7!	3.2
Do not currently obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes	20	2.2	15	2.4	52*	6.0
Number of district responses	**435**		**331**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G3).

Table 2.4.4.6b. Ways in which districts obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
State or district data systems	41	2.8	46	4.2	37	3.8
State or district surveys of providers who support former students after high school	19	2.3	20	3.2	18	3.1
State or district surveys of former students or their parents/guardians	49	2.9	58	4.2	41*	3.9
Summary reports from other agencies	12	2.1	11	2.7	13	3.0
Other	3!	1.1	.	.	3!	1.4
Do not currently obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes	20	2.2	8!	2.6	30*	3.5
Number of district responses	**435**		**216**		**219**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G3).

Table 2.4.4.6c. Ways in which districts obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
State or district data systems	41	2.8	34	4.9	44	3.4
State or district surveys of providers who support former students after high school	19	2.3	13	3.4	21	2.8
State or district surveys of former students or their parents/guardians	49	2.9	46	5.1	50	3.5
Summary reports from other agencies	12	2.1	9!	4.3	13	2.4
Other	3!	1.1	.	.	3!	1.3
Do not currently obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes	20	2.2	29	4.2	17*	2.6
Number of district responses	**435**		**154**		**281**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G3).

Table 2.4.4.7. Percentage of former students for whom districts are able to obtain required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
0 to 25% of former students	37	3.0
26 to 50% of former students	18	2.3
51 to 75% of former students	20	2.4
76 to 100% of former students	25	2.6
Number of district responses	**411**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14 includes the post-high school outcomes of enrollment in higher education, enrollment in other postsecondary education or training, competitive employment, and other employment. Respondents were asked to provide their best estimate. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G4).

Table 2.4.4.7a. Percentage of former students for whom districts are able to obtain required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
0 to 25% of former students	37	3.0	34	3.3	58*	6.4
26 to 50% of former students	18	2.3	19	2.5	13!	4.4
51 to 75% of former students	20	2.4	20	2.7	17	4.9
76 to 100% of former students	25	2.6	27	3.0	12!*	4.3
Number of district responses	**411**		**314**		**97**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14 includes the post-high school outcomes of enrollment in higher education, enrollment in other postsecondary education or training, competitive employment, and other employment. Respondents were asked to provide their best estimate. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G4).

Table 2.4.4.7b. Percentage of former students for whom districts are able to obtain required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
0 to 25% of former students	37	3.0	31	4.2	43*	4.2
26 to 50% of former students	18	2.3	22	3.6	14	2.8
51 to 75% of former students	20	2.4	21	3.7	19	3.3
76 to 100% of former students	25	2.6	26	4.0	24	3.6
Number of district responses	**411**		**204**		**207**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14 includes the post-high school outcomes of enrollment in higher education, enrollment in other postsecondary education or training, competitive employment, and other employment. Respondents were asked to provide their best estimate. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G4).

Table 2.4.4.7c. Percentage of former students for whom districts are able to obtain required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
0 to 25% of former students	37	3.0	42	5.0	36	3.6
26 to 50% of former students	18	2.3	18	4.1	18	2.7
51 to 75% of former students	20	2.4	20	4.4	20	2.9
76 to 100% of former students	25	2.6	19	4.2	27	3.2
Number of district responses	**411**		**144**		**267**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14 includes the post-high school outcomes of enrollment in higher education, enrollment in other postsecondary education or training, competitive employment, and other employment. Respondents were asked to provide their best estimate. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G4).

Table 2.4.4.8. Post-high school outcomes districts collect in addition to required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Enrollment in higher education more than one year after leaving high school	44	2.9
Enrollment in other postsecondary education or training program more than one year after leaving high school	39	2.9
Completion of higher education, postsecondary education, or training program	30	2.8
Any employment more than one year after leaving high school	35	2.9
Competitive employment more than one year after leaving high school	22	2.5
Independent living arrangements	17	2.3
Supervised living arrangements	9	1.8
Incarceration	7	1.6
Hospitalization	4!	1.3
Activities used by schools to prepare students for success after leaving high school	8	1.7
Other	5	1.4
None of the above	42	3.0
Number of district responses	**428**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14 include enrollment in higher education, enrollment in other postsecondary education or training program, competitive employment, and other employment within one year of leaving high school. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G5).

Table 2.4.4.8a. Post-high school outcomes districts collect in addition to required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Enrollment in higher education more than one year after leaving high school	44	2.9	47	3.3	23*	4.9
Enrollment in other postsecondary education or training program more than one year after leaving high school	39	2.9	42	3.3	21*	4.8
Completion of higher education, postsecondary education, or training program	30	2.8	33	3.2	16*	4.3
Any employment more than one year after leaving high school	35	2.9	39	3.3	11!*	3.6
Competitive employment more than one year after leaving high school	22	2.5	24	2.8	7!*	2.9
Independent living arrangements	17	2.3	19	2.7	6!*	2.9
Supervised living arrangements	9	1.8	10	2.0	.	.
Incarceration	7	1.6	8	1.8	.	.
Hospitalization	4!	1.3	4!	1.4	.	.
Activities used by schools to prepare students for success after leaving high school	8	1.7	9	1.9	6!	3.0
Other	5	1.4	4!	1.5	.	.
None of the above	42	3.0	39	3.3	66*	5.7
Number of district responses	**428**		**324**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14 include enrollment in higher education, enrollment in other postsecondary education or training program, competitive employment, and other employment within one year of leaving high school. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G5).

Table 2.4.4.8b. Post-high school outcomes districts collect in addition to required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Enrollment in higher education more than one year after leaving high school	44	2.9	50	4.4	38*	4.0
Enrollment in other postsecondary education or training program more than one year after leaving high school	39	2.9	43	4.3	36	3.9
Completion of higher education, postsecondary education, or training program	30	2.8	32	4.0	29	3.9
Any employment more than one year after leaving high school	35	2.9	38	4.2	32	3.9
Competitive employment more than one year after leaving high school	22	2.5	27	3.8	17	3.2
Independent living arrangements	17	2.3	20	3.6	15	3.1
Supervised living arrangements	9	1.8	12	2.9	7!	2.2
Incarceration	7	1.6	10	2.7	5!	1.8
Hospitalization	4!	1.3	5!	2.1	3!	1.4
Activities used by schools to prepare students for success after leaving high school	8	1.7	8!	2.3	9	2.3
Other	5	1.4	.	.	6!	2.0
None of the above	42	3.0	41	4.4	44	4.0
Number of district responses	**428**		**212**		**216**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14 include enrollment in higher education, enrollment in other postsecondary education or training program, competitive employment, and other employment within one year of leaving high school. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G5).

Table 2.4.4.8c. Post-high school outcomes districts collect in addition to required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Enrollment in higher education more than one year after leaving high school	44	2.9	45	4.6	44	3.6
Enrollment in other postsecondary education or training program more than one year after leaving high school	39	2.9	37	4.6	40	3.6
Completion of higher education, postsecondary education, or training program	30	2.8	33	5.5	30	3.3
Any employment more than one year after leaving high school	35	2.9	33	5.3	36	3.5
Competitive employment more than one year after leaving high school	22	2.5	25	4.4	20	2.9
Independent living arrangements	17	2.3	15	3.5	18	2.9
Supervised living arrangements	9	1.8	9!	2.6	9	2.2
Incarceration	7	1.6	3!	1.5	8	2.1
Hospitalization	4!	1.3	.	.	4!	1.6
Activities used by schools to prepare students for success after leaving high school	8	1.7	6!	2.6	9	2.0
Other	5	1.4	.	.	5!	1.8
None of the above	42	3.0	45	5.2	41	3.6
Number of district responses	**428**		**153**		**275**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Required outcomes for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B Indicator 14 include enrollment in higher education, enrollment in other postsecondary education or training program, competitive employment, and other employment within one year of leaving high school. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question G5).

2.5.1. Behavioral policies and supports: Discipline policy

Table 2.5.1.1. Number of state agencies that provide districts with requirements or recommended guidelines on discipline (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state does not provide districts with requirements or recommended guidelines	7	1
The state provides districts with requirements	29	6
The state provides districts with recommended guidelines	15	2
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K1).

Table 2.5.1.2. Number of state agencies that have posted their current discipline policy on the agency website (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Information not available on a website	7	2
Information available on a website	35	6
Number of responses	**42**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported providing districts with requirements or recommended guidelines around discipline (states: n=44; entities: n=8). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K2).

Table 2.5.1.3. Number of states with a zero-tolerance policy

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	29	4
Yes	15	4
Number of responses	**44**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported providing districts with requirements or recommended guidelines around discipline (states: n=44; entities: n=8). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K3).

Table 2.5.1.4. Differences in state zero-tolerance policies based on whether a student has a disability

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The policy is the same for all students	8	1
It always differs for students with and without disabilities	3	2
It depends on the infraction	4	1
Number of responses	**15**	**4**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having a zero-tolerance policy (states: n=15; entities: n=4). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K4).

Table 2.5.1.5. Number of states with a policy pertaining to suspensions (in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	7	1
Yes	37	7
Number of responses	**44**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported providing districts with requirements or recommended guidelines around discipline (states: n=44; entities: n=8). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K5).

Table 2.5.1.6. Differences in state in-school suspension policies based on whether a student has a disability

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The policy is the same for all students	19	5
It always differs for students with and without disabilities	13	1
It depends on the infraction	5	1
Number of responses	**37**	**7**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having a policy pertaining to suspensions (both in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions (states: n=37; entities: n=7). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K6).

Table 2.5.1.7. Differences in state out-of-school suspension policies based on whether a student has a disability

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The policy is the same for all students	16	3
It always differs for students with and without disabilities	15	3
It depends on the infraction	6	1
Number of responses	**37**	**7**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having a policy pertaining to suspensions (both in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions (states: n=37; entities: n=7). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K7).

Table 2.5.1.8. Differences in state expulsion policies based on whether a student has a disability

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The policy is the same for all students	14	3
It always differs for students with and without disabilities	16	3
It depends on the infraction	7	1
Number of responses	**37**	**7**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having a policy pertaining to suspensions (both in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions (states: n=37; entities: n=7). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K8).

Table 2.5.1.9. Number of states with a policy restricting the use of restraints and seclusion in schools

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	7	5
Yes	37	3
Number of responses	**44**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported providing districts with requirements or recommended guidelines around discipline (states: n=44; entities: n=8). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K9).

Table 2.5.1.10. Differences in state policies restricting the use of restraints and seclusion in schools based on whether a student has a disability

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The policy is the same for all students	27	2
It always differs for students with and without disabilities	7	0
It depends on the infraction	3	1
Number of responses	**37**	**3**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having a policy restricting the use of restraints and seclusion in schools (states: n=37; entities: n=3). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K10).

Table 2.5.1.11. Number of state agencies that collaborate with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	19	5
Yes	25	3
Number of responses	**44**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported providing districts with requirements or recommended guidelines around discipline (states: n=44; entities: n=8). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K11).

Table 2.5.1.12. Agencies or organizations with which state agencies work to develop or support the implementation of behavioral supports to address disciplinary issues among school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Behavioral/mental health agency	19	3
Developmental disabilities agency	17	1
Health agency	12	3
Local or state disability advocacy groups	21	1
Private therapists or therapy organizations (for example, trauma-informed therapists, applied behavior analysis providers)	8	1
Social services	14	2
Other	3	1
Number of responses	**24**	**3**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported collaborating with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for school-age children with disabilities (states: n=25; entities: n=3). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K12).

Table 2.5.1.13. Strategies, programs, or curricula that state agencies recommend to manage behavioral issues for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Mental health consultation	26	6
Functional Behavioral Assessment	42	7
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support	41	1
Teacher training focused on managing student behavior	39	6
Technical assistance focused on managing student behavior	38	7
Other	7	1
Do not use any strategies or programs to manage the behavior of school-age children with disabilities	0	0
Number of responses	**43**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported providing districts with requirements or recommended guidelines around discipline (states: n=44; entities: n=8). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K13).

Table 2.5.1.14. Number of state agencies that provide districts with requirements or recommended guidelines on discipline (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state does not provide districts with requirements or recommended guidelines	14	3
The state provides districts with requirements	24	4
The state provides districts with recommended guidelines	13	1
Number of responses	**51**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the child's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H1).

Table 2.5.1.15. Number of state agencies that have posted their current discipline policy on the agency website (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Information not available on a website	3	3
Information available on a website	34	2
Number of responses	**37**	**5**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported providing districts with requirements or recommended guidelines around discipline (states: n=37; entities: n=5). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H2).

Table 2.5.1.16. Number of states with a policy pertaining to suspensions (in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions for preschool-age children

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	14	3
Yes	23	2
Number of responses	**37**	**5**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported providing districts with requirements or recommended guidelines around discipline (states: n=37; entities: n=5). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the child's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H3).

Table 2.5.1.17. Differences in state in-school suspension policies for preschool-age children based on whether a child has a disability

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The policy is the same for all students	13	1
It always differs for students with and without disabilities	8	1
It depends on the infraction	1	0
Number of responses	**22**	**2**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having a policy pertaining to suspensions (both in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions for preschool-age children (states: n=23; entities: n=2). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the child's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H4).

Table 2.5.1.18. Differences in state out-of-school suspension policies for preschool-age children based on whether a child has a disability

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The policy is the same for all students	11	1
It always differs for students with and without disabilities	8	1
It depends on the infraction	3	0
Number of responses	**22**	**2**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having a policy pertaining to suspensions (both in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions for preschool-age children (states: n=23; entities: n=2). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the child's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H5).

Table 2.5.1.19. Differences in state expulsion policies for preschool-age children based on whether a child has a disability

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The policy is the same for all students	11	1
It always differs for students with and without disabilities	8	1
It depends on the infraction	3	0
Number of responses	**22**	**2**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having a policy pertaining to suspensions (both in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions for preschool-age children (states: n=23; entities: n=2). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the child's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H6).

Table 2.5.1.20. Number of states with a policy restricting the use of restraints and seclusion for preschool-age children in schools

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	15	4
Yes	22	1
Number of responses	**37**	**5**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported providing districts with requirements or recommended guidelines around discipline (states: n=37; entities: n=5). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the child's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H7).

Table 2.5.1.21. Differences in state policies restricting the use of restraints and seclusion for preschool-age children in schools based on whether a child has a disability

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The policy is the same for all students	13	1
It always differs for students with and without disabilities	6	0
It depends on the infraction	2	0
Number of responses	**21**	**1**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported having a policy restricting the use of restraints and seclusion for preschool-age children in schools (states: n=22; entities: n=1). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the child's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H8).

Table 2.5.1.22. Number of state agencies that collaborate with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	18	4
Yes	19	1
Number of responses	**37**	**5**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported providing districts with requirements or recommended guidelines around discipline (states: n=37; entities: n=5). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the child's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H9).

Table 2.5.1.23. Agencies or organizations with which state agencies work to develop or support the implementation of behavioral supports to address disciplinary issues among preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Behavioral/mental health agency	10	1
Developmental disabilities agency	7	1
Early Intervention Part C	10	0
Head Start	13	1
Health agency	4	1
Local or state disability advocacy groups	9	1
Private therapists or therapy organizations (for example, trauma-informed therapists, applied behavior analysis providers)	5	0
Social services	11	1
Other	0	0
Number of responses	**19**	**1**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported collaborating with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities (states: n=19; entities: n=1). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the child's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H10).

Table 2.5.1.24. Strategies, programs, or curricula that state agencies recommend to manage behavioral issues for preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Early childhood mental health consultation	19	3
Functional Behavioral Assessment	30	2
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support	26	0
Teacher training focused on managing student behavior	29	1
Technical assistance focused on managing student behavior	27	3
Other	7	0
Do not use any strategies or programs to manage the behavior of preschool-age children with disabilities	1	1
Number of responses	**37**	**5**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported providing districts with requirements or recommended guidelines around discipline (states: n=37; entities: n=5). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the child's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H11).

Table 2.5.1.25. Percentage of districts with a zero-tolerance policy

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	55	3.0
Yes	45	3.0
Number of district responses	**434**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I1).

Table 2.5.1.25a. Percentage of districts with a zero-tolerance policy, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	55	3.0	56	3.3	49	6.2
Yes	45	3.0	44	3.3	51	6.2
Number of district responses	**434**		**330**		**104**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I1).

Table 2.5.1.25b. Percentage of districts with a zero-tolerance policy, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	55	3.0	59	4.3	52	4.1
Yes	45	3.0	41	4.3	48	4.1
Number of district responses	**434**		**214**		**220**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I1).

Table 2.5.1.25c. Percentage of districts with a zero-tolerance policy, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	55	3.0	53	4.9	56	3.6
Yes	45	3.0	47	4.9	44	3.6
Number of district responses	**434**		**154**		**280**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I1).

Table 2.5.1.26. Differences in district zero-tolerance policies based on whether a student has a disability

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The policy is the same for all students	27	3.9
It always differs for students with and without disabilities	24	3.9
It depends on the infraction	48	4.3
Number of district responses	**202**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having a zero-tolerance policy (n=202). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I2).

Table 2.5.1.27. Percentage of districts with a policy pertaining to suspensions (in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	5	1.3
Yes	95	1.3
Number of district responses	**436**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I3).

Table 2.5.1.27a. Percentage of districts with a policy pertaining to suspensions (in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	5	1.3	5	1.5	.	.
Yes	95	1.3	95	1.5	95	2.8
Number of district responses	**436**		**332**		**104**	

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I3).

Table 2.5.1.27b. Percentage of districts with a policy pertaining to suspensions (in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	5	1.3	5!	2.0	5!	1.8
Yes	95	1.3	95	2.0	95	1.8
Number of district responses	**436**		**215**		**221**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I3).

Table 2.5.1.27c. Percentage of districts with a policy pertaining to suspensions (in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	5	1.3	.	.	6	1.7
Yes	95	1.3	98	1.7	94	1.7
Number of district responses	**436**		**154**		**282**	

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I3).

Table 2.5.1.28. Differences in district in-school suspension policies based on whether a student has a disability

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The policy is the same for all students	31	2.9
It always differs for students with and without disabilities	17	2.4
It depends on the infraction	51	3.0
Number of district responses	**414**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having a policy pertaining to suspensions (both in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions (n=415). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I4).

Table 2.5.1.29. Differences in district out-of-school suspension policies based on whether a student has a disability

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The policy is the same for all students	28	2.8
It always differs for students with and without disabilities	19	2.5
It depends on the infraction	53	3.0
Number of district responses	**413**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having a policy pertaining to suspensions (both in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions (n=415). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I5).

Table 2.5.1.30. Differences in district expulsion policies based on whether a student has a disability

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The policy is the same for all students	28	2.8
It always differs for students with and without disabilities	28	2.9
It depends on the infraction	44	3.0
Number of district responses	**413**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having a policy pertaining to suspensions (both in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions (n=415). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I6).

Table 2.5.1.31. Sources of authority to suspend or expel school-age children, by student group

Response category	Percentage of districts in which the teacher has authority	Percentage of districts in which the assistant principal has authority	Percentage of districts in which the principal has authority	Percentage of districts in which the superintendent has authority	Percentage of districts that do not specify who has the authority
Elementary school students with disabilities (SE)	1! (0.6)	37 (2.8)	89 (2.1)	70 (2.7)	4! (1.2)
Elementary school students without disabilities (SE)	1! (0.6)	37 (2.8)	89 (2.1)	70 (2.7)	4! (1.3)
Middle school students with disabilities (SE)	.	44 (3.0)	89 (2.2)	70 (2.8)	5! (1.5)
Middle school students without disabilities (SE)	1! (0.7)	45 (3.0)	89 (2.2)	70 (2.8)	5! (1.5)
High school students with disabilities (SE)	1! (0.7)	46 (3.0)	86 (2.5)	66 (2.9)	7 (1.8)
High school students without disabilities (SE)	1! (0.7)	47 (3.0)	86 (2.4)	66 (2.9)	7 (1.8)
Number of district responses	**411**				

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having a policy pertaining to suspensions (both in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions (n=415). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I7).

Table 2.5.1.32. Percentage of districts with a policy restricting the use of restraints and seclusion in schools

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	21	2.5
Yes	79	2.5
Number of district responses	**432**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I8).

Table 2.5.1.32a. Percentage of districts with a policy restricting the use of restraints and seclusion in schools, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	21	2.5	20	2.8	22	5.3
Yes	79	2.5	80	2.8	78	5.3
Number of district responses	**432**		**328**		**104**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I8).

Table 2.5.1.32b. Percentage of districts with a policy restricting the use of restraints and seclusion in schools, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	21	2.5	16	3.4	24	3.7
Yes	79	2.5	84	3.4	76	3.7
Number of district responses	**432**		**215**		**217**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I8).

Table 2.5.1.32c. Percentage of districts with a policy restricting the use of restraints and seclusion in schools, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	21	2.5	18	3.8	22	3.1
Yes	79	2.5	82	3.8	78	3.1
Number of district responses	**432**		**153**		**279**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I8).

Table 2.5.1.33. Differences in district policies restricting the use of restraints and seclusion in schools based on whether a student has a disability

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The policy is the same for all students	69	3.1
It always differs for students with and without disabilities	15	2.3
It depends on the infraction	16	2.5
Number of district responses	**347**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having a policy restricting the use of restraints and seclusion in schools (n=347). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I9).

Table 2.5.1.34. Percentage of districts that have posted their current discipline policy on the district website

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Information not available on a website	30	2.7
Information available on a website	70	2.7
Number of district responses	**428**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I10).

Table 2.5.1.34a. Percentage of districts that have posted their current discipline policy on the district website, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Information not available on a website	30	2.7	28	2.9	40	6.0
Information available on a website	70	2.7	72	2.9	60	6.0
Number of district responses	**428**		**327**		**101**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I10).

Table 2.5.1.34b. Percentage of districts that have posted their current discipline policy on the district website, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Information not available on a website	30	2.7	23	3.7	35*	3.8
Information available on a website	70	2.7	77	3.7	65*	3.8
Number of district responses	**428**		**211**		**217**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I10).

Table 2.5.1.34c. Percentage of districts that have posted their current discipline policy on the district website, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Information not available on a website	30	2.7	26	4.6	31	3.2
Information available on a website	70	2.7	74	4.6	69	3.2
Number of district responses	**428**		**151**		**277**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question I10).

Table 2.5.1.35. Percentage of districts that ever remove preschool-age children with disabilities from a preschool program for disciplinary purposes for the remainder of the school year or longer

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	85	2.5
Yes	.	.
Not applicable	15	2.5
Number of district responses	**318**	

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question G1).

Table 2.5.1.35a. Percentage of districts that ever remove preschool-age children with disabilities from a preschool program for disciplinary purposes for the remainder of the school year or longer, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	85	2.5	86	2.5	53*	15.3
Yes	.	.	.	.	0	.
Not applicable	15	2.5	14	2.5	47!*	15.3
Number of district responses	**318**		**294**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question G1).

Table 2.5.1.36. Percentage of districts that collaborate with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	55	3.3
Yes	45	3.3
Number of district responses	**317**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question G2).

Table 2.5.1.36a. Percentage of districts that collaborate with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	55	3.3	55	3.4	60	14.7
Yes	45	3.3	45	3.4	40!	14.7
Number of district responses	**317**		**293**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question G2).

Table 2.5.1.36b. Percentage of districts that collaborate with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	55	3.3	61	4.5	49	5.1
Yes	45	3.3	39	4.5	51	5.1
Number of district responses	**317**		**190**		**127**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question G2).

Table 2.5.1.36c. Percentage of districts that collaborate with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	55	3.3	74	5.8	51*	3.9
Yes	45	3.3	26	5.8	49*	3.9
Number of district responses	**317**		**88**		**229**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question G2).

Table 2.5.1.37. Agencies or organizations with which districts work to support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Behavioral/mental health agency	60	5.5
Developmental disabilities agency	26	4.9
Early Intervention Part C	45	5.5
Head Start	59	5.2
Health agency	19	4.3
Local or state disability advocacy groups	17	4.1
Private therapists or therapy organizations (for example, trauma-informed therapists, applied behavior analysis providers)	42	5.3
Social services	45	5.4
Other	19	4.3
Number of district responses	**143**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported collaborating with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities (n=143). Respondents were asked to assume manifestation determination review had taken place and it had been determined that the infraction was not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the Individualized Education Program. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question G3).

2.5.2. Behavioral policies and supports: Significant disproportionality in discipline

Table 2.5.2.1. Actions state agencies take when a district is required to address significant disproportionality in discipline

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Develops or works with district to develop a specific plan for the district to follow to address significant disproportionality in discipline	38	1
Reviews and approves a district-developed plan	41	0
Reviews or revises (if appropriate) policies, practices, and procedures	41	1
Provides or arranges training for the district	40	2
Provides or arranges technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for the district	43	2
Provides additional (beyond the 15% required by Part B) targeted monetary or staff resources to the district	6	0
Recommends focusing funds on elementary schools	4	0
Recommends focusing funds on middle schools	4	0
Recommends focusing funds on high schools	4	0
Recommends focusing funds on specific interventions	5	0
Recommends focusing funds on specific areas, such as literacy or comprehensive behavioral supports	10	2
Other	5	1
None of the above	4	6
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Significant disproportionality in discipline occurs when districts discipline children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district. Respondents were asked to include all actions that are used in the state, even if they are not used in all situations.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question D5).

Table 2.5.2.2. Percentage of districts, by school year over the past five years, the state has identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
2014-2015	2!	0.8
2015-2016	3!	0.9
2016-2017	2!	0.8
2017-2018	5	1.2
2018-2019	4	1.0
The district has not been identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline for school-age children in the past five school years	76	2.4
Don't know if the district has been identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline for school-age children in the past five school years	15	2.0
Number of district responses	**438**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Significant disproportionality in discipline occurs when districts discipline children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C7).

Table 2.5.2.2a. Percentage of districts, by school year over the past five years, the state has identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
2014-2015	2!	0.8	2!	0.9	.	.
2015-2016	3!	0.9	3!	1.1	.	.
2016-2017	2!	0.8	2!	0.9	.	.
2017-2018	5	1.2	5	1.3	.	.
2018-2019	4	1.0	4	1.2	.	.
The district has not been identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline for school-age children in the past five school years	76	2.4	77	2.7	76	5.0
Don't know if the district has been identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline for school-age children in the past five school years	15	2.0	14	2.2	18	4.6
Number of district responses	**438**		**334**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Significant disproportionality in discipline occurs when districts discipline children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C7).

Table 2.5.2.2b. Percentage of districts, by school year over the past five years, the state has identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
2014-2015	2!	0.8	5!	1.7	.	.
2015-2016	3!	0.9	6!	1.9	.	.
2016-2017	2!	0.8	5!	1.7	.	.
2017-2018	5	1.2	9	2.4	.	.
2018-2019	4	1.0	8	2.1	.	.
The district has not been identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline for school-age children in the past five school years	76	2.4	70	3.9	82*	2.9
Don't know if the district has been identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline for school-age children in the past five school years	15	2.0	14	2.9	15	2.7
Number of district responses	**438**		**216**		**222**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Significant disproportionality in discipline occurs when districts discipline children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C7).

Table 2.5.2.2c. Percentage of districts, by school year over the past five years, the state has identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
2014-2015	2!	0.8	5!	2.1	.	.
2015-2016	3!	0.9	5!	2.2	2!	1.0
2016-2017	2!	0.8	2!	1.1	2!	1.0
2017-2018	5	1.2	3!	1.3	5	1.5
2018-2019	4	1.0	6!	2.0	3!	1.2
The district has not been identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline for school-age children in the past five school years	76	2.4	75	4.6	77	2.8
Don't know if the district has been identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline for school-age children in the past five school years	15	2.0	12	3.3	15	2.4
Number of district responses	**438**		**155**		**283**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Significant disproportionality in discipline occurs when districts discipline children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C7).

Table 2.5.2.3. Actions districts have taken in the past five school years to address or prevent significant disproportionality in discipline

Response category	Percentage of districts that funded this action through CCEIS (mandatory) funds	Percentage of districts that funded this action through voluntary CEIS funds	Percentage of districts that funded this action through other funds	Percentage of districts that did not do this
Changed student code of conduct (SE)	.	.	42! (12.9)	48 (14.3)
Made environmental changes to schools (for example, cameras in blind hallways; classroom communication systems) to prevent or address problems (SE)	.	.	43 (12.3)	51 (12.9)
Increased monitoring of school disciplinary actions (SE)	.	.	66 (13.7)	.
Used a support team to review general education student behavioral plans, ensure they have needed support(s), and track progress (SE)	26! (11.8)	.	52 (14.8)	28! (12.6)
Used Interdisciplinary Team Teaching or Schools-within-Schools approach (SE)	.	.	18! (8.4)	76 (10.5)
Developed a specific plan for school staff to address significant disproportionality in discipline (SE)	27! (12.8)	.	50 (13.2)	30! (13.9)
Provided targeted supports to all schools (SE)	.	.	46! (14.7)	37! (13.2)
Provided targeted supports only to schools with evidence of significant disproportionality, or near-significant disproportionality (SE)	.	.	23! (10.4)	55 (14.9)
Provided targeted supports for elementary schools (SE)	.	8! (2.9)	42! (13.5)	36! (12.6)
Provided targeted supports for middle schools (SE)	33! (13.1)	.	50 (14.0)	26! (9.2)
Provided targeted supports for high schools (SE)	27! (11.3)	0 (.)	39! (14.9)	43! (14.1)
Provided or supported interventions to address issues in literacy (SE)	.	.	71 (14.4)	.
Provided or supported interventions to address issues in math (SE)	.	.	72 (14.9)	.
Provided or supported interventions to address issues in science (SE)	.	.	41! (14.5)	57 (14.5)
Provided or supported behavioral supports (SE)	33! (13.7)	.	75 (11.9)	.
Initiated a tiered system of support for behavior (for example, PBIS/School-Wide PBIS) (SE)	27! (11.8)	.	81 (10.8)	.
Used Reconnecting Youth program (SE)	.	0 (.)	.	93 (6.9)
Used Restorative Justice approach (SE)	10! (4.7)	.	47! (14.2)	46! (14.1)
Used Safe and Responsive Schools Guide (SE)	.	0 (.)	36! (12.7)	64 (12.7)
Provided school resource officers at schools (SE)	.	0 (.)	74 (12.7)	26! (12.7)
Used social-emotional or character development curriculum (SE)	.	0 (.)	80 (11.1)	.
Used trauma-informed practices or programs (SE)	16! (7.7)	.	64 (14.4)	.
Initiated other specific interventions (SE)	.	0 (.)	.	76 (13.2)
Developed guidance on office referrals for all staff (SE)	.	.	81 (13.3)	.
Other (SE)	.	.	.	88 (6.4)
Number of district responses	**51**			

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported the state identifying them as having significant disproportionality in discipline in the past five school years (n=51). Respondents were asked to include all actions that were used in the district, even if they were not used in all situations. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

CCEIS = Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services; CEIS = Coordinated Early Intervening Services; PBIS = Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C8).

Table 2.5.2.4. Professional development districts provided in the past five school years to address or prevent significant disproportionality in discipline, by funding type

Response category	Percentage of districts that provided this professional development through CCEIS (mandatory) funds	Percentage of districts that provided this professional development through voluntary CEIS funds	Percentage of districts that provided this professional development through other funds	Percentage of districts that did not provide this professional development
Training for school staff on how to manage behavior in the classroom (SE)	.	.	81 (11.4)	.
Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for general education teachers (SE)	.	.	58 (14.4)	27! (11.9)
Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for special education teachers (SE)	.	.	65 (14.2)	.
Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for school administrative staff (SE)	.	.	69 (14.4)	.
Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for other school staff (SE)	.	.	68 (14.0)	31! (13.9)
Other (SE)	.	.	.	86 (7.2)
Number of district responses	**50**			

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported being identified by the state as having significant disproportionality in discipline in the past five school years (2014-2015 through 2018-2019) (n=51). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

CCEIS = Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services; CEIS = Coordinated Early Intervening Services; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question C9).

2.5.3. Behavioral policies and supports: Supports provided

Table 2.5.3.1. Strategies, programs, or curricula districts recommend to support positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Mental health specialists to work with children needing individualized support	53	2.8
Early warning indicator systems	16	2.1
Trauma-informed curriculum	34	2.7
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support	67	2.8
Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports	63	2.8
Applied behavior analysis, including Pivotal Response Training and discrete trials	28	2.5
Functional Behavior Assessment and Behavioral Intervention Plans	79	2.3
Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning training modules	6	1.3
Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence	9	1.6
Calm Classroom	8	1.6
First Step to Success	2!	0.7
Incredible Years	2!	0.8
Lions Quest	1!	0.7
Mandt System	6	1.4
Positive Action	10	1.7
Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies	3	0.9
Second Step	25	2.4
Tools of the Mind	2!	0.7
Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training	55	2.8
Other	18	2.4
Number of district responses	**438**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question J1).

Table 2.5.3.1a. Strategies, programs, or curricula districts recommend to support positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of school-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Mental health specialists to work with children needing individualized support	53	2.8	55	3.1	42*	5.9
Early warning indicator systems	16	2.1	17	2.3	11!	3.5
Trauma-informed curriculum	34	2.7	34	3.0	32	5.6
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support	67	2.8	67	3.1	68	5.6
Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports	63	2.8	64	3.1	57	6.0
Applied behavior analysis, including Pivotal Response Training and discrete trials	28	2.5	31	2.8	14!*	4.1
Functional Behavior Assessment and Behavioral Intervention Plans	79	2.3	82	2.4	61*	5.9
Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning training modules	6	1.3	6	1.5	.	.
Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence	9	1.6	10	1.8	.	.
Calm Classroom	8	1.6	8	1.7	10!	3.9
First Step to Success	2!	0.7	2!	0.8	0*	.
Incredible Years	2!	0.8	2!	0.9	0*	.
Lions Quest	1!	0.7	2!	0.8	0*	.
Mandt System	6	1.4	6	1.5	8!	3.5
Positive Action	10	1.7	10	1.9	9!	3.1
Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies	3	0.9	4	1.0	0*	.
Second Step	25	2.4	28	2.7	10!*	3.4
Tools of the Mind	2!	0.7	2!	0.8	.	.
Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training	55	2.8	58	3.1	41*	5.9
Other	18	2.4	18	2.6	17	4.5
Number of district responses	**438**		**334**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question J1).

Table 2.5.3.1b. Strategies, programs, or curricula districts recommend to support positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of school-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Mental health specialists to work with children needing individualized support	53	2.8	60	4.1	48*	4.0
Early warning indicator systems	16	2.1	22	3.5	10*	2.4
Trauma-informed curriculum	34	2.7	39	4.0	29	3.6
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support	67	2.8	71	3.9	64	3.9
Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports	63	2.8	66	4.3	61	3.9
Applied behavior analysis, including Pivotal Response Training and discrete trials	28	2.5	36	3.9	22*	3.2
Functional Behavior Assessment and Behavioral Intervention Plans	79	2.3	89	2.6	71*	3.5
Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning training modules	6	1.3	8	2.3	4!	1.4
Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence	9	1.6	11	2.6	7	2.0
Calm Classroom	8	1.6	8	2.3	8	2.1
First Step to Success	2!	0.7	.	.	.	.
Incredible Years	2!	0.8	.	.	.	.
Lions Quest	1!	0.7	.	.	.	.
Mandt System	6	1.4	5!	1.7	8	2.0
Positive Action	10	1.7	8	2.3	11	2.5
Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies	3	0.9	5	1.4	2!	1.1
Second Step	25	2.4	34	3.9	17*	2.8
Tools of the Mind	2!	0.7	.	.	.	.
Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training	55	2.8	62	4.1	49*	3.9
Other	18	2.4	22	3.8	15	2.8
Number of district responses	**438**		**216**		**222**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question J1).

Table 2.5.3.1c. Strategies, programs, or curricula districts recommend to support positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Mental health specialists to work with children needing individualized support	53	2.8	52	4.7	54	3.4
Early warning indicator systems	16	2.1	20	4.0	14	2.4
Trauma-informed curriculum	34	2.7	36	5.5	33	3.1
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support	67	2.8	74	5.0	65	3.4
Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports	63	2.8	58	5.1	65	3.4
Applied behavior analysis, including Pivotal Response Training and discrete trials	28	2.5	31	4.0	27	3.1
Functional Behavior Assessment and Behavioral Intervention Plans	79	2.3	79	3.8	79	2.8
Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning training modules	6	1.3	6!	2.5	6	1.5
Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence	9	1.6	10!	3.0	8	1.9
Calm Classroom	8	1.6	11!	3.4	7	1.7
First Step to Success	2!	0.7	.	.	2!	0.9
Incredible Years	2!	0.8	.	.	2!	1.0
Lions Quest	1!	0.7	.	.	.	.
Mandt System	6	1.4	3!	1.4	7	1.8
Positive Action	10	1.7	12	3.6	9	1.9
Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies	3	0.9	5	1.4	3!	1.1
Second Step	25	2.4	26	4.6	25	2.8
Tools of the Mind	2!	0.7	.	.	2!	0.9
Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training	55	2.8	61	4.3	53	3.4
Other	18	2.4	18	4.2	18	2.8
Number of district responses	**438**		**155**		**283**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question J1).

Table 2.5.3.2. Supports districts provide to teachers who are using positive behavioral development or social-emotional skills curricula with school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Training to learn new curricula (such as workshops, institutes, or online modules)	76	2.5
Ongoing individualized support to classroom teachers (such as consultation, coaching, or mentoring) for implementing curricula or interventions	72	2.6
Ongoing group support (in the form of special education department meetings or community of practice/professional learning communities) for implementing curricula or interventions	62	2.8
Release time to attend conferences and workshops outside of school	76	2.4
Other types of support for implementing curricula	4	1.0
Do not provide support for implementing curricula	3!	1.0
Number of district responses	**438**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question J2).

Table 2.5.3.2a. Supports districts provide to teachers who are using positive behavioral development or social-emotional skills curricula with school-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Training to learn new curricula (such as workshops, institutes, or online modules)	76	2.5	78	2.7	63*	5.8
Ongoing individualized support to classroom teachers (such as consultation, coaching, or mentoring) for implementing curricula or interventions	72	2.6	72	2.9	71	5.5
Ongoing group support (in the form of special education department meetings or community of practice/professional learning communities) for implementing curricula or interventions	62	2.8	63	3.1	50	6.0
Release time to attend conferences and workshops outside of school	76	2.4	80	2.6	54*	6.0
Other types of support for implementing curricula	4	1.0	4	1.1	.	.
Do not provide support for implementing curricula	3!	1.0	3!	1.1	7!	3.2
Number of district responses	**438**		**334**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question J2).

Table 2.5.3.2b. Supports districts provide to teachers who are using positive behavioral development or social-emotional skills curricula with school-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Training to learn new curricula (such as workshops, institutes, or online modules)	76	2.5	82	3.4	72*	3.4
Ongoing individualized support to classroom teachers (such as consultation, coaching, or mentoring) for implementing curricula or interventions	72	2.6	76	3.6	68	3.6
Ongoing group support (in the form of special education department meetings or community of practice/professional learning communities) for implementing curricula or interventions	62	2.8	68	4.0	57*	3.8
Release time to attend conferences and workshops outside of school	76	2.4	84	3.3	70*	3.6
Other types of support for implementing curricula	4	1.0	5!	1.7	2!	1.1
Do not provide support for implementing curricula	3!	1.0	.	.	6!	1.8
Number of district responses	**438**		**216**		**222**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question J2).

Table 2.5.3.2c. Supports districts provide to teachers who are using positive behavioral development or social-emotional skills curricula with school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Training to learn new curricula (such as workshops, institutes, or online modules)	76	2.5	79	4.1	75	3.0
Ongoing individualized support to classroom teachers (such as consultation, coaching, or mentoring) for implementing curricula or interventions	72	2.6	76	4.3	71	3.1
Ongoing group support (in the form of special education department meetings or community of practice/professional learning communities) for implementing curricula or interventions	62	2.8	63	4.9	61	3.4
Release time to attend conferences and workshops outside of school	76	2.4	76	3.6	76	3.0
Other types of support for implementing curricula	4	1.0	5!	2.0	3!	1.1
Do not provide support for implementing curricula	3!	1.0	4!	1.7	3!	1.3
Number of district responses	**438**		**155**		**283**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question J2).

Table 2.5.3.3. Percentage of districts with formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports to school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	36	2.9
Yes	64	2.9
Number of district responses	**436**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question J3).

Table 2.5.3.3a. Percentage of districts with formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports to school-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	36	2.9	32	3.1	66*	5.6
Yes	64	2.9	68	3.1	34*	5.6
Number of district responses	**436**		**332**		**104**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question J3).

Table 2.5.3.3b. Percentage of districts with formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports to school-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	36	2.9	26	3.8	45*	4.0
Yes	64	2.9	74	3.8	55*	4.0
Number of district responses	**436**		**215**		**221**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question J3).

Table 2.5.3.3c. Percentage of districts with formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports to school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	36	2.9	41	5.4	35	3.3
Yes	64	2.9	59	5.4	65	3.3
Number of district responses	**436**		**155**		**281**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question J3).

Table 2.5.3.4. Agencies or entities with which districts have formal agreements to provide direct mental health or social-emotional supports to school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Behavioral/mental health agency	75	3.3
Court system	9	2.3
Developmental disabilities agency	15	2.8
Health agency	22	3.3
Local or state disability advocacy groups	7	2.0
Private therapists or therapy organizations (for example, trauma-informed therapists, applied behavior analysis providers)	42	3.8
Social services	25	3.3
Other	8	2.1
Number of district responses	**278**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported developing formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health and/or social-emotional supports to school-age children with disabilities (n=278). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question J4).

Table 2.5.3.5. Percentage of districts with formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports to preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	62	3.3
Yes	38	3.3
Number of district responses	**318**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H1).

Table 2.5.3.5a. Percentage of districts with formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports to preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	62	3.3	62	3.4	72	13.5
Yes	38	3.3	38	3.4	28!	13.5
Number of district responses	**318**		**294**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H1).

Table 2.5.3.5b. Percentage of districts with formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports to preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	62	3.3	57	4.5	68	4.8
Yes	38	3.3	43	4.5	32	4.8
Number of district responses	**318**		**191**		**127**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H1).

Table 2.5.3.5c. Percentage of districts with formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports to preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	62	3.3	63	6.5	62	3.8
Yes	38	3.3	37	6.5	38	3.8
Number of district responses	**318**		**89**		**229**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H1).

Table 2.5.3.6. Agencies or entities with which districts have formal agreements to provide direct mental health or social-emotional supports to preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Behavioral/mental health agency	67	5.8
Developmental disabilities agency	15	4.0
Early Intervention Part C	23	5.2
Head Start	31	5.5
Health agency	10!	3.5
Local or state disability advocacy groups	7!	3.0
Private therapists or therapy organizations (for example, trauma-informed therapists, applied behavior analysis providers)	28	5.2
Social services	23	4.7
Other	15	4.2
Number of district responses	**121**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported developing formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide mental health and/or social-emotional supports to preschool-age children with disabilities (n=121). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H2).

Table 2.5.3.7. Percentage of districts that recommend programs, practices, or curricula to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district does not recommend any programs, practices, or curricula	27	3.0
The district recommends one specific program, practice, or curriculum	13	2.2
The district recommends several programs, practices, or curricula	60	3.3
Number of district responses	**317**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H3).

Table 2.5.3.7a. Percentage of districts that recommend programs, practices, or curricula to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district does not recommend any programs, practices, or curricula	27	3.0	27	3.1	29!	13.1
The district recommends one specific program, practice, or curriculum	13	2.2	12	2.2	36!	14.9
The district recommends several programs, practices, or curricula	60	3.3	61	3.4	35!	14.8
Number of district responses	**317**		**293**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H3).

Table 2.5.3.7b. Percentage of districts that recommend programs, practices, or curricula to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district does not recommend any programs, practices, or curricula	27	3.0	20	3.6	35*	5.0
The district recommends one specific program, practice, or curriculum	13	2.2	16	3.3	10	2.9
The district recommends several programs, practices, or curricula	60	3.3	64	4.3	55	5.1
Number of district responses	**317**		**191**		**126**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H3).

Table 2.5.3.7c. Percentage of districts that recommend programs, practices, or curricula to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district does not recommend any programs, practices, or curricula	27	3.0	17!	5.2	30	3.6
The district recommends one specific program, practice, or curriculum	13	2.2	18	5.2	12	2.4
The district recommends several programs, practices, or curricula	60	3.3	65	6.6	59	3.8
Number of district responses	**317**		**89**		**228**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H3).

Table 2.5.3.8. Strategies, programs, or curricula districts recommend to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Early childhood mental health specialists to work with children needing individualized support	19	3.1
Early warning indicator systems	8	2.3
Trauma-informed curriculum	35	4.0
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support	53	4.2
Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports	68	3.9
Applied behavior analysis, including Pivotal Response Training and discrete trials	39	3.9
Functional Behavior Assessment and Behavioral Intervention Plans	80	3.3
Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning training modules	15	2.9
Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence	21	3.2
Calm Classroom	7!	2.1
First Step to Success	3!	1.5
Incredible Years	7!	2.3
Lions Quest	.	.
Mandt System	6!	1.9
Positive Action	4!	1.6
Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies	5!	1.8
Second Step	28	3.6
Tools of the Mind	5!	1.9
Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training	53	4.1
Other	20	3.2
Number of district responses	**235**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported recommending the use of any programs, practices, or curricula to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of preschool-age children with disabilities (n=235). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H4).

Table 2.5.3.9. Supports districts provide to teachers who are using positive behavioral development or social-emotional skills curricula with preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Training to learn new curricula (such as workshops, institutes, or online modules)	85	2.8
Ongoing individualized support to classroom teachers (such as consultation, coaching, or mentoring) for implementing curricula or interventions	75	3.6
Ongoing group support (in the form of special education department meetings or community of practice/professional learning communities) for implementing curricula or interventions	62	4.1
Release time to attend conferences and workshops outside of school	74	3.7
Other types of support for implementing curricula	.	.
Do not provide support for implementing curricula	.	.
Number of district responses	**235**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported recommending the use of any programs, practices, or curricula to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of preschool-age children with disabilities (n=235). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question H5).

Table 2.5.3.10. Strategies, programs, or curricula schools use to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of students with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Mental health specialists to work with children needing individualized support	73	2.1
Early warning indicator systems	35	2.4
Trauma-informed curriculum	33	2.2
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support	72	2.0
Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports	75	1.8
Applied behavior analysis, including Pivotal Response Training and discrete trials	24	1.8
Functional Behavior Assessment and Behavioral Intervention Plans	84	1.5
Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning training modules	6	1.0
Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence	11	1.2
Calm Classroom	17	1.9
First Step to Success	2	0.6
Incredible Years	1!	0.4
Lions Quest	1!	0.3
Mandt System	5	0.8
Positive Action	3	0.8
Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies	4	0.8
Second Step	23	2.4
Tools of the Mind	2!	0.6
Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training	54	2.2
Other	15	1.4
Number of school responses	**1,366**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question F1).

Table 2.5.3.10a. Strategies, programs, or curricula schools use to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of students with disabilities, by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Mental health specialists to work with children needing individualized support	73	2.1	73	2.2	72	4.0	66	4.3
Early warning indicator systems	35	2.4	35	2.5	39	4.6	42	4.4
Trauma-informed curriculum	33	2.2	33	2.4	34	3.8	38	4.4
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support	72	2.0	72	2.1	77	4.3	73	3.9
Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports	75	1.8	75	1.9	81	3.5	68	4.2
Applied behavior analysis, including Pivotal Response Training and discrete trials	24	1.8	24	1.9	26	3.9	23	3.8
Functional Behavior Assessment and Behavioral Intervention Plans	84	1.5	84	1.5	82	3.1	79	3.5
Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning training modules	6	1.0	6	1.0	4!	1.4	7!	2.4
Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence	11	1.2	11	1.3	5!*	1.7	15	3.3
Calm Classroom	17	1.9	17	2.0	19	3.4	16	3.0
First Step to Success	2	0.6	2	0.7	3!	1.6	.	.
Incredible Years	1!	0.4	1!	0.5	.	.	.	.
Lions Quest	1!	0.3	1!	0.3	0*	.	.	.
Mandt System	5	0.8	5	0.9	.	.	5!	2.3
Positive Action	3	0.8	3	0.9	.	.	2!	0.7
Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies	4	0.8	4	0.9	.	.	4!	1.8
Second Step	23	2.4	23	2.6	18	3.8	23	3.8
Tools of the Mind	2!	0.6	2!	0.7	.	.	.	.
Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training	54	2.2	54	2.3	50	4.9	59	4.4
Other	15	1.4	15	1.5	24*	4.5	21	3.7
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**977**		**178**		**211**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question F1).

Table 2.5.3.10b. Strategies, programs, or curricula schools use to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of students with disabilities, by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Mental health specialists to work with children needing individualized support	73	2.1	76	3.6	70	2.2
Early warning indicator systems	35	2.4	39	4.3	32	2.2
Trauma-informed curriculum	33	2.2	33	4.2	33	2.2
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support	72	2.0	73	3.5	71	2.1
Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports	75	1.8	74	3.1	76	2.0
Applied behavior analysis, including Pivotal Response Training and discrete trials	24	1.8	26	3.3	23	1.9
Functional Behavior Assessment and Behavioral Intervention Plans	84	1.5	86	2.1	82	1.9
Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning training modules	6	1.0	7	1.7	5	0.9
Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence	11	1.2	11	1.9	11	1.6
Calm Classroom	17	1.9	17	3.3	18	2.0
First Step to Success	2	0.6	1!	0.4	3!	1.1
Incredible Years	1!	0.4	1!	0.4	2!	0.7
Lions Quest	1!	0.3	.	.	1!	0.4
Mandt System	5	0.8	6	1.6	4	0.8
Positive Action	3	0.8	.	.	3	0.7
Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies	4	0.8	4!	1.4	4	0.9
Second Step	23	2.4	23	4.7	23	2.2
Tools of the Mind	2!	0.6	3!	1.3	1!	0.4
Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training	54	2.2	52	3.8	55	2.4
Other	15	1.4	15	2.4	15	1.8
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**656**		**710**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question F1).

Table 2.5.3.10c. Strategies, programs, or curricula schools use to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of students with disabilities, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response category	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Mental health specialists to work with children needing individualized support	73	2.1	70	2.5	77*	2.9
Early warning indicator systems	35	2.4	33	2.4	38	4.3
Trauma-informed curriculum	33	2.2	31	2.2	35	4.1
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support	72	2.0	72	2.5	72	3.1
Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports	75	1.8	75	2.2	76	2.8
Applied behavior analysis, including Pivotal Response Training and discrete trials	24	1.8	23	2.6	26	2.5
Functional Behavior Assessment and Behavioral Intervention Plans	84	1.5	84	1.6	84	2.6
Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning training modules	6	1.0	6	1.0	6	1.8
Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence	11	1.2	10	1.5	11	2.0
Calm Classroom	17	1.9	15	2.1	21	3.2
First Step to Success	2	0.6	3!	1.0	2	0.6
Incredible Years	1!	0.4	1!	0.6	1!	0.6
Lions Quest	1!	0.3	.	.	.	.
Mandt System	5	0.8	5	1.0	4!	1.3
Positive Action	3	0.8	4!	1.4	1!*	0.5
Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies	4	0.8	3	0.8	5!	1.6
Second Step	23	2.4	19	2.3	28	4.5
Tools of the Mind	2!	0.6	.	.	2!	1.0
Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training	54	2.2	53	2.7	55	3.5
Other	15	1.4	14	1.8	17	2.4
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**819**		**526**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for schools eligible for Title I ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question F1).

Table 2.5.3.11. Strategies, programs, or curricula schools use to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of prekindergarten students with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Early childhood mental health specialists to work with children needing individualized support	53	3.0
Early warning indicator systems	34	3.2
Trauma-informed curriculum	29	3.2
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support	54	3.5
Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports	66	3.1
Applied behavior analysis, including Pivotal Response Training and discrete trials	22	2.9
Functional Behavior Assessment and Behavioral Intervention Plans	68	2.9
Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning training modules	7	2.1
Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence	10	2.3
Calm Classroom	10	2.1
First Step to Success	2!	0.8
Incredible Years	2!	0.9
Lions Quest	.	.
Mandt System	3	0.9
Positive Action	3!	1.0
Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies	2!	0.8
Second Step	20	3.2
Tools of the Mind	3!	1.3
Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training	42	3.4
Other	12	1.9
Number of school responses	**514**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering prekindergarten (n=522). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question F2).

Table 2.5.3.12. Percentage of schools that collaborate with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports for students with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
No	22	1.6
Yes	78	1.6
Number of school responses	**1,364**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question F3).

Table 2.5.3.12a. Percentage of schools that collaborate with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports for students with disabilities, by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
No	22	1.6	21	1.7	19	4.0	32*	4.3
Yes	78	1.6	79	1.7	81	4.0	68*	4.3
Number of school responses	**1,364**		**976**		**177**		**211**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question F3).

Table 2.5.3.12b. Percentage of schools that collaborate with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports for students with disabilities, by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
No	22	1.6	22	2.6	22	2.0
Yes	78	1.6	78	2.6	78	2.0
Number of school responses	**1,364**		**656**		**708**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question F3).

Table 2.5.3.12c. Percentage of schools that collaborate with other agencies or entities to provide mental health or social-emotional supports for students with disabilities, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response category	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
No	22	1.6	19	1.9	25*	2.6
Yes	78	1.6	81	1.9	75*	2.6
Number of school responses	**1,364**		**819**		**524**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for schools eligible for Title I ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question F3).

Table 2.5.3.13. Agencies or entities with which schools have collaborated to provide direct mental health or social-emotional supports for students with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Behavioral/mental health agency	85	1.8
Court system	33	2.4
Developmental disabilities agency	20	1.8
Early Intervention Part C	12	1.7
Head Start	26	2.0
Health agency	22	2.0
Local or state disability advocacy groups	22	2.0
Private therapists or therapy organizations (for example, trauma-informed therapists, applied behavior analysis providers)	49	2.3
Social services	59	2.5
Other	6	0.9
Number of school responses	**1,074**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported collaborating with other agencies or entities to provide mental health and/or social-emotional supports for students with disabilities (n=1,074). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question F4).

2.6.1. Evidence from research: Identifying evidence

Table 2.6.1.1. Outcome data state agencies examine for all school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Assessment score	47	8
Assessment type	46	5
Attendance	38	4
Course progress or completion	22	3
Discipline	49	9
Dropout rates	50	9
Functional performance or adaptive behavior	7	4
Grades	12	2
Graduation rates	51	9
Participation in AP or honors courses	23	1
Post-school outcomes (further education, employment)	48	8
Social-emotional skills development	10	3
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Adaptive behavior refers to behavior that enables a person to get along in his or her environment with greatest success and least conflict with others.

AP = Advanced Placement.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H1).

Table 2.6.1.2. Ways in which states measure progress for school-age children with disabilities as part of federal accountability under the Every Student Succeeds Act

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
By percentage of school-age children with disabilities meeting 'proficient' level (minimal or expected proficiency levels for grade)	42	4
By percentage of school-age children with disabilities who moved up to the next level of proficiency from one year to the next	1	0
Other	6	0
Do not have a formal measure	2	5
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question H2).

Table 2.6.1.3a. Sources of information state agencies use when selecting special education policies and practices, by frequency of use (50 states and DC; school-age children)

Response category	Number of state agencies that never use this source or for which this source is not applicable	Number of state agencies that use this source rarely	Number of state agencies that use this source sometimes	Number of state agencies that use this source often	Number of state agencies whose information on this source is unavailable
Information provided by the intervention's developer or vendor	10	12	14	13	2
Recommendations from colleagues in other state education departments	1	1	33	15	1
Information from a federal-funded technical assistance center	1	0	5	45	0
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center	1	5	19	19	7
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory	2	6	28	10	5
Information from the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse	1	4	22	24	0
Information from the state's research/evaluation office	7	2	22	17	3
Information from professional associations	0	2	24	24	1
Information from a college/university researcher	2	5	30	13	1
Information from a research journal	6	6	24	15	0
Social media (Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, other)	29	15	2	0	5
Other	38	0	2	10	0
Number of state responses	**51**				

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question R1).

Table 2.6.1.3b. Sources of information state-level agencies use when selecting special education policies and practices, by frequency of use (entities; school-age children)

Response category	Number of state level agencies that never use this source or for which this source is not applicable	Number of state level agencies that use this source rarely	Number of state level agencies that use this source sometimes	Number of state level agencies that use this source often	Number of state agencies whose information on this source is unavailable
Information provided by the intervention's developer or vendor	3	2	2	2	0
Recommendations from colleagues in other entity education departments	0	1	4	4	0
Information from a federal-funded technical assistance center	0	0	2	7	0
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center	1	0	2	4	2
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory	0	2	3	3	1
Information from the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse	1	2	2	4	0
Information from the entity's research/evaluation office	1	3	4	0	1
Information from professional associations	0	0	4	5	0
Information from a college/university researcher	1	2	2	4	0
Information from a research journal	0	1	7	0	1
Social media (Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, other)	5	2	0	1	1
Other	5	0	2	2	0
Number of entity responses	**9**				

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question R1).

Table 2.6.1.4. Level of evidence state agencies require, as specified in the Every Student Succeeds Act, for evidence-based special education policies, procedures, and practices to be used by school districts in the state (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Tier 1 - Strong Evidence	6	0
Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence	2	1
Tier 3 - Promising Evidence	8	0
Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale	2	0
Not applicable (for example, the state agency requires different levels of evidence for different activities related to special education)	32	6
Number of responses	**50**	**7**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Tier 1 - Strong Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented randomized controlled experimental studies. Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental studies. Tier 3 - Promising Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented correlational studies (with statistical controls for selection bias). Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale: practices that have a well-defined logic model or theory of action, are supported by research, and have some effort underway by a state education agency, local education agency, or outside research organization to determine their effectiveness.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question R2).

Table 2.6.1.5. Outcome data state agencies examine for all preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Attendance	15	6
Discipline	24	3
Functional performance or adaptive behaviors	39	7
Measures of language development	40	8
Measures of self-regulation or behavior	32	6
Measures of social-emotional development	45	8
Measures of performance in academic areas such as reading, math, and science	26	5
Other	2	1
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Adaptive behavior refers to behavior that enables a person to get along in his or her environment with greatest success and least conflict with others.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F1).

Table 2.6.1.6. Number of state agencies that examine outcomes for preschool-age children with disabilities separately based on whether they are taught primarily in inclusive classrooms versus separate classrooms

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	40	7
Yes	8	1
This information is not available	2	1
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F2).

Table 2.6.1.7. Number of states that include prekindergarten assessment data in the K–12 data system

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	34	7
Yes	17	2
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F4).

Table 2.6.1.8. Ways in which state agencies share and receive data from other programs or entities, such as Part B 611, Head Start, or social services

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
There is an integrated, longitudinal data system for storing data	4	1
Separate data systems are linked as needed using a common identifier or other matching process	9	0
Individual-level data from separate data systems are shared but cannot be linked	12	4
Aggregate data from separate data systems are shared	17	2
Other	7	2
Number of responses	**49**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. If data are shared using more than one method, respondents were asked to select the method by which most data are shared.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F5).

Table 2.6.1.9a. Sources of information state agencies use when selecting special education policies and practices, by frequency of use (50 states and DC; preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of state agencies that never use this source or for which this source is not applicable	Number of state agencies that use this source rarely	Number of state agencies that use this source sometimes	Number of state agencies that use this source often	Number of state agencies whose information on this source is unavailable
Information provided by the intervention's developer or vendor	8	7	18	8	9
Recommendations from colleagues in other state education departments	1	0	31	15	3
Information from a federally funded technical assistance center	0	0	7	42	1
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center	1	1	21	12	14
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory	2	11	16	12	9
Information from the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse	0	5	19	20	6
Information from the state's research/evaluation office	3	5	21	10	10
Information from professional associations	1	1	23	21	4
Information from a college/university researcher	2	2	23	16	7
Information from a research journal	2	5	25	12	6
Social media (Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, other)	24	14	3	0	9
Other	46	0	0	4	0
Number of state responses	**50**				

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question P1).

Table 2.6.1.9b. Sources of information state-level agencies use when selecting special education policies and practices, by frequency of use (entities; preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of state level agencies that never use this source or for which this source is not applicable	Number of state level agencies that use this source rarely	Number of state level agencies that use this source sometimes	Number of state level agencies that use this source often	Number of state agencies whose information on this source is unavailable
Information provided by the intervention's developer or vendor	0	1	4	1	3
Recommendations from colleagues in other entity education departments	0	1	6	2	0
Information from a federally funded technical assistance center	0	0	2	7	0
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center	0	1	5	1	2
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory	0	3	3	2	1
Information from the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse	1	1	4	2	1
Information from the entity's research/evaluation office	2	1	4	2	0
Information from professional associations	2	1	2	4	0
Information from a college/university researcher	1	1	2	5	0
Information from a research journal	0	1	6	1	1
Social media (Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, other)	5	0	3	0	1
Other	9	0	0	0	0
Number of entity responses	**9**				

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question P1).

Table 2.6.1.10. Level of evidence state agencies require, as specified in the Every Student Succeeds Act, for evidence-based special education policies, procedures, and practices to be used by school districts in the state (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Tier 1 - Strong Evidence	8	1
Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence	3	0
Tier 3 - Promising Evidence	2	0
Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale	7	0
Not applicable (for example, the state agency requires different levels of evidence for different activities related to special education)	29	7
Number of responses	**49**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Tier 1 – Strong Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented randomized controlled experimental studies. Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental studies. Tier 3 – Promising Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented correlational studies (with statistical controls for selection bias). Tier 4 – Demonstrates a Rationale: practices that have a well-defined logic model or theory of action, are supported by research, and have some effort underway by a state, district, or outside research organization to determine their effectiveness.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question P2).

Table 2.6.1.11a. Sources of information lead agencies use when selecting early intervention policies and practices, by frequency of use (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of lead agencies that never use this source or for which this source is not applicable	Number of lead agencies that use this source rarely	Number of lead agencies that use this source sometimes	Number of lead agencies that use this source often	Number of state agencies whose information on this source is unavailable
Information provided by the intervention's developer or vendor	5	5	19	15	7
Recommendations from colleagues in other state early intervention agencies or education departments	0	3	30	17	1
Information from a federally funded technical assistance center	0	1	4	46	0
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center	10	5	16	4	16
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory	23	10	7	2	9
Information from the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse	8	11	21	6	5
Information from the state's research/evaluation office	18	10	8	9	6
Information from professional associations	1	4	25	20	1
Information from a college/university researcher	1	7	23	18	2
Information from a research journal	3	6	28	12	2
Social media (Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, other)	33	16	2	0	0
Other	38	0	2	8	0
Number of state responses	**51**				

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question M1).

Table 2.6.1.11b. Sources of information lead agencies use when selecting early intervention policies and practices, by frequency of use (entities)

Response category	Number of lead agencies that never use this source or for which this source is not applicable	Number of lead agencies that use this source rarely	Number of lead agencies that use this source sometimes	Number of lead agencies that use this source often	Number of state agencies whose information on this source is unavailable
Information provided by the intervention's developer or vendor	1	0	1	2	2
Recommendations from colleagues in other state-level early intervention agencies or education departments	2	1	0	3	0
Information from a federally funded technical assistance center	0	1	0	5	0
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center	1	1	1	3	0
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory	1	1	2	0	2
Information from the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse	1	0	2	0	3
Information from the entity's research/evaluation office	1	2	1	1	1
Information from professional associations	0	1	1	3	1
Information from a college/university researcher	2	0	2	1	1
Information from a research journal	0	2	1	2	1
Social media (Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, other)	2	1	2	1	0
Other	5	0	0	1	0
Number of entity responses	**6**				

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (n=6). Surveys were sent to six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question M1).

Table 2.6.1.12. Sources of information districts use when selecting special education policies and practices, by frequency of use

Response category	Percentage of districts that never use this source or for which this source is not applicable	Percentage of districts that use this source rarely	Percentage of districts that use this source sometimes	Percentage of districts that use this source often	Percentage of districts that don t know whether they use this source
Guidance or advice from the state education department or a technical assistance center funded by the state (SE)	2! (0.9)	7 (1.6)	27 (2.5)	55 (2.9)	9 (1.7)
A list of vendors approved by the state (SE)	9 (1.7)	11 (1.9)	42 (2.8)	23 (2.4)	14 (2.0)
Information provided by the intervention's developer or vendor (SE)	10 (1.7)	15 (2.1)	47 (2.9)	14 (2.0)	14 (2.1)
Recommendations from colleagues in own or other school districts (SE)	.	3! (1.0)	44 (2.9)	45 (3.0)	7 (1.5)
Information from a federally funded technical assistance center (SE)	18 (2.2)	16 (2.1)	34 (2.8)	9 (1.6)	24 (2.6)
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center (SE)	19 (2.3)	18 (2.3)	30 (2.6)	6 (1.7)	26 (2.6)
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory (SE)	22 (2.5)	17 (2.1)	26 (2.4)	6 (1.6)	29 (2.6)
Information from the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse (SE)	13 (1.9)	12 (1.9)	32 (2.7)	23 (2.4)	19 (2.4)
Information from the district's research/evaluation office (SE)	37 (2.9)	6 (1.4)	23 (2.4)	16 (2.2)	17 (2.2)
Information from professional associations (SE)	4! (1.1)	6 (1.3)	47 (2.9)	35 (2.7)	9 (1.7)
Information from a college/university researcher (SE)	13 (2.0)	22 (2.4)	39 (2.8)	10 (1.7)	15 (2.1)
Information from a research journal (SE)	9 (1.7)	20 (2.3)	45 (2.9)	14 (2.0)	12 (1.9)
Social media (Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, other) (SE)	44 (2.8)	23 (2.4)	16 (2.2)	4! (1.4)	13 (1.9)
Number of district responses	**437**				

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question M3).

Table 2.6.1.13. Percentage of districts that collect data to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities, beyond early childhood data that states must report to the Office of Special Education Programs

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district only collects the data it needs to report to the Office of Special Education Programs	34	3.2
The district collects data to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities	66	3.2
Number of district responses	**316**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D1).

Table 2.6.1.13a. Percentage of districts that collect data to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities, beyond early childhood data that states must report to the Office of Special Education Programs, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district only collects the data it needs to report to the Office of Special Education Programs	34	3.2	34	3.3	47!	15.4
The district collects data to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities	66	3.2	66	3.3	53	15.4
Number of district responses	**316**		**292**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D1).

Table 2.6.1.13b. Percentage of districts that collect data to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities, beyond early childhood data that states must report to the Office of Special Education Programs, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district only collects the data it needs to report to the Office of Special Education Programs	34	3.2	35	4.2	34	4.9
The district collects data to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities	66	3.2	65	4.2	66	4.9
Number of district responses	**316**		**191**		**125**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D1).

Table 2.6.1.13c. Percentage of districts that collect data to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities, beyond early childhood data that states must report to the Office of Special Education Programs, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
The district only collects the data it needs to report to the Office of Special Education Programs	34	3.2	36	6.1	34	3.7
The district collects data to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities	66	3.2	64	6.1	66	3.7
Number of district responses	**316**		**87**		**229**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D1).

Table 2.6.1.14. Staff who examine outcome data to inform targeted assistance districts provide to preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
District level staff	75	3.7
Preschool staff	77	3.5
Other regional staff	14	3.1
Other	12	2.9
The district does not use assessment data to inform targeted assistance	.	.
Number of district responses	**210**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported collecting data to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities, beyond the early childhood data that states need to report to the Office of Special Education Programs (n=210). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D3).

Table 2.6.1.15. Percentage of districts that examine outcomes for preschool-age children with disabilities separately based on whether they are taught primarily in inclusive classrooms versus separate classrooms

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	63	3.9
Yes	28	3.7
Don't know	9	2.2
Number of district responses	**209**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported collecting data to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities, beyond the early childhood data that states need to report to the Office of Special Education Programs (n=210). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D4).

Table 2.6.1.16. Percentage of districts that provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools and early childhood programs should use to provide services to preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	24	2.9
Yes	76	2.9
Number of district responses	**318**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question K1).

Table 2.6.1.16a. Percentage of districts that provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools and early childhood programs should use to provide services to preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	24	2.9	23	3.0	49!	15.3
Yes	76	2.9	77	3.0	51!	15.3
Number of district responses	**318**		**294**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question K1).

Table 2.6.1.16b. Percentage of districts that provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools and early childhood programs should use to provide services to preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	24	2.9	20	3.5	29	4.8
Yes	76	2.9	80	3.5	71	4.8
Number of district responses	**318**		**191**		**127**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question K1).

Table 2.6.1.16c. Percentage of districts that provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools and early childhood programs should use to provide services to preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	24	2.9	28	6.0	23	3.3
Yes	76	2.9	72	6.0	77	3.3
Number of district responses	**318**		**89**		**229**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question K1).

Table 2.6.1.17. Outcome data schools examine for students with and without disabilities

Response category	Percentage of schools that examine for students with disabilities	Percentage of schools that examine for students without disabilities
Assessment scores (SE)	100 (0.1)	98 (0.5)
Attendance (SE)	99 (0.2)	97 (0.7)
Course progress or completion (SE)	99 (0.5)	97 (0.6)
Disciplinary actions (SE)	99 (0.4)	98 (0.4)
Grades (SE)	98 (0.6)	97 (0.5)
Functional performance/adaptive behavior (SE)	100 (0.1)	57 (1.9)
Social-emotional skills development/behavior (SE)	100 (0.2)	83 (1.6)
Dropout rates (SE)	99 (0.5)	97 (1.1)
Graduation rates (SE)	100 (0.3)	99 (0.6)
Participation in AP or Honors courses (SE)	82 (2.8)	97 (1.1)
Post-school outcomes (further education, employment) (SE)	99 (0.6)	82 (2.4)
Number of school responses	**1,366**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Only respondents whose schools offer 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade were asked to address dropout rates, graduation rates, participation in Advanced Placement or honors courses, and post-school outcomes (n=454). Adaptive behavior is behavior that enables a person to get along in his or her environment with the greatest success and least conflict with others. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

AP = Advanced Placement; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question C6).

Table 2.6.1.18. Sources of information schools use when selecting special education policies and practices, by frequency of use

Response category	Percentage of schools that never use this source or for which this source is not applicable	Percentage of schools that use this source rarely	Percentage of schools that use this source sometimes	Percentage of schools that use this source often	Percentage of schools that don t know whether they use this source
Guidance or advice from the state education department or a technical assistance center funded by the state (SE)	7 (1.1)	9 (1.0)	29 (1.9)	41 (2.0)	14 (1.3)
A list of vendors approved by the state (SE)	16 (1.6)	16 (1.5)	26 (2.0)	16 (1.8)	26 (1.8)
Information provided by the intervention's developer or vendor (SE)	16 (1.6)	17 (1.6)	33 (2.0)	11 (1.1)	24 (1.6)
Recommendations from colleagues in own or other school districts (SE)	5 (0.9)	5 (0.8)	35 (1.8)	48 (2.0)	6 (0.9)
Information from a federally funded technical assistance center (SE)	21 (1.8)	21 (2.2)	23 (1.9)	8 (1.3)	28 (1.9)
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center (SE)	26 (1.9)	19 (1.6)	17 (1.6)	7 (1.1)	32 (1.9)
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory (SE)	30 (2.0)	18 (1.7)	12 (1.5)	3 (0.5)	37 (1.9)
Information from the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse (SE)	26 (1.8)	15 (1.7)	22 (1.7)	6 (1.0)	31 (1.9)
Information from the district's research/evaluation office (SE)	25 (1.9)	6 (0.8)	21 (1.7)	32 (2.3)	16 (1.5)
Information from professional associations (SE)	10 (1.4)	8 (0.9)	44 (2.1)	22 (1.7)	16 (1.4)
Information from a college/university researcher (SE)	21 (1.6)	21 (1.6)	28 (1.8)	8 (1.2)	21 (1.4)
Information from a research journal (SE)	15 (1.5)	22 (1.9)	37 (2.0)	7 (1.0)	19 (1.3)
Social media (Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, other) (SE)	38 (2.1)	21 (1.7)	19 (1.5)	3 (0.5)	19 (1.5)
Other (SE)	94 (0.9)	.	1! (0.3)	6 (0.9)	.
Number of school responses	**1,365**				

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question H1).

2.6.2. Evidence from research: Supporting use of evidence

Table 2.6.2.1. Actions state agencies take to support or ensure school districts use evidence-based special education policies, procedures, and practices (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Share an approved list of evidence-based programs, interventions, and practices with districts	21	3
Provide training and technical assistance to districts on implementing evidence-based practices	44	8
Use a checklist to observe districts to assess the use of a particular required evidence-based practice, or to review videos submitted to state	9	2
Provide a checklist to districts to support their assessment of the use of a particular required evidence-based practice	19	3
Conduct focus groups or surveys with parents/guardians to assess the extent to which evidence-based practices are being used	4	2
Conduct focus groups or surveys with district staff to assess the extent to which evidence-based practices are being used	8	1
Develop online modules or other materials to assist districts in identifying and selecting evidence-based programs, interventions, and/or practices	25	0
Use existing online modules or other materials to assist districts in identifying and selecting evidence-based programs, interventions, and/or practices	23	2
Have districts complete self-assessments on practices	26	3
Other	2	0
The state agency does not take particular steps to ensure that districts use evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices	3	1
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question R3).

Table 2.6.2.2. Strategies state agencies use to implement or scale up the evidence-based practices identified in their State Systemic Improvement Plans for Part B 611

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Provide online training (including single or modular courses) to support local implementation	26	6
Encourage district and local staff participation in federal model programs (for example, the Pyramid Model)	22	1
Support district and local staff participation in federal model programs (for example, the Pyramid Model)	25	1
Pilot implementation of the practice(s) in select districts in order to prepare for more widespread implementation	39	6
Disseminate written materials to practitioners to provide training or information to support local implementation	37	5
Disseminate written materials that provide training or information to support local implementation	41	6
Host informational webinars to support local implementation	24	2
Provide coaches to support local implementation	37	6
Support communities of practice	29	3
Some other strategy	4	0
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question R4).

Table 2.6.2.3. Status of state agency efforts in implementing or scaling up evidence-based practices identified in State Systemic Improvement Plans for Part B (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
In the early planning stages	1	1
Developing materials but have not put any practices in place yet	0	0
Have begun implementation but at a small scale	10	3
Have expanded beyond an initial phase to reach more districts	21	0
Have scaled up or implemented statewide	9	3
Different practices are in different stages of implementation	9	2
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question R5).

Table 2.6.2.4. Actions state agencies take in response to examination of outcome data for preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Provided data analysis (for example, reports) for local use	40	8
Provided training and support to local programs on how to analyze and use their data	35	4
Provided individualized training and support to local programs based on their data	24	4
Developed written procedures and guidance in response to findings from the data	19	2
Coordinated with State Part C colleagues to review findings and discuss an appropriate course of action	18	2
Coordinated with State Part B colleagues to review findings and discuss an appropriate course of action	25	4
Provided parents/guardians with materials, training, or other resources	11	4
Other	5	2
Not applicable	4	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question F3).

Table 2.6.2.5. Actions state agencies take to support or ensure school districts use evidence-based special education policies, procedures, and practices (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Share an approved list of evidence-based programs, interventions, and practices with districts	15	3
Provide training and technical assistance to districts on implementing evidence-based practices	41	5
Use a checklist to observe districts to assess the use of a particular required evidence-based practice, or to review videos submitted to state	11	1
Provide a checklist to districts to support their assessment of the use of a particular required evidence-based practice	13	0
Conduct focus groups or surveys with parents/guardians to assess the extent to which evidence-based practices are being used	3	1
Conduct focus groups or surveys with district staff to assess the extent to which evidence-based practices are being used	7	1
Develop online modules or other materials to assist districts in identifying and selecting evidence-based programs, interventions, and/or practices	20	0
Use existing online modules or other materials to assist districts in identifying and selecting evidence-based programs, interventions, and/or practices	21	1
Have districts complete self-assessments on practices	20	1
Other	3	1
The state agency does not take particular steps to ensure that districts use evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices	4	1
Number of responses	**50**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question P3).

Table 2.6.2.6. Strategies state agencies use to implement or scale up the evidence-based practices identified in their State Systemic Improvement Plans for the Part B 619 preschool-age special education program

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Provide online training (including single or modular courses) to support local implementation	26	3
Encourage district and local staff participation in federal model programs (for example, the Pyramid Model)	26	4
Support district and local staff participation in federal model programs (for example, the Pyramid Model)	24	1
Pilot implementation of the practice(s) in select districts in order to prepare for more widespread implementation	23	4
Disseminate information to parents/guardians to inform them of the scale-up plans	8	2
Disseminate written materials that provide training or information to support local implementation	25	3
Host informational webinars to support local implementation	16	1
Provide coaches to support local implementation	24	2
Support communities of practice	22	1
Some other strategy	9	1
Number of responses	**49**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question P4).

Table 2.6.2.7. Status of state agency efforts in implementing or scaling up evidence-based practices identified in State Systemic Improvement Plans for Part B (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
In the early planning stages	2	2
Developing materials but have not put any practices in place yet	1	0
Have begun implementation but at a small scale	9	2
Have expanded beyond an initial phase to reach more parts of the state	19	1
Have scaled up or implemented statewide	7	2
Different practices are in different stages of implementation	10	2
Number of responses	**48**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question P5).

Table 2.6.2.8. Factors by which lead agencies examine child outcome data collected under State Performance Plans/Annual Performance Reports Part C Indicator 3

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Demographic characteristics	39	4
Setting in which services are provided (for example, home, child care, community setting)	20	4
Service provider (for example, particular agency, type of staff)	25	4
Services received (for example, speech and language therapy; physical or occupational therapy; psychological services; home visits; medical, nursing, or nutrition services; hearing or vision services; social work services; transportation)	11	5
Reason for early intervention services (for example, due to developmental delay or due to a specific health condition that could lead to a delay)	25	5
None of the above	8	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. States receiving funds to implement the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) must develop a State Performance Plan that describes their efforts to meet the requirements and purposes of IDEA, as well as an Annual Performance Report that reports on their performance. Indicator 3 measures the percentage of infants and toddlers with Individualized Family Service Plans who demonstrate improved a) positive social-emotional skills, b) acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and c) use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question F1).

Table 2.6.2.9. Actions lead agencies undertake for infants and toddlers with disabilities in response to examination of outcome data from State Performance Plans/Annual Performance Reports Part C Indicator 3

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Provide data analysis (for example, reports) for local use	46	4
Provide training and support to local providers on how to analyze and use their data	35	4
Provide individualized training and support to local providers based on results of the data analysis	30	4
Develop written procedures and guidance in response to findings from the data	24	3
Coordinate with state Part B colleagues to review findings and discuss an appropriate course of action	13	2
Provide families with materials, training, or other resources	14	2
Other	6	0
Not applicable	2	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. States receiving funds to implement the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) must develop a State Performance Plan that describes their efforts to meet the requirements and purposes of IDEA, as well as an Annual Performance Report that reports on their performance. Indicator 3 measures the percentage of infants and toddlers with Individualized Family Service Plans who demonstrate improved a) positive social-emotional skills, b) acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and c) use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question F2).

Table 2.6.2.10. Actions lead agencies take to support or ensure local early intervention programs use evidence-based early intervention policies, procedures, and practices

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Share an approved list of evidence-based programs, interventions, and practices with providers	19	2
Provide training and technical assistance to providers on implementing evidence-based practices	50	5
Use a checklist to observe providers to assess the use of a particular required evidence-based practice, or to review videos submitted to state	26	3
Provide a checklist to providers to support their assessment of the use of a particular required evidence-based practice	28	2
Conduct focus groups or surveys with families in order to assess the extent to which evidence-based practices are being used	8	3
Conduct focus groups or surveys with providers in order to assess the extent to which evidence-based practices are being used	15	2
Develop online modules or other materials to assist programs/agencies in identifying and selecting evidence-based programs, interventions, and/or practices	29	0
Use existing online modules or other materials to assist programs/agencies in identifying and selecting evidence-based programs, interventions, and/or practices	32	4
Have providers complete self-assessments on practices	27	3
Other	6	0
The state does not take particular steps to ensure that local early intervention providers use evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices	0	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question M2).

Table 2.6.2.11. Strategies lead agencies use to implement or scale up the evidence-based practices identified in their State Systemic Improvement Plans for Part C

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Provide online training (including single or modular courses) to support local implementation	36	2
Encourage local staff participation in federal model programs (for example, the Pyramid Model)	24	1
Support local staff participation in federal model programs (for example, the Pyramid Model)	24	1
Pilot implementation of the practice(s) in order to prepare for more widespread implementation	40	3
Disseminate information to parents/guardians to inform them of scale-up plans	14	1
Disseminate written materials that provide training or information to support local implementation	36	4
Host informational webinars to support local implementation	27	1
Provide coaches to support local implementation	30	3
Support communities of practice	33	1
Other	8	1
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question M3).

Table 2.6.2.12. Status of lead agency efforts in implementing or scaling up evidence-based practices identified in State Systemic Improvement Plans

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
In the early planning stages	1	2
Developing materials but have not put any practices in place yet	0	1
Have begun implementation but at a small scale	10	1
Have expanded beyond an initial phase to reach more parts of the state	12	1
Have scaled up or implemented statewide	14	0
Different practices are in different stages of implementation	14	1
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question M4).

Table 2.6.2.13. Targeted assistance, based on student outcome data, districts provide to some or all schools that serve children with Individualized Education Programs

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Provide additional staff to schools	45	3.0
Provide additional professional development to school staff	75	2.8
Provide resources to help schools increase progress monitoring of students with disabilities	56	3.0
Provide resources to help schools make curriculum adaptations	54	3.1
Provide resources to help schools implement programs and interventions	77	2.5
Number of district responses	**417**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E6).

Table 2.6.2.13a. Targeted assistance, based on student outcome data, districts provide to some or all schools that serve children with Individualized Education Programs, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Provide additional staff to schools	45	3.0	46	3.3	45	6.4
Provide additional professional development to school staff	75	2.8	75	3.1	75	5.4
Provide resources to help schools increase progress monitoring of students with disabilities	56	3.0	56	3.4	54	6.4
Provide resources to help schools make curriculum adaptations	54	3.1	53	3.5	58	6.4
Provide resources to help schools implement programs and interventions	77	2.5	79	2.7	67	6.2
Number of district responses	**417**		**320**		**97**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E6).

Table 2.6.2.13b. Targeted assistance, based on student outcome data, districts provide to some or all schools that serve children with Individualized Education Programs, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Provide additional staff to schools	45	3.0	53	4.5	39*	4.0
Provide additional professional development to school staff	75	2.8	75	4.0	75	3.8
Provide resources to help schools increase progress monitoring of students with disabilities	56	3.0	55	4.5	56	4.2
Provide resources to help schools make curriculum adaptations	54	3.1	54	4.5	53	4.2
Provide resources to help schools implement programs and interventions	77	2.5	84	3.2	71*	3.7
Number of district responses	**417**		**210**		**207**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E6).

Table 2.6.2.13c. Targeted assistance, based on student outcome data, districts provide to some or all schools that serve children with Individualized Education Programs, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Provide additional staff to schools	45	3.0	50	5.5	44	3.5
Provide additional professional development to school staff	75	2.8	74	5.5	75	3.2
Provide resources to help schools increase progress monitoring of students with disabilities	56	3.0	51	5.3	58	3.7
Provide resources to help schools make curriculum adaptations	54	3.1	55	5.8	53	3.7
Provide resources to help schools implement programs and interventions	77	2.5	75	4.6	78	2.9
Number of district responses	**417**		**147**		**270**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E6).

Table 2.6.2.14. Components of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support that districts implement or have challenges implementing when serving school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts that implement this component	Percentage of districts that have challenges implementing this component	Percentage of districts that do not implement this component
Universal screening (SE)	69 (2.8)	22 (2.3)	13 (2.1)
Data-driven decision making (SE)	70 (2.6)	29 (2.6)	6 (1.6)
Progress monitoring (SE)	72 (2.6)	29 (2.6)	4 (1.2)
Evidence-based instruction and supplemental support (SE)	68 (2.7)	34 (2.8)	5! (1.5)
Number of district responses	**438**		

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question E7).

Table 2.6.2.15. Percentage of districts that provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools should use to provide services to students with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	18	2.3
Yes	82	2.3
Number of district responses	**437**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question M1).

Table 2.6.2.15a. Percentage of districts that provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools should use to provide services to students with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	18	2.3	18	2.5	16	4.4
Yes	82	2.3	82	2.5	84	4.4
Number of district responses	**437**		**333**		**104**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question M1).

Table 2.6.2.15b. Percentage of districts that provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools should use to provide services to students with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	18	2.3	16	3.2	20	3.2
Yes	82	2.3	84	3.2	80	3.2
Number of district responses	**437**		**216**		**221**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question M1).

Table 2.6.2.15c. Percentage of districts that provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools should use to provide services to students with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	18	2.3	12	3.3	20	2.8
Yes	82	2.3	88	3.3	80	2.8
Number of district responses	**437**		**155**		**282**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question M1).

Table 2.6.2.16. Ways in which districts help ensure schools use evidence-based special education programs and services

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Provide a curated list of suggested evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices	36	3.1
Require that schools only purchase materials and programs from a curated list of suggested evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices	26	2.7
Conduct a formal review of the materials and programs used by schools to make sure they are evidence-based	39	3.2
Recommend materials based on the level of evidence of their effectiveness (Tier 1 to Tier 4, under ESSA), specifically for children with disabilities	58	3.1
Other	7	1.8
Number of district responses	**359**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported providing guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools should use to provide services to students with disabilities (n=362). Tier 1 - Strong Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented randomized controlled experimental studies. Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental studies. Tier 3 - Promising Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented correlational studies (with statistical controls for selection bias). Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale: practices that have a well-defined logic model or theory of action, are supported by research, and have some effort underway by a state education agency, local education agency, or outside research organization to determine their effectiveness. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

ESSA = Every Student Succeeds Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question M2).

Table 2.6.2.17. Targeted assistance, based on data collected to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities, that districts offer to some or all preschools that serve children with Individualized Education Programs

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Provide additional staff to preschools	52	4.2
Provide additional professional development to preschool staff	66	4.0
Provide resources to help preschools increase progress monitoring of preschool-age children with disabilities	53	4.4
Provide resources to help preschools make curriculum adaptations	59	4.3
Provide resources to help preschools implement programs and interventions	75	3.7
Number of district responses	**205**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported collecting data to monitor outcomes for all preschool-age children with disabilities, beyond the early childhood data that states need to report to the Office of Special Education Programs (n=210). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question D2).

Table 2.6.2.18. Ways in which districts help ensure schools and early childhood programs use evidence-based special education programs and services

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Provide a curated list of suggested evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices	32	3.6
Require that schools and early childhood programs only purchase materials and programs from a curated list of suggested evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices	28	3.5
Conduct a formal review of the materials and programs used by schools and early childhood programs to make sure they are evidence-based	39	3.7
Recommend materials based on the level of evidence of their effectiveness (Tier 1 to Tier 4, under ESSA), specifically for preschool-age children with disabilities	42	3.9
Other	12	2.4
Number of district responses	**243**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported providing guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools and early childhood programs should use to provide services to preschool-age children with disabilities (n=248). Tier 1 - Strong Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented randomized controlled experimental studies. Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental studies. Tier 3 - Promising Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented correlational studies (with statistical controls for selection bias). Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale: practices that have a well-defined logic model or theory of action, are supported by research, and have some effort underway by a state education agency, local education agency, or outside research organization to determine their effectiveness. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

ESSA = Every Student Succeeds Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question K2).

Table 2.6.2.19. Sources of information districts use when selecting early childhood special education policies and practices, by frequency of use

Response category	Percentage of districts that never use this source or for which this source is not applicable	Percentage of districts that use this source rarely	Percentage of districts that use this source sometimes	Percentage of districts that use this source often	Percentage of districts that don t know whether they use this source
Guidance or advice from the state education department or a technical assistance center funded by the state (SE)	5! (1.4)	7 (1.7)	31 (3.1)	45 (3.3)	12 (2.3)
A list of vendors approved by the state (SE)	16 (2.6)	12 (2.2)	31 (3.1)	21 (2.8)	20 (2.7)
Information provided by the intervention's developer or vendor (SE)	13 (2.3)	13 (2.2)	43 (3.3)	12 (2.2)	18 (2.6)
Recommendations from colleagues in own or other school districts (SE)	3! (1.4)	2! (0.9)	42 (3.4)	45 (3.3)	7 (1.7)
Information from a federally funded technical assistance center (SE)	19 (2.7)	17 (2.6)	24 (2.8)	13 (2.3)	27 (3.0)
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center (SE)	23 (2.9)	16 (2.5)	23 (2.8)	8 (1.8)	30 (3.2)
Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory (SE)	24 (2.9)	17 (2.5)	21 (2.9)	7 (1.7)	31 (3.1)
Information from the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse (SE)	15 (2.4)	11 (2.2)	32 (3.2)	18 (2.6)	23 (2.9)
Information from the district's research/evaluation office (SE)	43 (3.4)	4! (1.2)	25 (2.9)	14 (2.3)	15 (2.4)
Information from professional associations (SE)	4! (1.6)	5 (1.5)	47 (3.4)	32 (3.2)	12 (2.2)
Information from a college/university researcher (SE)	19 (2.8)	18 (2.5)	35 (3.2)	9 (1.9)	19 (2.7)
Information from a research journal (SE)	11 (2.2)	16 (2.5)	43 (3.4)	11 (2.1)	19 (2.6)
Social media (Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, other) (SE)	42 (3.3)	20 (2.7)	17 (2.5)	4! (1.4)	16 (2.5)
Other (SE)	79 (2.8)	.	3! (1.3)	17 (2.6)	.
Number of district responses	**318**				

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question K3).

Table 2.6.2.20. Ways in which schools ensure staff are using evidence-based practices in providing special education and related services

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Observations or videos of staff	79	1.8
Parent reports	29	1.8
Review of IEPs	85	1.5
Review of written materials such as lesson plans	65	2.0
Help from outside consultants or coaches	39	2.0
Teacher self-assessments of use of evidence-based practices	48	2.4
Other	5	0.9
None of the above	1	0.3
Number of school responses	**1,366**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question H2).

Table 2.6.2.20a. Ways in which schools ensure staff are using evidence-based practices in providing special education and related services, by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Observations or videos of staff	79	1.8	79	1.9	77	3.8	85	3.0
Parent reports	29	1.8	29	1.9	25	3.6	31	4.0
Review of IEPs	85	1.5	85	1.6	86	3.4	86	3.2
Review of written materials such as lesson plans	65	2.0	65	2.1	62	4.3	67	4.1
Help from outside consultants or coaches	39	2.0	39	2.1	36	5.0	44	4.4
Teacher self-assessments of use of evidence-based practices	48	2.4	48	2.5	45	4.6	51	4.4
Other	5	0.9	5	0.9	3!	1.1	7!	2.2
None of the above	1	0.3	1	0.3	.	.	.	.
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**977**		**178**		**211**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question H2).

Table 2.6.2.20b. Ways in which schools ensure staff are using evidence-based practices in providing special education and related services, by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Observations or videos of staff	79	1.8	78	3.3	80	1.9
Parent reports	29	1.8	26	3.1	31	2.1
Review of IEPs	85	1.5	84	2.6	86	1.7
Review of written materials such as lesson plans	65	2.0	67	3.4	63	2.3
Help from outside consultants or coaches	39	2.0	37	3.4	40	2.3
Teacher self-assessments of use of evidence-based practices	48	2.4	47	4.3	49	2.4
Other	5	0.9	4!	1.4	6	1.1
None of the above	1	0.3	1!	0.5	1	0.4
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**656**		**710**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question H2).

Table 2.6.2.20c. Ways in which schools ensure staff are using evidence-based practices in providing special education and related services, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response category	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Observations or videos of staff	79	1.8	80	2.4	78	2.6
Parent reports	29	1.8	28	2.2	30	3.0
Review of IEPs	85	1.5	83	2.0	87	2.2
Review of written materials such as lesson plans	65	2.0	66	2.5	64	3.5
Help from outside consultants or coaches	39	2.0	36	2.5	43	3.2
Teacher self-assessments of use of evidence-based practices	48	2.4	43	2.6	55*	3.9
Other	5	0.9	5	1.1	4!	1.4
None of the above	1	0.3	2!	0.5	1!	0.3
Number of school responses	**1,366**		**819**		**526**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for schools eligible for Title I ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question H2).

2.7.1. Funding allocation: Funding sources

Table 2.7.1.1. State funding sources that support services for school-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of
IDEA, Part B	51	9
State education funds	48	7
Local municipality or county funds	39	1
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	9	0
Medicaid/Title XIX	44	0
Private insurance	14	0
State Children's Health Insurance Program	5	0
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	7	0
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	6	0
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	4	0
Other federal funding sources	2	1
Other state funding sources	6	0
Other local funding sources	0	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question P1).

Table 2.7.1.2. Among states that used each funding source to support services for school-age children with disabilities, number that listed funding source as one of their top three (by share of funding)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
IDEA, Part B	49	9
State education funds	45	7
Local municipality or county funds	33	1
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	1	0
Medicaid/Title XIX	15	0
Private insurance	0	0
State Children's Health Insurance Program	1	0
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	0	0
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	0	0
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	0	0
Other federal funding sources	0	1
Other state funding sources	2	0
Other local funding sources	0	0
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that identified a funding source that supports services for school-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question P1a).

Table 2.7.1.3. State funding sources that support services for preschool-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
IDEA, Part B	51	9
State education funds	44	5
Local municipality or county funds	27	2
Head Start	23	5
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	3	0
Medicaid/Title XIX	37	0
Private insurance	12	0
State Children's Health Insurance Program	9	0
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	5	1
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	8	1
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	6	0
Other federal funding sources	4	1
Other state funding sources	6	0
Other local funding sources	0	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question N1).

Table 2.7.1.4. Among states that used each funding source to support services for preschool-age children with disabilities, number that listed funding source as one of their top three (by share of funding)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
IDEA, Part B	47	9
State education funds	42	4
Local municipality or county funds	21	1
Head Start	3	3
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	0	0
Medicaid/Title XIX	17	0
Private insurance	2	0
State Children's Health Insurance Program	0	0
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	0	0
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	0	0
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	0	0
Other federal funding sources	1	1
Other state funding sources	4	0
Other local funding sources	0	0
Number of responses	**49**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that identified a funding source that supports services for preschool-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question N1a).

Table 2.7.1.5. Items included in state System of Payments policies

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Private insurance only	15	0
Family fees only (for example, sliding fee scale, co-payment, participation fee, cost share)	3	0
Both private insurance and family fees	17	1
None of the above	16	5
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question L1).

Table 2.7.1.6. Lead agency funding sources that support Part C early intervention services, as required by Individualized Family Service Plans

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
IDEA, Part B	10	1
IDEA, Part C (infants and toddlers)	48	6
State early intervention funds	44	2
Local municipality or county funds	15	0
Family fees/co-payments/sliding fee	18	0
Head Start	3	0
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	6	0
Medicaid/Title XIX	48	0
Private insurance	36	0
State Children's Health Insurance Program	26	0
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	2	0
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	4	0
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	18	0
Other federal funding sources	4	1
Other state funding sources	10	0
Other local funding sources	2	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question L2).

Table 2.7.1.7. Among states that used each funding source to support Part C early intervention services, number that listed funding source as one of their top three (by share of funding)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
IDEA, Part B	3	1
IDEA, Part C (infants and toddlers)	38	6
State early intervention funds	41	2
Local municipality or county funds	8	0
Family fees/co-payments/sliding fee	3	0
Head Start	0	0
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	0	0
Medicaid/Title XIX	43	0
Private insurance	6	0
State Children's Health Insurance Program	0	0
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	0	0
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	1	0
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	0	0
Other federal funding sources	1	1
Other state funding sources	8	0
Other local funding sources	0	0
Number of responses	**48**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all lead agencies that identified a funding source that supports Part C early intervention services as required by Individualized Family Service Plans (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question L2a).

Table 2.7.1.8. Steps lead agencies have taken in past three fiscal years to help meet the cost of continued participation in the Part C program

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Reduced provider reimbursements	3	0
Reduced administrative staff at the state level	6	0
Use of data management systems, communication systems, or other technologies to reduce costs	9	0
Changed processes to reduce administrative costs	11	0
Changed eligibility criteria to be more restrictive	1	0
Changed State Medicaid Plan to increase Medicaid coverage for early intervention services	6	0
Changed regulations or legislation to increase private insurance coverage for early intervention services	3	0
Increased state funding for early intervention services	29	0
Increased State Children's Health Insurance Program coverage for early intervention services	1	0
Increased reliance on local municipality or county funds for early intervention services	3	0
Increased reliance on private donations, including money from foundations, United Way, or other fundraising	2	0
Increased use of Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children for early intervention services	0	0
Increased use of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families for early intervention services	1	0
Other	5	1
Not applicable	12	4
Number of responses	**51**	**5**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question L3).

Table 2.7.1.9. District funding sources for services that support school-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
IDEA, Part B	94	1.4
General education funds	86	2.0
Local municipality or county funds	26	2.5
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	4	1.1
Medicaid/Title XIX	47	2.8
Private insurance	5	1.2
State Children's Health Insurance Program	2!	1.0
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	2!	0.7
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	2!	0.8
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	.	.
Other federal funding sources	3!	0.9
Other state funding sources	8	1.5
Other local funding sources	2!	0.8
Number of district responses	**437**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K1).

Table 2.7.1.9a. District funding sources for services that support school-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
IDEA, Part B	94	1.4	94	1.5	92	3.5
General education funds	86	2.0	87	2.1	75*	5.2
Local municipality or county funds	26	2.5	28	2.9	11!*	3.8
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	4	1.1	4	1.2	.	.
Medicaid/Title XIX	47	2.8	52	3.1	15*	4.1
Private insurance	5	1.2	5	1.3	6!	2.8
State Children's Health Insurance Program	2!	1.0	3!	1.1	.	.
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	2!	0.7	2!	0.8	.	.
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	2!	0.8	2!	1.0	0*	.
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	.	.	.	.	.	.
Other federal funding sources	3!	0.9	2!	1.0	.	.
Other state funding sources	8	1.5	7	1.6	8!	3.2
Other local funding sources	2!	0.8	.	.	.	.
Number of district responses	**437**		**333**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K1).

Table 2.7.1.9b. District funding sources for services that support school-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
IDEA, Part B	94	1.4	98	1.0	90*	2.4
General education funds	86	2.0	90	2.5	82*	3.0
Local municipality or county funds	26	2.5	32	4.0	20*	3.3
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	4	1.1	5!	1.8	3!	1.2
Medicaid/Title XIX	47	2.8	57	4.2	39*	3.8
Private insurance	5	1.2	5!	1.8	5!	1.6
State Children's Health Insurance Program	2!	1.0	.	.	.	.
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	2!	0.7	.	.	.	.
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	2!	0.8	.	.	.	.
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	.	.	.	.	.	.
Other federal funding sources	3!	0.9	.	.	3!	1.3
Other state funding sources	8	1.5	9	2.4	6	1.8
Other local funding sources	2!	0.8	.	.	.	.
Number of district responses	**437**		**216**		**221**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K1).

Table 2.7.1.9c. District funding sources for services that support school-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
IDEA, Part B	94	1.4	95	2.0	93	1.7
General education funds	86	2.0	83	3.4	87	2.4
Local municipality or county funds	26	2.5	26	4.7	25	3.0
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	4	1.1	.	.	5!	1.4
Medicaid/Title XIX	47	2.8	37	4.7	51*	3.4
Private insurance	5	1.2	6!	2.2	4!	1.4
State Children's Health Insurance Program	2!	1.0	.	.	3!	1.2
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	2!	0.7	.	.	2!	0.9
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	2!	0.8	.	.	2!	1.1
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	.	.	.	.	.	.
Other federal funding sources	3!	0.9	.	.	3!	1.1
Other state funding sources	8	1.5	12	3.2	6	1.6
Other local funding sources	2!	0.8	.	.	.	.
Number of district responses	**437**		**155**		**282**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K1).

Table 2.7.1.10. Among districts that used each funding source for services that support school-age children with disabilities, percentage of districts that listed funding source as one of their top three (based on share of funding)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
IDEA, Part B	99	0.7
General education funds	97	1.0
Local municipality or county funds	82	4.1
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	34!	10.2
Medicaid/Title XIX	77	3.4
Private insurance	21!	9.8
State Children's Health Insurance Program	.	.
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	.	.
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	.	.
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	.	.
Other federal funding sources	46!	20.1
Other state funding sources	82	9.0
Other local funding sources	74	21.8
Number of district responses	**409**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that identified a funding source that supports services for school-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs (n=434). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K1a).

Table 2.7.1.11. Percentage of district special education funding for school-age children with disabilities provided by various sources

Funding source	Mean	Standard error
Federal Funding Sources	29	1.6
State Funding Sources	35	1.6
Local District Funding Sources	34	1.8
Number of district responses	**371**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Respondents were asked to provide their best estimate. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Differences in the characteristics of responders and the full population of districts do not show evidence of potential nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K9).

Table 2.7.1.11a. Percentage of district special education funding for school-age children with disabilities provided by various sources, by district type

	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
Funding source	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error
Federal Funding Sources	29	1.6	27	1.7	40*	3.8
State Funding Sources	35	1.6	34	1.7	39	3.7
Local District Funding Sources	34	1.8	37	2.0	16*	3.2
Number of district responses	**371**		**278**		**93**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Respondents were asked to provide their best estimate. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Differences in the characteristics of responders and the full population of districts do not show evidence of potential nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K9).

Table 2.7.1.11b. Percentage of district special education funding for school-age children with disabilities provided by various sources, by district size

Funding source	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error
Federal Funding Sources	29	1.6	29	2.4	29	2.1
State Funding Sources	35	1.6	34	2.2	35	2.2
Local District Funding Sources	34	1.8	37	2.7	33	2.4
Number of district responses	**371**		**169**		**202**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Respondents were asked to provide their best estimate. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Differences in the characteristics of responders and the full population of districts do not show evidence of potential nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K9).

Table 2.7.1.11c. Percentage of district special education funding for school-age children with disabilities provided by various sources, by district rurality

Funding source	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error
Federal Funding Sources	29	1.6	29	3.0	28	1.8
State Funding Sources	35	1.6	34	2.7	35	1.9
Local District Funding Sources	34	1.8	36	3.0	34	2.1
Number of district responses	**371**		**128**		**243**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Respondents were asked to provide their best estimate. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Differences in the characteristics of responders and the full population of districts do not show evidence of potential nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K9).

Table 2.7.1.12. Percentage of districts with changes in the proportion of their budget provided by state special education funding in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	78	2.4
Yes	22	2.4
Number of district responses	**425**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K10).

Table 2.7.1.12a. Percentage of districts with changes in the proportion of their budget provided by state special education funding in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	78	2.4	77	2.7	84	4.4
Yes	22	2.4	23	2.7	16	4.4
Number of district responses	**425**		**324**		**101**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K10).

Table 2.7.1.12b. Percentage of districts with changes in the proportion of their budget provided by state special education funding in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	78	2.4	73	3.8	82	3.2
Yes	22	2.4	27	3.8	18	3.2
Number of district responses	**425**		**211**		**214**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K10).

Table 2.7.1.12c. Percentage of districts with changes in the proportion of their budget provided by state special education funding in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	78	2.4	75	4.5	79	2.9
Yes	22	2.4	25	4.5	21	2.9
Number of district responses	**425**		**151**		**274**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K10).

Table 2.7.1.13. Percentage of districts in which the proportion of state funding for special education increased or decreased in the past three school years (2017-2018 through 2019-2020)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Increased	42	6.7
Decreased	41	6.4
Increased and decreased over the years	17	4.2
Number of district responses	**93**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported a change in the proportion of the district budget provided by state special education funding in school year 2017-2018, 2018-2019, or 2019-2020 (n=94). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K11).

Table 2.7.1.14. District funding sources for services that support preschool-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
IDEA, Part B	86	2.4
General education funds	58	3.2
State education funds	67	3.1
Local municipality or county funds	25	2.7
Head Start	11	2.1
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	2!	1.0
Medicaid/Title XIX	26	2.9
Private insurance	4!	1.4
State Children's Health Insurance Program	2!	0.8
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	.	.
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	.	.
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	.	.
Other federal funding sources	2!	1.0
Other state funding sources	5	1.5
Other local funding sources	3!	1.3
Number of district responses	**315**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I2).

Table 2.7.1.14a. District funding sources for services that support preschool-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
IDEA, Part B	86	2.4	87	2.4	75	13.3
General education funds	58	3.2	58	3.3	47!	15.3
State education funds	67	3.1	68	3.2	62	14.3
Local municipality or county funds	25	2.7	25	2.8	.	.
Head Start	11	2.1	12	2.1	0*	.
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	2!	1.0	3!	1.1	0*	.
Medicaid/Title XIX	26	2.9	26	3.0	.	.
Private insurance	4!	1.4	4!	1.4	0*	.
State Children's Health Insurance Program	2!	0.8	2!	0.8	0*	.
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	.	.	.	.	0	.
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	.	.	.	.	0	.
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	.	.	.	.	0	.
Other federal funding sources	2!	1.0	2!	1.0	.	.
Other state funding sources	5	1.5	5	1.5	0*	.
Other local funding sources	3!	1.3	3!	1.3	.	.
Number of district responses	**315**		**291**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I2).

Table 2.7.1.14b. District funding sources for services that support preschool-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
IDEA, Part B	86	2.4	92	2.4	80*	4.2
General education funds	58	3.2	65	4.2	49*	5.0
State education funds	67	3.1	72	3.7	62	5.1
Local municipality or county funds	25	2.7	27	3.8	22	4.1
Head Start	11	2.1	13	2.9	9!	3.0
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	2!	1.0	3!	1.5	.	.
Medicaid/Title XIX	26	2.9	27	3.9	24	4.4
Private insurance	4!	1.4	4!	1.8	.	.
State Children's Health Insurance Program	2!	0.8	.	.	.	.
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	.	.	.	.	.	.
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	.	.	.	.	.	.
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	.	.	.	.	0	.
Other federal funding sources	2!	1.0	.	.	.	.
Other state funding sources	5	1.5	4!	1.6	6!	2.6
Other local funding sources	3!	1.3	.	.	.	.
Number of district responses	**315**		**189**		**126**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I2).

Table 2.7.1.14c. District funding sources for services that support preschool-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
IDEA, Part B	86	2.4	83	5.0	87	2.7
General education funds	58	3.2	56	6.0	58	3.8
State education funds	67	3.1	59	5.9	70	3.6
Local municipality or county funds	25	2.7	33	6.1	23	3.1
Head Start	11	2.1	9!	3.3	12	2.5
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	2!	1.0	.	.	.	.
Medicaid/Title XIX	26	2.9	26	5.7	26	3.4
Private insurance	4!	1.4	.	.	5!	1.7
State Children's Health Insurance Program	2!	0.8	.	.	.	.
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	.	.	.	.	.	.
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	.	.	.	.	.	.
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	.	.	0	.	.	.
Other federal funding sources	2!	1.0	0	.	2!*	1.2
Other state funding sources	5	1.5	.	.	5!	1.8
Other local funding sources	3!	1.3	.	.	3!	1.5
Number of district responses	**315**		**89**		**226**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I2).

Table 2.7.1.15. Among districts that used each funding source for services that support preschool-age children with disabilities, percentage of districts that listed funding source as one of their top three (by share of funding)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
IDEA, Part B	95	1.7
General education funds	86	3.1
State education funds	95	1.4
Local municipality or county funds	73	6.4
Head Start	52	12.1
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	.	.
Medicaid/Title XIX	51	6.6
Private insurance	.	.
State Children's Health Insurance Program	.	.
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	0	.
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	0	.
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	0	.
Other federal funding sources	92	11.6
Other state funding sources	85	5.5
Other local funding sources	57	4.9
Number of district responses	**266**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that identified a funding source that supports services for preschool-age children with disabilities, as required by their Individualized Education Programs (n=312). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I2a).

2.7.2. Funding allocation: Distribution of funding

Table 2.7.2.1. Methods states use to determine how special education funding (including federal and state) is allocated to services for school-age children

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
A fixed amount based on all students enrolled in a school district	22	1
A fixed amount per student with disabilities enrolled in a school district	18	1
Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in a school district, depending on disability category	12	0
Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in a school district, depending on specific services required	6	0
Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on type of student placement	6	0
Predetermined amounts per teacher, supportive services staff position, or other resource required given the number of students with disabilities	4	1
A formula based on the amount of specific allowable special education expenses actually incurred (for example, full reimbursement or percentage reimbursement)	14	0
A formula based on a measure of local poverty	29	1
A formula based on funding allocations in a base year or a previous year	30	3
Other	5	3
Funding to support special education is not separated out from the general education funding formula	0	2
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question P3).

Table 2.7.2.2. Number of states that allocate a portion of their special education funding to another state agency or agencies responsible for serving school-age children

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	37	9
Yes	14	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked not to include high-cost funding. High Cost Funds help offset the financial impact on local education agencies that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question P4).

Table 2.7.2.3. Other state agencies that are allocated special education funds (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Postsecondary education and training	2	0
Independent living agencies	2	0
Employment or workforce	1	0
Health care agencies	2	0
Mental health agencies	1	0
Social services agencies	4	0
Vocational rehabilitation services	2	0
Other	6	0
Number of responses	**14**	**0**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported allocating a portion of state special education funding to another state agency or agencies who have responsibility for serving school-age children (states: n=14; entities: n=0). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question P5).

Table 2.7.2.4. Number of states that maintain a high-cost fund (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	15	9
Yes	36	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. High Cost Funds help offset the financial impact on local education agencies that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question P7).

Table 2.7.2.5. High-cost fund mechanisms states use to fund districts with high-cost school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state allocates IDEA Part B funds to a high-cost fund to assist districts with high-cost students	20	0
The state allocates additional state funds, not part of IDEA, to a high-cost fund to assist districts with high-cost students	23	0
The state requires districts to pay into a high-cost fund to assist districts with high-cost students	2	0
Funding to support districts with high-cost students is not separated out from the broader special education funding formula	0	0
Number of responses	**36**	**0**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported maintaining a high-cost fund (states: n=36; entities: n=0). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question P8).

Table 2.7.2.6. Methods states use to determine how special education funding (including federal and state) is allocated to services for preschool-age children

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
A fixed amount based on all children enrolled in preschool in a school district	6	3
A fixed amount per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in a school district	14	2
Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in a school district, depending on disability category	7	0
Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in a school district, depending on specific services required	5	0
Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in a school district, depending on type of student placement	3	0
Predetermined amounts per teacher, supportive services staff position, or other resource required given the number of students with disabilities	3	1
A formula based on the amount of specific allowable special education expenses actually incurred (for example, full reimbursement or percentage reimbursement)	11	1
A formula based on a measure of local poverty	23	0
A formula based on funding allocations in a base year or a previous year	31	2
Other	7	2
Funding to support special education is not separated out from the general preschool funding formula	0	2
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked not to include high-cost funding. High Cost Funds help offset the financial impact on local education agencies that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question N2).

Table 2.7.2.7. Number of states that allocate a portion of their special education funding to another state agency or agencies responsible for serving preschool-age children

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	44	8
Yes	7	1
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked not to include high-cost funding.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question N3).

Table 2.7.2.8. Other state agencies that are allocated special education funds (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Health care agencies	1	1
Mental health agencies	0	1
Social services agencies	3	1
Other	3	0
Number of responses	**6**	**1**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported allocating a portion of state special education funding to another state agency or agencies who have responsibility for serving preschool-age children (states: n=7; entities: n=1). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question N4).

Table 2.7.2.9. Number of states that maintain a high-cost fund (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	21	6
Yes	26	1
Number of responses	**47**	**7**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. High Cost Funds help offset the financial impact on local education agencies that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question N6).

Table 2.7.2.10. High-cost fund mechanisms states use to fund districts with high-cost preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
The state allocates IDEA Part B funds to a high-cost fund to assist districts with high-cost students	17	1
The state allocates additional state funds, not part of IDEA, to a high-cost fund to assist districts with high-cost students	12	1
The state requires districts to pay into a high-cost fund to assist districts with high-cost students	1	0
Funding to support districts with high-cost students is not separated out from the broader special education funding formula	2	0
Number of responses	**26**	**1**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported maintaining a high-cost fund (states: n=26; entities: n=1). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. High Cost Funds help offset the financial impact on local education agencies that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question N7).

Table 2.7.2.11. Methods lead agencies use to determine how special education funding (including federal and state) is allocated to local programs in the state that provide early intervention services to infants and toddlers

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
A state central vendor system that pays individual providers by a calculated fee per service	15	0
A fixed amount based on children from birth through age 2 serviced in the area	6	0
A fixed amount based on children and families served in a previous year	5	0
A fixed amount based on birth rate in the area	0	0
Predetermined amounts based on birth rate in the area, depending on risk factors such as registered defects, premature birth, or birth to a teen mother	0	0
A formula based on past changes in the number of children served per year	13	1
A formula based on a measure of local poverty	2	0
A formula based on the area's geography (for example, urban or rural)	5	0
A formula based on the rate of private insurance coverage	2	0
A formula based on the rate of public insurance coverage	1	0
A formula based on expenditures in a base year or a previous year	8	0
A formula based on allocations in a base year or a previous year	7	0
Other	17	1
The state provides early intervention services directly on a statewide basis	3	4
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question L4).

Table 2.7.2.12. Actions districts used to reduce the cost of special education services for school-age children in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Changed educational placement or least restrictive environment options	28	2.6
Changed processes to reduce administrative costs	17	2.3
Changed use of data management, communication systems, or other technologies to reduce costs	9	1.8
Changed level of contracted services	31	2.8
Changed local municipality, county, or school district funding	3!	1.0
Changed policy related to State Children's Health Insurance Program billing	.	.
Changed use of general state funds	6	1.5
Changed level of administrative staffing	8	1.7
Changed level of general education aide or paraprofessional staffing	11	1.8
Changed level of special education aide or paraprofessional staffing	19	2.5
Changed level of general education teacher staffing	5	1.3
Changed level of special education teacher staffing	14	2.1
Changed level of specialized instructional support personnel staffing	.	.
Changed class size	12	2.2
Renegotiated provider reimbursements	7	1.5
Changed the amount of professional development activities	14	2.2
Changed the amount of spending on materials, buildings, or grounds	19	2.4
Other	7	1.6
Number of district responses	**390**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K12).

Table 2.7.2.12a. Actions districts used to reduce the cost of special education services for school-age children in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Changed educational placement or least restrictive environment options	28	2.6	31	2.9	8!*	3.3
Changed processes to reduce administrative costs	17	2.3	17	2.5	21	5.3
Changed use of data management, communication systems, or other technologies to reduce costs	9	1.8	9	1.9	9!	3.8
Changed level of contracted services	31	2.8	30	3.0	38	6.3
Changed local municipality, county, or school district funding	3!	1.0	3!	1.2	0*	.
Changed policy related to State Children's Health Insurance Program billing	.	.	.	.	0	.
Changed use of general state funds	6	1.5	6	1.6	9!	3.6
Changed level of administrative staffing	8	1.7	8	1.8	11!	3.8
Changed level of general education aide or paraprofessional staffing	11	1.8	11	2.1	7!	3.2
Changed level of special education aide or paraprofessional staffing	19	2.5	21	2.8	9!*	3.7
Changed level of general education teacher staffing	5	1.3	5	1.4	6!	2.9
Changed level of special education teacher staffing	14	2.1	14	2.3	17	4.9
Changed level of specialized instructional support personnel staffing	.	.	.	.	.	.
Changed class size	12	2.2	12	2.5	8!	3.4
Renegotiated provider reimbursements	7	1.5	6	1.7	11!	3.6
Changed the amount of professional development activities	14	2.2	15	2.5	13!	4.4
Changed the amount of spending on materials, buildings, or grounds	19	2.4	19	2.6	20	5.2
Other	7	1.6	7	1.8	7!	3.4
Number of district responses	**390**		**298**		**92**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K12).

Table 2.7.2.12b. Actions districts used to reduce the cost of special education services for school-age children in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Changed educational placement or least restrictive environment options	28	2.6	33	3.9	23	3.6
Changed processes to reduce administrative costs	17	2.3	19	3.6	16	2.9
Changed use of data management, communication systems, or other technologies to reduce costs	9	1.8	13	3.0	7	1.9
Changed level of contracted services	31	2.8	36	4.3	26	3.6
Changed local municipality, county, or school district funding	3!	1.0	4!	1.6	.	.
Changed policy related to State Children's Health Insurance Program billing	.	.	.	.	0	.
Changed use of general state funds	6	1.5	6!	2.3	6!	2.0
Changed level of administrative staffing	8	1.7	9	2.6	8	2.1
Changed level of general education aide or paraprofessional staffing	11	1.8	9	2.4	12	2.7
Changed level of special education aide or paraprofessional staffing	19	2.5	21	3.7	17	3.2
Changed level of general education teacher staffing	5	1.3	4!	1.6	7!	2.0
Changed level of special education teacher staffing	14	2.1	14	3.0	14	2.9
Changed level of specialized instructional support personnel staffing	.	.	.	.	.	.
Changed class size	12	2.2	11	2.9	12	3.2
Renegotiated provider reimbursements	7	1.5	8!	2.5	6!	1.8
Changed the amount of professional development activities	14	2.2	20	3.8	10*	2.4
Changed the amount of spending on materials, buildings, or grounds	19	2.4	19	3.5	19	3.3
Other	7	1.6	7!	2.4	6!	2.1
Number of district responses	**390**		**196**		**194**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K12).

Table 2.7.2.12c. Actions districts used to reduce the cost of special education services for school-age children in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Changed educational placement or least restrictive environment options	28	2.6	30	4.6	27	3.1
Changed processes to reduce administrative costs	17	2.3	20	4.4	16	2.7
Changed use of data management, communication systems, or other technologies to reduce costs	9	1.8	13	3.9	8	1.9
Changed level of contracted services	31	2.8	36	5.1	29	3.3
Changed local municipality, county, or school district funding	3!	1.0	.	.	3!	1.2
Changed policy related to State Children's Health Insurance Program billing	.	.	0	.	.	.
Changed use of general state funds	6	1.5	5!	2.3	6	1.9
Changed level of administrative staffing	8	1.7	12	3.0	7	2.0
Changed level of general education aide or paraprofessional staffing	11	1.8	7!	2.5	12	2.3
Changed level of special education aide or paraprofessional staffing	19	2.5	16	3.9	20	3.0
Changed level of general education teacher staffing	5	1.3	6!	2.4	5	1.5
Changed level of special education teacher staffing	14	2.1	16	4.0	13	2.5
Changed level of specialized instructional support personnel staffing	.	.	.	.	.	.
Changed class size	12	2.2	16!	5.1	10	2.4
Renegotiated provider reimbursements	7	1.5	8	2.3	6!	1.9
Changed the amount of professional development activities	14	2.2	18	4.0	13	2.6
Changed the amount of spending on materials, buildings, or grounds	19	2.4	18	4.0	19	2.9
Other	7	1.6	7!	3.0	7	1.9
Number of district responses	**390**		**135**		**255**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K12).

Table 2.7.2.13. Methods districts use to determine how to allocate all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) to schools

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A fixed amount based on all students enrolled in the school district	19	2.3
A fixed amount per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district	22	2.4
Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on disability category	7	1.6
Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on specific services required	5	1.3
Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on type of student placement	5	1.2
Predetermined amounts per teacher, supportive services staff position, or other resource required given the number of students with disabilities	7	1.5
A formula based on the amount of specific allowable special education expenses actually incurred (for example, full reimbursement or percentage reimbursements)	11	1.9
A formula based on a measure of local poverty	5	1.3
A formula based on funding allocations in a base year or a previous year	15	2.1
Other	7	1.6
Funding to support special education is not separated out from the general education funding formula	16	2.2
Only one school in the district serves school-age children with disabilities	11	1.9
No funds go directly to the school	10	1.6
Number of district responses	**418**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Respondents were asked not to include high-cost funding. High Cost Funds help offset the financial impact on local education agencies that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K13).

Table 2.7.2.13a. Methods districts use to determine how to allocate all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) to schools, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A fixed amount based on all students enrolled in the school district	19	2.3	18	2.5	25	5.3
A fixed amount per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district	22	2.4	20	2.6	34*	5.9
Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on disability category	7	1.6	7	1.8	6!	2.9
Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on specific services required	5	1.3	5	1.4	.	.
Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on type of student placement	5	1.2	4	1.3	7!	3.2
Predetermined amounts per teacher, supportive services staff position, or other resource required given the number of students with disabilities	7	1.5	7	1.7	.	.
A formula based on the amount of specific allowable special education expenses actually incurred (for example, full reimbursement or percentage reimbursements)	11	1.9	12	2.2	.	.
A formula based on a measure of local poverty	5	1.3	5	1.5	.	.
A formula based on funding allocations in a base year or a previous year	15	2.1	15	2.3	17	4.4
Other	7	1.6	8	1.8	5!	2.5
Funding to support special education is not separated out from the general education funding formula	16	2.2	17	2.5	8!*	3.3
Only one school in the district serves school-age children with disabilities	11	1.9	10	2.0	14!	4.4
No funds go directly to the school	10	1.6	11	1.9	.	.
Number of district responses	**418**		**317**		**101**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Respondents were asked not to include high-cost funding. High Cost Funds help offset the financial impact on local education agencies that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K13).

Table 2.7.2.13b. Methods districts use to determine how to allocate all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) to schools, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A fixed amount based on all students enrolled in the school district	19	2.3	17	3.3	21	3.4
A fixed amount per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district	22	2.4	23	3.7	22	3.4
Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on disability category	7	1.6	9!	2.9	5!	1.6
Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on specific services required	5	1.3	6!	2.1	5!	1.6
Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on type of student placement	5	1.2	4!	1.6	5!	1.7
Predetermined amounts per teacher, supportive services staff position, or other resource required given the number of students with disabilities	7	1.5	8	2.3	6!	2.0
A formula based on the amount of specific allowable special education expenses actually incurred (for example, full reimbursement or percentage reimbursements)	11	1.9	9	2.7	11	2.7
A formula based on a measure of local poverty	5	1.3	5!	2.0	4!	1.7
A formula based on funding allocations in a base year or a previous year	15	2.1	20	3.5	11*	2.4
Other	7	1.6	7!	2.4	7	2.2
Funding to support special education is not separated out from the general education funding formula	16	2.2	18	3.4	14	2.8
Only one school in the district serves school-age children with disabilities	11	1.9	.	.	19	3.3
No funds go directly to the school	10	1.6	18	3.1	3!*	1.5
Number of district responses	**418**		**206**		**212**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Respondents were asked not to include high-cost funding. High Cost Funds help offset the financial impact on local education agencies that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K13).

Table 2.7.2.13c. Methods districts use to determine how to allocate all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) to schools, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A fixed amount based on all students enrolled in the school district	19	2.3	22	4.2	18	2.7
A fixed amount per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district	22	2.4	27	4.5	20	2.8
Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on disability category	7	1.6	8!	2.9	6!	1.9
Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on specific services required	5	1.3	6!	2.2	5	1.6
Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on type of student placement	5	1.2	8!	2.8	4!	1.3
Predetermined amounts per teacher, supportive services staff position, or other resource required given the number of students with disabilities	7	1.5	5!	2.5	7	1.8
A formula based on the amount of specific allowable special education expenses actually incurred (for example, full reimbursement or percentage reimbursements)	11	1.9	7!	3.1	12	2.3
A formula based on a measure of local poverty	5	1.3	.	.	5!	1.6
A formula based on funding allocations in a base year or a previous year	15	2.1	18	4.0	14	2.4
Other	7	1.6	4!	1.6	9	2.1
Funding to support special education is not separated out from the general education funding formula	16	2.2	15	3.6	16	2.6
Only one school in the district serves school-age children with disabilities	11	1.9	8!	3.0	11	2.3
No funds go directly to the school	10	1.6	14	3.3	8	1.9
Number of district responses	**418**		**149**		**269**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Respondents were asked not to include high-cost funding. High Cost Funds help offset the financial impact on local education agencies that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K13).

Table 2.7.2.14. Methods districts use to determine how to allocate all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) to services for preschool-age children

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A fixed amount based on all children enrolled in preschool in the school district	9	1.8
A fixed amount per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district	11	2.1
Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district, depending on disability category	7	1.8
Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district, depending on specific services required	7	1.7
Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district, depending on type of student placement	6	1.5
Predetermined amounts per teacher, supportive services staff position, or other resource required given the number of students with disabilities	7	1.7
A formula based on the amount of specific allowable special education expenses actually incurred (for example, full reimbursement or percentage reimbursements)	9	1.9
A formula based on a measure of local poverty	5!	1.5
A formula based on funding allocations in a base year or a previous year	19	2.5
Other	9	1.9
Funding to support special education is not separated out from the general preschool funding formula	8	1.7
Only one school in the district serves preschool-age children with disabilities	19	2.7
The district or a regional organization directly provides special education services to preschool-age children	19	2.7
Number of district responses	**320**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Respondents were asked not to include high-cost funding. High Cost Funds help offset the financial impact on local education agencies that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I1).

Table 2.7.2.14a. Methods districts use to determine how to allocate all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) to services for preschool-age children, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A fixed amount based on all children enrolled in preschool in the school district	9	1.8	9	1.9	.	.
A fixed amount per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district	11	2.1	11	2.2	.	.
Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district, depending on disability category	7	1.8	7	1.8	.	.
Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district, depending on specific services required	7	1.7	7	1.8	.	.
Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district, depending on type of student placement	6	1.5	6	1.6	.	.
Predetermined amounts per teacher, supportive services staff position, or other resource required given the number of students with disabilities	7	1.7	7	1.7	.	.
A formula based on the amount of specific allowable special education expenses actually incurred (for example, full reimbursement or percentage reimbursements)	9	1.9	9	2.0	0*	.
A formula based on a measure of local poverty	5!	1.5	5!	1.5	0*	.
A formula based on funding allocations in a base year or a previous year	19	2.5	19	2.5	.	.
Other	9	1.9	9	2.0	.	.
Funding to support special education is not separated out from the general preschool funding formula	8	1.7	7	1.7	34!	14.9
Only one school in the district serves preschool-age children with disabilities	19	2.7	20	2.8	0*	.
The district or a regional organization directly provides special education services to preschool-age children	19	2.7	18	2.7	28!	13.5
Number of district responses	**320**		**296**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Respondents were asked not to include high-cost funding. High Cost Funds help offset the financial impact on local education agencies that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I1).

Table 2.7.2.14b. Methods districts use to determine how to allocate all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) to services for preschool-age children, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A fixed amount based on all children enrolled in preschool in the school district	9	1.8	11	2.8	7!	2.3
A fixed amount per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district	11	2.1	10	2.6	13	3.4
Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district, depending on disability category	7	1.8	6!	2.1	8!	2.9
Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district, depending on specific services required	7	1.7	8!	2.4	6!	2.4
Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district, depending on type of student placement	6	1.5	5	1.6	7!	2.7
Predetermined amounts per teacher, supportive services staff position, or other resource required given the number of students with disabilities	7	1.7	8	2.2	5!	2.5
A formula based on the amount of specific allowable special education expenses actually incurred (for example, full reimbursement or percentage reimbursements)	9	1.9	8!	2.5	9!	3.0
A formula based on a measure of local poverty	5!	1.5	4!	1.6	6!	2.6
A formula based on funding allocations in a base year or a previous year	19	2.5	24	3.6	13*	3.4
Other	9	1.9	9	2.7	9!	2.8
Funding to support special education is not separated out from the general preschool funding formula	8	1.7	7	2.0	9!	2.9
Only one school in the district serves preschool-age children with disabilities	19	2.7	20	3.8	18	3.8
The district or a regional organization directly provides special education services to preschool-age children	19	2.7	14	3.0	24	4.5
Number of district responses	**320**		**192**		**128**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Respondents were asked not to include high-cost funding. High Cost Funds help offset the financial impact on local education agencies that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I1).

Table 2.7.2.14c. Methods districts use to determine how to allocate all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) to services for preschool-age children, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A fixed amount based on all children enrolled in preschool in the school district	9	1.8	.	.	9	2.1
A fixed amount per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district	11	2.1	9!	3.2	12	2.5
Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district, depending on disability category	7	1.8	.	.	7	2.0
Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district, depending on specific services required	7	1.7	.	.	7	1.9
Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district, depending on type of student placement	6	1.5	4!	1.6	7	1.9
Predetermined amounts per teacher, supportive services staff position, or other resource required given the number of students with disabilities	7	1.7	7!	2.8	7	2.0
A formula based on the amount of specific allowable special education expenses actually incurred (for example, full reimbursement or percentage reimbursements)	9	1.9	5!	2.4	10	2.3
A formula based on a measure of local poverty	5!	1.5	.	.	5!	1.8
A formula based on funding allocations in a base year or a previous year	19	2.5	24	5.8	17	2.7
Other	9	1.9	10!	3.6	9	2.2
Funding to support special education is not separated out from the general preschool funding formula	8	1.7	10!	3.9	8	1.9
Only one school in the district serves preschool-age children with disabilities	19	2.7	16!	5.4	20	3.1
The district or a regional organization directly provides special education services to preschool-age children	19	2.7	14	4.3	20	3.1
Number of district responses	**320**		**89**		**231**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Respondents were asked not to include high-cost funding. High Cost Funds help offset the financial impact on local education agencies that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I1).

Table 2.7.2.15. Special education supports for preschool-age children funded through collaboration or contracts with other agencies or service providers in districts

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child Find disability screening	45	3.5
Evaluations and diagnostic services	57	3.5
Case management and referrals to services	30	3.3
Equipment and assistive technologies	31	3.3
Transportation services	29	3.2
Mental and behavioral health services	32	3.4
Personal aide services	17	2.7
Occupational therapy	62	3.4
Physical therapy	63	3.3
Speech or language therapy	61	3.4
Professional development for staff supporting preschool-age children with IEPs	40	3.5
Specialized instruction (for example, Braille, orientation and mobility, sign language, or applied behavioral analysis)	43	3.4
Other	3!	1.2
Number of district responses	**305**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I8).

Table 2.7.2.15a. Special education supports for preschool-age children funded through collaboration or contracts with other agencies or service providers in districts, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child Find disability screening	45	3.5	45	3.6	37!	16.2
Evaluations and diagnostic services	57	3.5	58	3.6	33!	15.5
Case management and referrals to services	30	3.3	30	3.4	.	.
Equipment and assistive technologies	31	3.3	32	3.4	.	.
Transportation services	29	3.2	30	3.3	.	.
Mental and behavioral health services	32	3.4	32	3.4	.	.
Personal aide services	17	2.7	17	2.7	.	.
Occupational therapy	62	3.4	62	3.4	83	10.5
Physical therapy	63	3.3	64	3.4	36!	16.1
Speech or language therapy	61	3.4	60	3.5	85*	9.9
Professional development for staff supporting preschool-age children with IEPs	40	3.5	41	3.6	.	.
Specialized instruction (for example, Braille, orientation and mobility, sign language, or applied behavioral analysis)	43	3.4	44	3.5	.	.
Other	3!	1.2	3!	1.2	.	.
Number of district responses	**305**		**283**		**22**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I8).

Table 2.7.2.15b. Special education supports for preschool-age children funded through collaboration or contracts with other agencies or service providers in districts, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child Find disability screening	45	3.5	40	4.6	51	5.3
Evaluations and diagnostic services	57	3.5	54	4.7	60	5.2
Case management and referrals to services	30	3.3	27	4.2	33	5.1
Equipment and assistive technologies	31	3.3	32	4.3	30	5.0
Transportation services	29	3.2	37	4.6	21*	4.4
Mental and behavioral health services	32	3.4	36	4.6	27	4.9
Personal aide services	17	2.7	15	3.4	18	4.1
Occupational therapy	62	3.4	57	4.5	69	5.0
Physical therapy	63	3.3	63	4.3	62	5.2
Speech or language therapy	61	3.4	50	4.7	72*	4.7
Professional development for staff supporting preschool-age children with IEPs	40	3.5	42	4.7	38	5.3
Specialized instruction (for example, Braille, orientation and mobility, sign language, or applied behavioral analysis)	43	3.4	48	4.6	37	5.2
Other	3!	1.2	.	.	.	.
Number of district responses	**305**		**181**		**124**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I8).

Table 2.7.2.15c. Special education supports for preschool-age children funded through collaboration or contracts with other agencies or service providers in districts, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child Find disability screening	45	3.5	34	6.8	47	4.0
Evaluations and diagnostic services	57	3.5	49	7.4	59	4.0
Case management and referrals to services	30	3.3	24	6.6	31	3.8
Equipment and assistive technologies	31	3.3	36	6.7	30	3.7
Transportation services	29	3.2	37	7.1	28	3.6
Mental and behavioral health services	32	3.4	31	6.8	32	3.8
Personal aide services	17	2.7	16!	5.6	17	3.0
Occupational therapy	62	3.4	52	7.2	65	3.8
Physical therapy	63	3.3	57	6.8	64	3.8
Speech or language therapy	61	3.4	46	7.0	64*	3.8
Professional development for staff supporting preschool-age children with IEPs	40	3.5	33	6.6	42	4.0
Specialized instruction (for example, Braille, orientation and mobility, sign language, or applied behavioral analysis)	43	3.4	37	6.8	44	3.9
Other	3!	1.2	.	.	.	.
Number of district responses	**305**		**81**		**224**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I8).

2.7.3. Funding allocation: Use of funds

Table 2.7.3.1. Activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs that can be reimbursed by Medicaid under state agency policy

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Disability screening and diagnosis	16	0
Case management and referrals to services	14	0
Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid	7	0
Equipment and assistive technologies	22	0
Transportation costs	26	0
Mental and behavioral health services	38	0
Occupational therapy	46	0
Physical therapy	45	0
Speech or language therapy	45	0
Personal aide services	22	0
Professional development for staff supporting school-age children with IEPs	2	0
Do not file for Medicaid reimbursement	3	9
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question P2).

Table 2.7.3.2. Uses of state set-aside funds from federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B grants for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
To finance a high-cost fund to support districts serving high-cost school-age children with disabilities	20	1
To support districts in meeting personnel shortages	23	3
To support districts in identifying and implementing evidence-based practices (for example, Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, Universal Design for Learning)	43	5
To provide districts and district staff with capacity building, technical assistance, professional development, and training	47	5
To support, expand, or improve the use of technology	39	6
To provide programming for children with disabilities who have been expelled from school, live in correctional facilities, or are enrolled in state-operated or state-supported schools	27	2
To provide programming for children with disabilities who are enrolled in charter schools	21	1
To support development and implementation of transition programs, including coordination of services with agencies involved in supporting the transition of children with disabilities to postsecondary activities	43	7
To support state-level monitoring, compliance, and other administrative expenditures for the IDEA Part B grant for preschool-age and school-age children	44	6
To support state-level monitoring, compliance, and other administrative expenditures for the IDEA Part C grant for early intervention services	18	1
Number of responses	**51**	**8**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question P6).

Table 2.7.3.3. Uses of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act state-level administration funds during the 2018–2019 school year (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Administration of school-age special education and related services	43	8
Administration of preschool-age special education and related services	41	7
Administration of early intervention services	19	3
Coordination of activities under Part B with other programs that provide services to children with disabilities	34	5
Provision of technical assistance to other programs that provide services to children with disabilities	30	5
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Section 300.704 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act allows the state education agency to reserve a portion of the total funding it receives for state set-asides: state-level administration and other state-level activities.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question Q1).

Table 2.7.3.4. Uses of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act other state-level activities funds during the 2018–2019 school year (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Providing professional development, including pre-service training	43	8
Implementing paperwork reduction activities, including expanding use of technology in the IEP process	26	2
Assisting districts in providing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and mental health services	40	3
Supporting use of technology to enhance learning, including technology with universal design principles and technology with assistive technology	35	6
Developing and/or implementing transition programs, including coordination of services with agencies involved in supporting the transition of students with disabilities to postsecondary activities	41	7
Assisting districts in meeting personnel shortages	23	2
Supporting capacity-building activities to improve results for children with disabilities	39	8
Supporting improvement of delivery services by districts to improve results for children with disabilities	43	5
Supporting programming for children with disabilities who have been expelled from school, live in correctional facilities, or are enrolled in state-operated or state-supported schools	27	1
Supporting programming for children with disabilities who are enrolled in charter schools	22	1
Developing and/or providing appropriate accommodations for children with disabilities	32	7
Developing and/or providing alternate assessments that are valid and reliable for assessing the performance of children with disabilities	37	4
Providing technical assistance to schools and districts implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities	41	7
Providing technical assistance to schools and districts implementing targeted support and improvement activities under Section 1111(d) of the ESSA	29	2
Providing professional development in the use of Universal Design for Learning	32	1
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Section 300.704 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act allows the state education agency to reserve a portion of the total funding it receives for state set-asides: state-level administration and other state-level activities.

ESSA = Every Student Succeeds Act; IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question Q2).

Table 2.7.3.5. Number of states that used other state-level activities funds to support activities aligned with State Systemic Improvement Plans during the 2018–2019 school year (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	9	2
Yes	42	7
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Section 300.704 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act allows the state education agency to reserve a portion of the total funding it receives for state set-asides: state-level administration and other state-level activities.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question Q3).

Table 2.7.3.6. Activities aligned with State Systemic Improvement Plans that were funded by other state-level activities funds during the 2018–2019 school year (school-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
To help districts provide professional development	34	6
To help districts support infrastructure, for example data systems	24	3
To help districts implement evidence-based practices	36	6
To help improve staff-to-student ratios	2	0
To help institutes of higher education or national experts provide professional development	19	4
Other	2	1
Number of responses	**42**	**7**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported using other state-level activities funds to support activities aligned with their State Systemic Improvement Plan (states: n=42; entities: n=7). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Section 300.704 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act allows the state education agency to reserve a portion of the total funding it receives for state set-asides: state-level administration and other state-level activities.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question Q4).

Table 2.7.3.7. Bases for state agency determination of how to spend Individuals with Disabilities Education Act state-level activities funds (both administration funds and other state-level activities funds), school-age children

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Based on requests from local education agencies	35	4
Based on an analysis of state or local data	45	7
Based on a review of state progress toward goals	42	4
Based on state priority areas	48	7
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Section 300.704 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act allows the state education agency to reserve a portion of the total funding it receives for state set-asides: state-level administration and other state-level activities.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question Q5).

Table 2.7.3.8. Uses of state set-aside funds from federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B grants for preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
To coordinate activities under Part B with, and provide technical assistance to, other programs that provide services to preschool-age children with disabilities	35	5
To provide service coordination or IEP case management for families	9	3
To provide activities at the state and local levels to meet the state performance goals	34	5
To provide direct services for preschool-age children with disabilities	22	9
To provide early intervention services (such as speech and language services, occupational therapy, or psychological services)	10	5
To supplement other funds used to develop and implement a statewide coordinated services system	18	3
To support administration for the IDEA Part C grant for early intervention services	4	1
To support administration for the IDEA Part B grant for preschool-age children	37	5
For support services, including establishing and implementing the mediation process	16	3
Number of responses	**48**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question N5).

Table 2.7.3.9. Uses of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act state-level administration funds during the 2018–2019 school year (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Administration of school-age special education and related services	26	8
Administration of preschool-age special education and related services	44	6
Administration of early intervention services	13	2
Coordination of activities under Part B with other programs that provide services to children with disabilities	33	6
Provision of technical assistance to other programs that provide services to children with disabilities	33	5
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Section 300.704 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act allows the state education agency to reserve a portion of the total funding it receives for state set-asides: state-level administration and other state-level activities.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question O1).

Table 2.7.3.10. Uses of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act other state-level activities funds during the 2018–2019 school year (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Providing professional development, including pre-service training	31	6
Implementing paperwork reduction activities, including expanding use of technology in the IEP process	10	0
Assisting districts in providing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and mental health services	34	3
Supporting use of technology to enhance learning, including technology with universal design principles and technology with assistive technology	18	2
Developing and/or implementing transition programs, including coordination of services with agencies involved in supporting the transition of students with disabilities to postsecondary activities	23	4
Assisting districts in meeting personnel shortages	10	2
Supporting capacity-building activities to improve results for children with disabilities	38	6
Supporting improvement of delivery services by districts to improve results for children with disabilities	33	4
Supporting programming for children with disabilities who have been expelled from school, live in correctional facilities, or are enrolled in state-operated or state-supported schools	13	0
Supporting programming for children with disabilities who are enrolled in charter schools	13	0
Developing and/or providing appropriate accommodations for children with disabilities	19	6
Developing and/or providing alternate assessments that are valid and reliable for assessing the performance of children with disabilities	18	4
Providing technical assistance to schools and districts implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities	30	5
Providing technical assistance to schools and districts implementing targeted support and improvement activities under Section 1111(d) of the ESSA	23	1
Providing professional development in the use of Universal Design for Learning	20	1
Number of responses	**48**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Section 300.704 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act allows the state education agency to reserve a portion of the total funding it receives for state set-asides: state-level administration and other state-level activities.

ESSA = Every Student Succeeds Act; IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question O2).

Table 2.7.3.11. Number of states that used other state-level activities funds to support activities aligned with State Systemic Improvement Plans during the 2018–2019 school year (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	16	2
Yes	33	7
Number of responses	**49**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Section 300.704 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act allows the state education agency to reserve a portion of the total funding it receives for state set-asides: state-level administration and other state-level activities.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question O3).

Table 2.7.3.12. Activities aligned with State Systemic Improvement Plans that were funded by other state-level activities funds during the 2018–2019 school year (preschool-age children)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
To help districts provide professional development	27	7
To help districts support infrastructure, for example data systems	13	4
To help districts implement evidence-based practices	25	6
To help improve staff-to-student ratios	3	1
To help institutes of higher education or national experts provide professional development	12	0
Other	2	1
Number of responses	**32**	**7**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state agencies that reported using other state-level activities funds to support activities aligned with their State Systemic Improvement Plan (states: n=33; entities: n=7). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Section 300.704 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act allows the state education agency to reserve a portion of the total funding it receives for state set-asides: state-level administration and other state-level activities.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question O4).

Table 2.7.3.13. Bases for state agency determination of how to spend Individuals with Disabilities Education Act state-level activities funds (both administration funds and other state-level activities funds), preschool-age children

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Based on requests from local education agencies	27	5
Based on an analysis of state or local data	38	3
Based on a review of state progress toward goals	39	3
Based on state priority areas	45	5
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Section 300.704 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act allows the state education agency to reserve a portion of the total funding it receives for state set-asides: state-level administration and other state-level activities.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question O5).

Table 2.7.3.14. District funding sources blended with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B funds to support Coordinated Early Intervention Services or Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervention Services for school-age children not yet identified with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts that blend these funds with Part B IDEA funds to support CCEIS	Percentage of districts that blend these funds with Part B IDEA funds to support voluntary CEIS	Percentage of districts that do not use these funds to support CCEIS or voluntary CEIS
General education funds (SE)	24 (2.6)	17 (2.2)	64 (2.9)
State education funds (SE)	21 (2.4)	16 (2.2)	66 (2.8)
Local municipality or county funds (SE)	15 (2.0)	9 (1.6)	79 (2.3)
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V (SE)	10 (1.7)	6 (1.4)	86 (2.0)
Medicaid/Title XIX (SE)	12 (1.9)	8 (1.5)	82 (2.3)
Private insurance (SE)	4! (1.1)	3! (1.0)	95 (1.3)
State Children's Health Insurance Program (SE)	4 (1.2)	3! (1.0)	94 (1.4)
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (SE)	3! (1.0)	2! (0.9)	96 (1.2)
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (SE)	3! (1.0)	2! (0.8)	96 (1.1)
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services) (SE)	2! (0.7)	.	98 (0.8)
Other federal funding sources (SE)	3! (0.8)	2! (0.8)	96 (1.0)
Other state funding sources (SE)	2! (0.8)	.	98 (0.9)
Other local funding sources (SE)	.	.	98 (0.9)
Number of district responses	**425**		

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) are services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services, but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment. CEIS can be mandatory (Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services, or CCEIS) or voluntary. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K2).

Table 2.7.3.15. District funding sources for training and implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Title I-A Schoolwide or Targeted Assistance funds	54	2.8
Title I-B Reading First funds	7	1.4
Title II-A funds	18	2.2
Title III funds	4	1.1
Title V grants for innovation	3!	1.0
IDEA EIS funds	9	1.7
IDEA Part B flow-through funds, other than funds used for EIS	11	1.8
IDEA district discretionary funds, other than funds used for EIS	3!	1.0
IDEA state discretionary funds	6	1.6
District general funds	75	2.5
Other	5	1.2
Number of district responses	**429**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

EIS = Early Intervening Services; IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K3).

Table 2.7.3.15a. District funding sources for training and implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Title I-A Schoolwide or Targeted Assistance funds	54	2.8	55	3.1	48	6.1
Title I-B Reading First funds	7	1.4	7	1.6	9!	3.5
Title II-A funds	18	2.2	19	2.5	10!*	3.7
Title III funds	4	1.1	3!	1.2	7!	3.3
Title V grants for innovation	3!	1.0	3!	1.1	.	.
IDEA EIS funds	9	1.7	9	1.9	8!	3.2
IDEA Part B flow-through funds, other than funds used for EIS	11	1.8	10	1.9	15	4.6
IDEA district discretionary funds, other than funds used for EIS	3!	1.0	3!	1.1	.	.
IDEA state discretionary funds	6	1.6	6!	1.8	9!	3.5
District general funds	75	2.5	77	2.8	63*	5.8
Other	5	1.2	5	1.3	5!	2.1
Number of district responses	**429**		**328**		**101**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

EIS = Early Intervening Services; IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K3).

Table 2.7.3.15b. District funding sources for training and implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Title I-A Schoolwide or Targeted Assistance funds	54	2.8	46	4.2	61*	3.9
Title I-B Reading First funds	7	1.4	9	2.4	6	1.7
Title II-A funds	18	2.2	17	3.0	18	3.1
Title III funds	4	1.1	4!	1.6	4!	1.6
Title V grants for innovation	3!	1.0	3!	1.5	3!	1.2
IDEA EIS funds	9	1.7	7!	2.3	11	2.5
IDEA Part B flow-through funds, other than funds used for EIS	11	1.8	10	2.4	12	2.6
IDEA district discretionary funds, other than funds used for EIS	3!	1.0	3!	1.4	4!	1.5
IDEA state discretionary funds	6	1.6	6!	2.2	6!	2.3
District general funds	75	2.5	78	3.7	73	3.5
Other	5	1.2	7!	2.0	3!	1.2
Number of district responses	**429**		**213**		**216**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

EIS = Early Intervening Services; IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K3).

Table 2.7.3.15c. District funding sources for training and implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention, by district rurality

Response	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of	Standard error	Percentage of	Standard error	Percentage of	Standard error
Title I-A Schoolwide or Targeted Assistance funds	54	2.8	45	4.7	57*	3.5
Title I-B Reading First funds	7	1.4	6!	2.2	8	1.8
Title II-A funds	18	2.2	18	3.9	18	2.6
Title III funds	4	1.1	6!	2.4	3!	1.3
Title V grants for innovation	3!	1.0	.	.	4!	1.2
IDEA EIS funds	9	1.7	7!	2.5	10	2.2
IDEA Part B flow-through funds, other than funds used for EIS	11	1.8	7!	2.3	12	2.3
IDEA district discretionary funds, other than funds used for EIS	3!	1.0	.	.	3!	1.2
IDEA state discretionary funds	6	1.6	9!	4.1	5!	1.6
District general funds	75	2.5	71	4.5	77	3.0
Other	5	1.2	5!	1.9	4!	1.4
Number of district responses	**429**		**154**		**275**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

EIS = Early Intervening Services; IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K3).

Table 2.7.3.16. Among districts that used each funding source for training and implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, percentage of districts that listed funding source as one of their top three (by share of funding)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Title I-A School-wide or Targeted Assistance funds	99	0.9
Title I-B Reading First funds	75	9.3
Title II-A funds	93	3.5
Title III funds	.	.
Title V grants for innovation	43!	15.6
IDEA EIS funds	78	7.1
IDEA Part B flow-through funds, other than funds used for EIS	76	7.1
IDEA district discretionary funds, other than funds used for EIS	47!	19.8
IDEA state discretionary funds	79	11.9
District general funds	99	0.4
Other	78	15.3
Number of district responses	**313**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that identified a funding source that supports training and implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, including Response to Intervention (n=408). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

EIS = Early Intervening Services; IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K3a).

Table 2.7.3.17. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by Medicaid funds

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Disability screening and diagnosis	26	3.0
Case management and referrals to services	22	3.1
Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid	7	1.8
Equipment and assistive technologies	28	3.0
Transportation services	21	2.7
Mental and behavioral health services	29	3.1
Occupational therapy	57	3.6
Personal aide services	26	3.0
Physical therapy	55	3.4
Speech therapy	64	3.3
Other	7	1.8
Number of district responses	**298**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Readers should interpret findings from this table with caution. Differences in some of the characteristics of responding districts and the full population of districts suggest the potential for nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K4).

Table 2.7.3.17a. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by Medicaid funds, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Disability screening and diagnosis	26	3.0	26	3.2	29!	9.1
Case management and referrals to services	22	3.1	22	3.3	21!	8.4
Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid	7	1.8	8	2.0	.	.
Equipment and assistive technologies	28	3.0	28	3.2	22!	8.4
Transportation services	21	2.7	22	2.9	.	.
Mental and behavioral health services	29	3.1	29	3.3	18!	7.7
Occupational therapy	57	3.6	56	3.8	68	9.5
Personal aide services	26	3.0	28	3.2	.	.
Physical therapy	55	3.4	56	3.6	39	9.8
Speech therapy	64	3.3	64	3.5	69	9.3
Other	7	1.8	8	1.9	.	.
Number of district responses	**298**		**259**		**39**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Readers should interpret findings from this table with caution. Differences in some of the characteristics of responding districts and the full population of districts suggest the potential for nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K4).

Table 2.7.3.17b. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by Medicaid funds, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Disability screening and diagnosis	26	3.0	27	4.2	25	4.4
Case management and referrals to services	22	3.1	22	4.1	22	4.6
Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid	7	1.8	8!	2.8	7!	2.4
Equipment and assistive technologies	28	3.0	38	4.7	18*	3.8
Transportation services	21	2.7	28	4.2	14*	3.4
Mental and behavioral health services	29	3.1	35	4.6	23*	4.1
Occupational therapy	57	3.6	57	4.8	57	5.2
Personal aide services	26	3.0	36	4.5	17*	3.7
Physical therapy	55	3.4	59	4.7	50	5.2
Speech therapy	64	3.3	64	4.8	65	4.7
Other	7	1.8	9!	2.7	6!	2.5
Number of district responses	**298**		**163**		**135**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Readers should interpret findings from this table with caution. Differences in some of the characteristics of responding districts and the full population of districts suggest the potential for nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K4).

Table 2.7.3.17c. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by Medicaid funds, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Disability screening and diagnosis	26	3.0	25	5.8	26	3.5
Case management and referrals to services	22	3.1	24	7.0	22	3.5
Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid	7	1.8	.	.	9	2.4
Equipment and assistive technologies	28	3.0	27	5.8	28	3.6
Transportation services	21	2.7	28	6.0	19	3.0
Mental and behavioral health services	29	3.1	34	6.1	27	3.6
Occupational therapy	57	3.6	56	7.5	57	4.1
Personal aide services	26	3.0	28	6.4	26	3.4
Physical therapy	55	3.4	56	6.1	54	4.0
Speech therapy	64	3.3	67	6.2	64	3.9
Other	7	1.8	9!	3.5	7!	2.1
Number of district responses	**298**		**90**		**208**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Readers should interpret findings from this table with caution. Differences in some of the characteristics of responding districts and the full population of districts suggest the potential for nonresponse bias.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K4).

Table 2.7.3.18. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by general education funds

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Disability screening and diagnosis	56	2.9
Case management and referrals to services	46	2.9
Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid	11	1.8
Equipment and assistive technologies	47	2.9
Transportation services	59	2.7
Mental and behavioral health services	39	2.8
Occupational therapy	44	2.8
Personal aide services	37	2.8
Physical therapy	40	2.8
Speech therapy	52	2.9
Professional development for administrators	61	2.9
Professional development for guidance counselors	44	2.9
Professional development for paid teacher aides/instructional assistants	57	2.9
Professional development for nursing/medical personnel	35	2.7
Professional development for reading specialists	41	2.8
Professional development for school psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	37	2.7
Professional development for special education resource room teachers	59	2.9
Professional development for speech/communication therapists	41	2.7
Professional development for other related services personnel (such as occupational or physical therapists)	29	2.5
Other	6	1.6
Number of district responses	**425**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K5).

Table 2.7.3.18a. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by general education funds, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Disability screening and diagnosis	56	2.9	57	3.2	49	6.1
Case management and referrals to services	46	2.9	49	3.3	29*	5.5
Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid	11	1.8	12	2.1	.	.
Equipment and assistive technologies	47	2.9	49	3.3	35*	5.8
Transportation services	59	2.7	64	3.0	22*	5.2
Mental and behavioral health services	39	2.8	42	3.1	23*	5.2
Occupational therapy	44	2.8	44	3.1	39	6.0
Personal aide services	37	2.8	39	3.1	20*	5.1
Physical therapy	40	2.8	41	3.1	30	5.8
Speech therapy	52	2.9	54	3.2	42	6.1
Professional development for administrators	61	2.9	61	3.3	64	5.9
Professional development for guidance counselors	44	2.9	47	3.2	28*	5.3
Professional development for paid teacher aides/instructional assistants	57	2.9	58	3.2	45	6.1
Professional development for nursing/medical personnel	35	2.7	38	3.0	11!*	3.9
Professional development for reading specialists	41	2.8	42	3.2	30	5.7
Professional development for school psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	37	2.7	39	3.0	20*	4.9
Professional development for special education resource room teachers	59	2.9	58	3.2	60	6.0
Professional development for speech/communication therapists	41	2.7	44	3.1	20*	4.9
Professional development for other related services personnel (such as occupational or physical therapists)	29	2.5	31	2.8	16*	4.6
Other	6	1.6	7	1.8	.	.
Number of district responses	**425**		**325**		**100**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K5).

Table 2.7.3.18b. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by general education funds, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Disability screening and diagnosis	56	2.9	58	4.3	53	4.1
Case management and referrals to services	46	2.9	50	4.2	43	4.0
Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid	11	1.8	17	3.3	6!*	1.9
Equipment and assistive technologies	47	2.9	53	4.4	42	4.0
Transportation services	59	2.7	75	3.8	45*	3.9
Mental and behavioral health services	39	2.8	47	4.1	33*	3.8
Occupational therapy	44	2.8	49	4.2	39	3.9
Personal aide services	37	2.8	43	4.2	32*	3.8
Physical therapy	40	2.8	46	4.3	34*	3.8
Speech therapy	52	2.9	59	4.3	46*	4.0
Professional development for administrators	61	2.9	69	4.1	54*	4.1
Professional development for guidance counselors	44	2.9	55	4.3	35*	3.8
Professional development for paid teacher aides/instructional assistants	57	2.9	59	4.3	55	4.0
Professional development for nursing/medical personnel	35	2.7	48	4.2	23*	3.3
Professional development for reading specialists	41	2.8	46	4.2	36	3.8
Professional development for school psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	37	2.7	48	4.3	27*	3.5
Professional development for special education resource room teachers	59	2.9	62	4.3	56	4.0
Professional development for speech/communication therapists	41	2.7	53	4.3	30*	3.6
Professional development for other related services personnel (such as occupational or physical therapists)	29	2.5	37	4.0	22*	3.2
Other	6	1.6	9!	2.8	4!	1.6
Number of district responses	**425**		**210**		**215**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K5).

Table 2.7.3.18c. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by general education funds, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Disability screening and diagnosis	56	2.9	57	4.9	55	3.6
Case management and referrals to services	46	2.9	49	5.3	45	3.5
Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid	11	1.8	8!	2.9	12	2.2
Equipment and assistive technologies	47	2.9	45	5.2	48	3.5
Transportation services	59	2.7	47	4.8	63*	3.3
Mental and behavioral health services	39	2.8	38	4.8	40	3.3
Occupational therapy	44	2.8	44	4.9	44	3.4
Personal aide services	37	2.8	32	4.3	39	3.4
Physical therapy	40	2.8	44	5.6	38	3.3
Speech therapy	52	2.9	46	5.0	54	3.5
Professional development for administrators	61	2.9	65	5.5	60	3.5
Professional development for guidance counselors	44	2.9	44	5.2	45	3.4
Professional development for paid teacher aides/instructional assistants	57	2.9	51	4.9	59	3.5
Professional development for nursing/medical personnel	35	2.7	36	4.4	34	3.2
Professional development for reading specialists	41	2.8	42	5.3	40	3.4
Professional development for school psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	37	2.7	44	4.9	34	3.2
Professional development for special education resource room teachers	59	2.9	60	4.9	58	3.5
Professional development for speech/communication therapists	41	2.7	41	4.6	40	3.3
Professional development for other related services personnel (such as occupational or physical therapists)	29	2.5	35	4.7	27	3.0
Other	6	1.6	4!	1.9	7	2.0
Number of district responses	**425**		**152**		**273**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K5).

Table 2.7.3.19. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by special education funds

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Disability screening and diagnosis	73	2.6
Case management and referrals to services	61	2.8
Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid	17	2.1
Equipment and assistive technologies	69	2.8
Transportation services	46	2.9
Mental and behavioral health services	42	2.8
Occupational therapy	70	2.8
Personal aide services	53	2.9
Physical therapy	67	2.7
Speech therapy	76	2.5
Professional development for administrators	37	2.8
Professional development for guidance counselors	16	2.1
Professional development for paid teacher aides/instructional assistants	45	2.9
Professional development for nursing/medical personnel	17	2.1
Professional development for reading specialists	15	2.0
Professional development for school psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	40	2.8
Professional development for special education resource room teachers	56	3.0
Professional development for speech/communication therapists	44	2.8
Professional development for other related services personnel (such as occupational or physical therapists)	33	2.6
Other	8	1.6
Number of district responses	**427**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K6).

Table 2.7.3.19a. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by special education funds, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Disability screening and diagnosis	73	2.6	73	2.9	71	5.6
Case management and referrals to services	61	2.8	62	3.1	53	6.1
Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid	17	2.1	18	2.4	7!*	3.2
Equipment and assistive technologies	69	2.8	73	3.0	48*	6.1
Transportation services	46	2.9	51	3.3	15*	4.3
Mental and behavioral health services	42	2.8	44	3.1	30*	5.7
Occupational therapy	70	2.8	71	3.1	60	6.0
Personal aide services	53	2.9	57	3.2	27*	5.5
Physical therapy	67	2.7	70	2.9	47*	6.1
Speech therapy	76	2.5	77	2.8	70	5.7
Professional development for administrators	37	2.8	38	3.1	25*	5.3
Professional development for guidance counselors	16	2.1	17	2.3	9!*	3.5
Professional development for paid teacher aides/instructional assistants	45	2.9	47	3.3	27*	5.5
Professional development for nursing/medical personnel	17	2.1	18	2.4	6!*	2.8
Professional development for reading specialists	15	2.0	16	2.2	13!	4.1
Professional development for school psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	40	2.8	44	3.2	15*	4.2
Professional development for special education resource room teachers	56	3.0	58	3.3	45	6.1
Professional development for speech/communication therapists	44	2.8	48	3.1	17*	4.4
Professional development for other related services personnel (such as occupational or physical therapists)	33	2.6	37	3.0	9!*	3.4
Other	8	1.6	7	1.7	10!	3.3
Number of district responses	**427**		**327**		**100**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K6).

Table 2.7.3.19b. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by special education funds, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Disability screening and diagnosis	73	2.6	71	3.9	74	3.5
Case management and referrals to services	61	2.8	64	4.1	58	4.0
Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid	17	2.1	22	3.4	12*	2.6
Equipment and assistive technologies	69	2.8	77	3.7	63*	3.9
Transportation services	46	2.9	56	4.4	37*	3.7
Mental and behavioral health services	42	2.8	51	4.3	34*	3.8
Occupational therapy	70	2.8	75	3.8	65	3.9
Personal aide services	53	2.9	63	4.2	44*	4.0
Physical therapy	67	2.7	75	3.6	59*	3.8
Speech therapy	76	2.5	78	3.6	75	3.5
Professional development for administrators	37	2.8	45	4.3	29*	3.6
Professional development for guidance counselors	16	2.1	18	3.2	14	2.7
Professional development for paid teacher aides/instructional assistants	45	2.9	53	4.4	38*	3.9
Professional development for nursing/medical personnel	17	2.1	22	3.5	12*	2.6
Professional development for reading specialists	15	2.0	19	3.2	13	2.6
Professional development for school psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	40	2.8	59	4.4	25*	3.3
Professional development for special education resource room teachers	56	3.0	66	4.1	48*	4.1
Professional development for speech/communication therapists	44	2.8	60	4.3	31*	3.6
Professional development for other related services personnel (such as occupational or physical therapists)	33	2.6	44	4.2	24*	3.3
Other	8	1.6	8	2.4	7	2.0
Number of district responses	**427**		**213**		**214**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K6).

Table 2.7.3.19c. District activities for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs supported by special education funds, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Disability screening and diagnosis	73	2.6	71	4.5	73	3.1
Case management and referrals to services	61	2.8	63	4.9	60	3.4
Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid	17	2.1	22	4.3	15	2.4
Equipment and assistive technologies	69	2.8	64	5.4	71	3.2
Transportation services	46	2.9	38	5.3	49	3.4
Mental and behavioral health services	42	2.8	43	5.0	41	3.4
Occupational therapy	70	2.8	68	5.5	71	3.2
Personal aide services	53	2.9	49	4.8	55	3.5
Physical therapy	67	2.7	68	4.4	66	3.3
Speech therapy	76	2.5	79	4.0	76	3.1
Professional development for administrators	37	2.8	38	5.0	36	3.3
Professional development for guidance counselors	16	2.1	15	3.5	16	2.5
Professional development for paid teacher aides/instructional assistants	45	2.9	39	5.1	47	3.5
Professional development for nursing/medical personnel	17	2.1	18	3.8	16	2.6
Professional development for reading specialists	15	2.0	19	3.8	14	2.4
Professional development for school psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	40	2.8	42	5.6	40	3.3
Professional development for special education resource room teachers	56	3.0	57	5.5	56	3.5
Professional development for speech/communication therapists	44	2.8	42	4.8	45	3.4
Professional development for other related services personnel (such as occupational or physical therapists)	33	2.6	33	4.5	33	3.2
Other	8	1.6	8!	2.6	8	1.9
Number of district responses	**427**		**150**		**277**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K6).

Table 2.7.3.20. Among districts that provided each service for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs, percentage of districts that ranked activity as their top three (by share of funding)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Disability screening and diagnosis	55	3.4
Case management and referrals to services	49	4.0
Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid	0	.
Equipment and assistive technologies	18	2.8
Transportation services	51	4.6
Mental and behavioral health services	42	4.6
Occupational therapy	45	3.5
Personal aide services	47	4.3
Physical therapy	23	3.1
Speech therapy	72	2.9
Professional development for administrators	6!	2.2
Professional development for guidance counselors	.	.
Professional development for paid teacher aides/instructional assistants	10	2.9
Professional development for nursing/medical personnel	.	.
Professional development for reading specialists	0	.
Professional development for school psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	5!	2.2
Professional development for special education resource room teachers	18	3.0
Professional development for speech/communication therapists	3!	1.7
Professional development for other related services personnel (such as occupational or physical therapists)	.	.
Other	93	5.2
Number of district responses	**322**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that identified activities supported with special education funds for school-age children with Individualized Education Programs (n=421). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K6a).

Table 2.7.3.21. District funding sources that support Individualized Education Program-specified residential placements for school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	2!	0.8
General education funds	47	3.1
Local municipality or county funds	10	1.8
IDEA, Part B	37	3.0
Private insurance	6	1.4
Medicaid/Title XIX	13	2.1
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	.	.
State Children's Health Insurance Program	.	.
State education funds	20	2.4
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	.	.
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	.	.
Other federal funding sources	4	1.2
Other state funding sources	5	1.5
Other local funding sources	5	1.5
Number of district responses	**373**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K7).

Table 2.7.3.21a. District funding sources that support Individualized Education Program-specified residential placements for school-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	2!	0.8	2!	0.9	0*	.
General education funds	47	3.1	50	3.4	24*	6.1
Local municipality or county funds	10	1.8	11	2.0	.	.
IDEA, Part B	37	3.0	38	3.3	29	6.5
Private insurance	6	1.4	7	1.5	.	.
Medicaid/Title XIX	13	2.1	15	2.4	.	.
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	.	.	.	.	0	.
State Children's Health Insurance Program	.	.	.	.	0	.
State education funds	20	2.4	20	2.6	16!	4.9
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	.	.	.	.	0	.
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	.	.	.	.	0	.
Other federal funding sources	4	1.2	3!	1.2	13!	5.0
Other state funding sources	5	1.5	6	1.7	0*	.
Other local funding sources	5	1.5	5!	1.7	.	.
Number of district responses	**373**		**297**		**76**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K7).

Table 2.7.3.21b. District funding sources that support Individualized Education Program-specified residential placements for school-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	2!	0.8	.	.	.	.
General education funds	47	3.1	50	4.5	45	4.3
Local municipality or county funds	10	1.8	9	2.6	10	2.5
IDEA, Part B	37	3.0	38	4.4	36	4.1
Private insurance	6	1.4	6!	1.8	7!	2.0
Medicaid/Title XIX	13	2.1	13	2.9	13	3.0
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	.	.	0	.	.	.
State Children's Health Insurance Program	.	.	.	.	.	.
State education funds	20	2.4	20	3.7	19	3.2
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	.	.	0	.	.	.
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	.	.	.	.	.	.
Other federal funding sources	4	1.2	6!	2.2	3!	1.2
Other state funding sources	5	1.5	9!	3.0	.	.
Other local funding sources	5	1.5	.	.	6!	2.3
Number of district responses	**373**		**189**		**184**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K7).

Table 2.7.3.21c. District funding sources that support Individualized Education Program-specified residential placements for school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	2!	0.8	.	.	2!	1.0
General education funds	47	3.1	45	6.0	48	3.7
Local municipality or county funds	10	1.8	7!	2.4	11	2.3
IDEA, Part B	37	3.0	37	5.8	37	3.6
Private insurance	6	1.4	5!	2.2	7	1.7
Medicaid/Title XIX	13	2.1	11!	3.7	14	2.6
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	.	.	0	.	.	.
State Children's Health Insurance Program	.	.	0	.	.	.
State education funds	20	2.4	15	3.7	22	3.0
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	.	.	0	.	.	.
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	.	.	0	.	.	.
Other federal funding sources	4	1.2	5!	2.3	4!	1.5
Other state funding sources	5	1.5	4!	1.8	6!	2.0
Other local funding sources	5	1.5	.	.	6!	1.9
Number of district responses	**373**		**127**		**246**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K7).

Table 2.7.3.22. District funding sources that support Individualized Education Program-specified residential placements for school-age children with disabilities in separate, non-public day schools

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	.	.
General education funds	49	3.2
Local municipality or county funds	10	1.9
IDEA, Part B	41	3.1
Private insurance	4!	1.1
Medicaid/Title XIX	9	1.8
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	0	.
State Children's Health Insurance Program	.	.
State education funds	20	2.5
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	0	.
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	0	.
Other federal funding sources	4	1.2
Other state funding sources	3!	1.0
Other local funding sources	6	1.6
Number of district responses	**370**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Differences in the characteristics of responders and the full population of districts do not show evidence of potential nonresponse bias.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K8).

Table 2.7.3.22a. District funding sources that support Individualized Education Program-specified residential placements for school-age children with disabilities in separate, non-public day schools, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	.	.	.	.	0	.
General education funds	49	3.2	52	3.5	27*	6.5
Local municipality or county funds	10	1.9	11	2.1	.	.
IDEA, Part B	41	3.1	43	3.4	30	6.7
Private insurance	4!	1.1	4!	1.2	.	.
Medicaid/Title XIX	9	1.8	10	2.0	.	.
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	0	.	0	.	0	.
State Children's Health Insurance Program	.	.	.	.	0	.
State education funds	20	2.5	21	2.8	15!	4.8
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	0	.	0	.	0	.
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	0	.	0	.	0	.
Other federal funding sources	4	1.2	3!	1.1	19!*	5.9
Other state funding sources	3!	1.0	3!	1.2	0*	.
Other local funding sources	6	1.6	6!	1.8	.	.
Number of district responses	**370**		**292**		**78**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Differences in the characteristics of responders and the full population of districts do not show evidence of potential nonresponse bias.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K8).

Table 2.7.3.22b. District funding sources that support Individualized Education Program-specified residential placements for school-age children with disabilities in separate, non-public day schools, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	.	.	.	.	0	.
General education funds	49	3.2	52	4.6	46	4.4
Local municipality or county funds	10	1.9	11	2.7	10	2.7
IDEA, Part B	41	3.1	49	4.6	34*	4.4
Private insurance	4!	1.1	3!	1.4	4!	1.7
Medicaid/Title XIX	9	1.8	8	2.3	10	2.7
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	0	.	0	.	0	.
State Children's Health Insurance Program	.	.	.	.	.	.
State education funds	20	2.5	21	3.9	19	3.4
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	0	.	0	.	0	.
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	0	.	0	.	0	.
Other federal funding sources	4	1.2	4!	1.5	5!	1.8
Other state funding sources	3!	1.0	6!	2.2	0*	.
Other local funding sources	6	1.6	5!	2.2	6!	2.4
Number of district responses	**370**		**193**		**177**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Differences in the characteristics of responders and the full population of districts do not show evidence of potential nonresponse bias.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K8).

Table 2.7.3.22c. District funding sources that support Individualized Education Program-specified residential placements for school-age children with disabilities in separate, non-public day schools, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	.	.	0	.	.	.
General education funds	49	3.2	49	6.2	49	3.8
Local municipality or county funds	10	1.9	10!	3.0	11	2.4
IDEA, Part B	41	3.1	50	5.4	38	3.7
Private insurance	4!	1.1	.	.	4!	1.4
Medicaid/Title XIX	9	1.8	8!	3.0	9	2.2
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	0	.	0	.	0	.
State Children's Health Insurance Program	.	.	0	.	.	.
State education funds	20	2.5	17	4.1	21	3.1
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	0	.	0	.	0	.
TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	0	.	0	.	0	.
Other federal funding sources	4	1.2	6!	2.1	4!	1.4
Other state funding sources	3!	1.0	2!	1.1	3!	1.4
Other local funding sources	6	1.6	.	.	7!	2.2
Number of district responses	**370**		**131**		**239**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent and missing data have not been imputed. Differences in the characteristics of responders and the full population of districts do not show evidence of potential nonresponse bias.

IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K8).

Table 2.7.3.23. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support direct service personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To fund their salaries	86	2.2
To fund their benefits	61	2.8
To provide professional development	50	3.0
Other	5	1.4
None of the above	6	1.6
Number of district responses	**435**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K14).

Table 2.7.3.23a. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support direct service personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To fund their salaries	86	2.2	85	2.5	92	3.2
To fund their benefits	61	2.8	63	3.1	43*	6.0
To provide professional development	50	3.0	51	3.3	41	6.0
Other	5	1.4	5!	1.6	.	.
None of the above	6	1.6	7	1.8	.	.
Number of district responses	**435**		**333**		**102**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K14).

Table 2.7.3.23b. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support direct service personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To fund their salaries	86	2.2	89	2.6	83	3.3
To fund their benefits	61	2.8	72	3.6	51*	4.1
To provide professional development	50	3.0	56	4.2	45	4.0
Other	5	1.4	.	.	5!	1.9
None of the above	6	1.6	6!	1.9	7!	2.5
Number of district responses	**435**		**216**		**219**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K14).

Table 2.7.3.23c. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support direct service personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To fund their salaries	86	2.2	80	5.2	88	2.3
To fund their benefits	61	2.8	51	5.4	64*	3.2
To provide professional development	50	3.0	47	5.5	51	3.5
Other	5	1.4	.	.	6!	1.8
None of the above	6	1.6	12!	4.4	5!	1.5
Number of district responses	**435**		**153**		**282**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K14).

Table 2.7.3.24. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support administrators and administrative support staff who serve school-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To fund their salaries	48	2.9
To fund their benefits	36	2.7
To provide professional development	34	2.8
Other	2!	1.0
None of the above	40	2.9
Number of district responses	**432**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K15).

Table 2.7.3.24a. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support administrators and administrative support staff who serve school-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To fund their salaries	48	2.9	51	3.2	32*	5.8
To fund their benefits	36	2.7	39	3.0	14!*	4.2
To provide professional development	34	2.8	36	3.1	19*	4.9
Other	2!	1.0	3!	1.1	0*	.
None of the above	40	2.9	37	3.2	60*	6.1
Number of district responses	**432**		**330**		**102**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K15).

Table 2.7.3.24b. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support administrators and administrative support staff who serve school-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To fund their salaries	48	2.9	60	4.1	38*	4.0
To fund their benefits	36	2.7	51	4.2	23*	3.5
To provide professional development	34	2.8	45	4.4	23*	3.4
Other	2!	1.0	.	.	4!	1.7
None of the above	40	2.9	32	3.9	48*	4.1
Number of district responses	**432**		**215**		**217**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K15).

Table 2.7.3.24c. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support administrators and administrative support staff who serve school-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To fund their salaries	48	2.9	39	5.0	51	3.5
To fund their benefits	36	2.7	27	4.7	39*	3.3
To provide professional development	34	2.8	31	5.1	34	3.3
Other	2!	1.0	.	.	3!	1.2
None of the above	40	2.9	45	5.0	39	3.4
Number of district responses	**432**		**152**		**280**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K15).

Table 2.7.3.25. Personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities and whose salaries, benefits, or contracts are supported by Part B special education program funds

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Guidance counselors	3	0.9
Nursing/medical personnel	10	1.7
Paraprofessionals, such as teacher aides/instructional assistants, occupational therapy assistants, personal aides, or health aides	56	2.8
Reading specialists	5	1.2
School psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	42	2.8
Special education teachers, including itinerant teachers or coaches	61	2.9
Speech/communication therapists or pathologists	46	2.9
Other related services personnel (for example, occupational or physical therapists)	31	2.6
Other	6	1.4
None of the above	14	2.2
Number of district responses	**432**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K16).

Table 2.7.3.25a. Personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities and whose salaries, benefits, or contracts are supported by Part B special education program funds, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Guidance counselors	3	0.9	2!	0.9	6!	2.9
Nursing/medical personnel	10	1.7	11	2.0	5!	2.7
Paraprofessionals, such as teacher aides/instructional assistants, occupational therapy assistants, personal aides, or health aides	56	2.8	58	3.1	44	6.1
Reading specialists	5	1.2	4	1.3	6!	2.7
School psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	42	2.8	43	3.1	37	5.9
Special education teachers, including itinerant teachers or coaches	61	2.9	60	3.2	71	5.5
Speech/communication therapists or pathologists	46	2.9	45	3.2	56	6.0
Other related services personnel (for example, occupational or physical therapists)	31	2.6	31	2.9	27	5.4
Other	6	1.4	7	1.6	.	.
None of the above	14	2.2	14	2.5	13!	4.1
Number of district responses	**432**		**330**		**102**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K16).

Table 2.7.3.25b. Personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities and whose salaries, benefits, or contracts are supported by Part B special education program funds, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Guidance counselors	3	0.9	3!	1.2	3!	1.2
Nursing/medical personnel	10	1.7	13	2.7	8	2.3
Paraprofessionals, such as teacher aides/instructional assistants, occupational therapy assistants, personal aides, or health aides	56	2.8	63	4.1	49*	4.0
Reading specialists	5	1.2	2!	1.0	7!	2.0
School psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	42	2.8	48	4.2	37	3.8
Special education teachers, including itinerant teachers or coaches	61	2.9	62	4.2	61	4.0
Speech/communication therapists or pathologists	46	2.9	44	4.2	48	4.0
Other related services personnel (for example, occupational or physical therapists)	31	2.6	36	4.0	26*	3.4
Other	6	1.4	9	2.5	4!	1.7
None of the above	14	2.2	12	3.1	15	3.2
Number of district responses	**432**		**214**		**218**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K16).

Table 2.7.3.25c. Personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities and whose salaries, benefits, or contracts are supported by Part B special education program funds, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of	Standard error	Percentage of	Standard error	Percentage of	Standard error
Guidance counselors	3	0.9	3!	1.6	3!	1.0
Nursing/medical personnel	10	1.7	12	3.4	10	2.0
Paraprofessionals, such as teacher aides/instructional assistants, occupational therapy assistants, personal aides, or health aides	56	2.8	49	4.8	58	3.4
Reading specialists	5	1.2	7!	2.6	4!	1.3
School psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	42	2.8	36	5.4	44	3.3
Special education teachers, including itinerant teachers or coaches	61	2.9	58	5.5	63	3.4
Speech/communication therapists or pathologists	46	2.9	40	5.1	48	3.5
Other related services personnel (for example, occupational or physical therapists)	31	2.6	22	4.0	34*	3.2
Other	6	1.4	7!	2.4	6	1.8
None of the above	14	2.2	23	5.3	11*	2.3
Number of district responses	**432**		**153**		**279**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K16).

Table 2.7.3.26. Direct services for school-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Special education or related services provided directly by the district	65	2.8
Special education or related services provided through contracted services	55	2.9
Contracted student placements outside of the school district	19	2.3
Other	.	.
None of the above	14	2.1
Number of district responses	**433**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K17).

Table 2.7.3.26a. Direct services for school-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Special education or related services provided directly by the district	65	2.8	64	3.2	71	5.4
Special education or related services provided through contracted services	55	2.9	55	3.2	57	6.0
Contracted student placements outside of the school district	19	2.3	21	2.6	7!*	3.1
Other	.	.	.	.	.	.
None of the above	14	2.1	13	2.4	18	4.6
Number of district responses	**433**		**330**		**103**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K17).

Table 2.7.3.26b. Direct services for school-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Special education or related services provided directly by the district	65	2.8	69	4.1	62	4.0
Special education or related services provided through contracted services	55	2.9	61	4.1	51	4.0
Contracted student placements outside of the school district	19	2.3	24	3.6	15*	2.8
Other	.	.	.	.	.	.
None of the above	14	2.1	11	2.9	16	3.1
Number of district responses	**433**		**214**		**219**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K17).

Table 2.7.3.26c. Direct services for school-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Special education or related services provided directly by the district	65	2.8	60	5.4	67	3.3
Special education or related services provided through contracted services	55	2.9	49	5.4	58	3.4
Contracted student placements outside of the school district	19	2.3	25	4.8	17	2.5
Other	.	.	.	.	.	.
None of the above	14	2.1	18	4.7	12	2.3
Number of district responses	**433**		**153**		**280**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K17).

Table 2.7.3.27. Supplies, equipment, or facility modifications for school-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Provide assistive technology or specialized equipment	52	2.9
Maintain, repair, manage, and upgrade assistive technology or specialized equipment	33	2.7
Make modifications to facilities to meet the unique needs of school-age children with disabilities	13	1.9
Provide instructional materials, specialized curriculum, or instructional software	55	2.9
Provide non-instructional software, supplies, and equipment	27	2.6
Other	2!	1.0
None of the above	32	2.7
Number of district responses	**436**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K18).

Table 2.7.3.27a. Supplies, equipment, or facility modifications for school-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Provide assistive technology or specialized equipment	52	2.9	55	3.2	33*	5.8
Maintain, repair, manage, and upgrade assistive technology or specialized equipment	33	2.7	36	3.1	15*	4.3
Make modifications to facilities to meet the unique needs of school-age children with disabilities	13	1.9	14	2.2	7!*	2.8
Provide instructional materials, specialized curriculum, or instructional software	55	2.9	57	3.2	42*	6.0
Provide non-instructional software, supplies, and equipment	27	2.6	30	2.9	7!*	3.0
Other	2!	1.0	2!	1.1	.	.
None of the above	32	2.7	30	3.0	46*	6.0
Number of district responses	**436**		**333**		**103**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K18).

Table 2.7.3.27b. Supplies, equipment, or facility modifications for school-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Provide assistive technology or specialized equipment	52	2.9	61	4.2	44*	3.9
Maintain, repair, manage, and upgrade assistive technology or specialized equipment	33	2.7	41	4.2	27*	3.5
Make modifications to facilities to meet the unique needs of school-age children with disabilities	13	1.9	17	3.2	10	2.3
Provide instructional materials, specialized curriculum, or instructional software	55	2.9	62	4.1	49*	4.0
Provide non-instructional software, supplies, and equipment	27	2.6	39	4.3	16*	2.8
Other	2!	1.0	.	.	.	.
None of the above	32	2.7	26	3.6	36	3.9
Number of district responses	**436**		**216**		**220**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K18).

Table 2.7.3.27c. Supplies, equipment, or facility modifications for school-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Provide assistive technology or specialized equipment	52	2.9	45	5.3	54	3.4
Maintain, repair, manage, and upgrade assistive technology or specialized equipment	33	2.7	32	5.1	34	3.2
Make modifications to facilities to meet the unique needs of school-age children with disabilities	13	1.9	14	3.5	13	2.3
Provide instructional materials, specialized curriculum, or instructional software	55	2.9	49	5.5	57	3.4
Provide non-instructional software, supplies, and equipment	27	2.6	21	4.1	29	3.1
Other	2!	1.0	.	.	3!	1.3
None of the above	32	2.7	40	5.5	29	3.1
Number of district responses	**436**		**154**		**282**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question K18).

Table 2.7.3.28. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support direct service personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To fund their salaries	75	2.9
To fund their benefits	53	3.3
To provide professional development	42	3.3
Other	9	2.0
None of the above	12	2.3
Number of district responses	**313**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I3).

Table 2.7.3.28a. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support direct service personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of	Standard error	Percentage of	Standard error	Percentage of	Standard error
To fund their salaries	75	2.9	76	2.9	46!	15.2
To fund their benefits	53	3.3	54	3.4	.	.
To provide professional development	42	3.3	42	3.4	.	.
Other	9	2.0	9	2.0	.	.
None of the above	12	2.3	12	2.3	.	.
Number of district responses	**313**		**289**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I3).

Table 2.7.3.28b. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support direct service personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of	Standard error	Percentage of	Standard error	Percentage of	Standard error
To fund their salaries	75	2.9	78	3.7	72	4.7
To fund their benefits	53	3.3	58	4.3	49	5.1
To provide professional development	42	3.3	44	4.3	39	5.1
Other	9	2.0	10	2.7	8!	2.8
None of the above	12	2.3	7!	2.3	18*	4.1
Number of district responses	**313**		**187**		**126**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I3).

Table 2.7.3.28c. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support direct service personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To fund their salaries	75	2.9	64	5.9	78*	3.3
To fund their benefits	53	3.3	45	6.1	56	3.9
To provide professional development	42	3.3	36	5.9	43	3.8
Other	9	2.0	.	.	11	2.4
None of the above	12	2.3	19	5.1	10	2.5
Number of district responses	**313**		**88**		**225**	

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I3).

Table 2.7.3.29. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support administrators and administrative support staff who serve preschool-age children with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To fund their salaries	41	3.4
To fund their benefits	27	3.0
To provide professional development	29	3.0
Other	5!	1.5
None of the above	45	3.4
Number of district responses	**312**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I4).

Table 2.7.3.29a. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support administrators and administrative support staff who serve preschool-age children with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To fund their salaries	41	3.4	41	3.4	.	.
To fund their benefits	27	3.0	27	3.1	.	.
To provide professional development	29	3.0	29	3.1	.	.
Other	5!	1.5	5!	1.5	0*	.
None of the above	45	3.4	45	3.5	55	15.2
Number of district responses	**312**		**288**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I4).

Table 2.7.3.29b. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support administrators and administrative support staff who serve preschool-age children with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To fund their salaries	41	3.4	43	4.5	38	5.0
To fund their benefits	27	3.0	28	4.0	25	4.5
To provide professional development	29	3.0	30	4.0	28	4.6
Other	5!	1.5	5!	2.1	.	.
None of the above	45	3.4	42	4.5	49	5.2
Number of district responses	**312**		**186**		**126**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I4).

Table 2.7.3.29c. Ways in which districts use Part B special education program funds to support administrators and administrative support staff who serve preschool-age children with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
To fund their salaries	41	3.4	38	6.4	42	3.9
To fund their benefits	27	3.0	22	5.3	28	3.5
To provide professional development	29	3.0	28	5.3	29	3.5
Other	5!	1.5	.	.	5!	1.7
None of the above	45	3.4	42	6.5	46	4.0
Number of district responses	**312**		**89**		**223**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I4).

Table 2.7.3.30. Personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities in districts and whose salaries, benefits, or contracts are supported by Part B special education program funds

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Nursing/medical personnel	13	2.2
Paraprofessionals, such as teacher aides/instructional assistants, occupational therapy assistants, personal aides, or health aides	55	3.3
School psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	34	3.2
Preschool special education teachers, including itinerant teachers or coaches	41	3.3
Speech/communication therapists or pathologists	49	3.4
Other related services personnel (for example, occupational or physical therapists)	33	3.2
Other	3!	1.1
None of the above	18	2.5
Number of district responses	**311**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I5).

Table 2.7.3.30a. Personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities in districts and whose salaries, benefits, or contracts are supported by Part B special education program funds, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Nursing/medical personnel	13	2.2	13	2.3	0*	.
Paraprofessionals, such as teacher aides/instructional assistants, occupational therapy assistants, personal aides, or health aides	55	3.3	56	3.4	33!	14.6
School psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	34	3.2	34	3.3	.	.
Preschool special education teachers, including itinerant teachers or coaches	41	3.3	42	3.3	.	.
Speech/communication therapists or pathologists	49	3.4	49	3.5	33!	14.5
Other related services personnel (for example, occupational or physical therapists)	33	3.2	34	3.3	.	.
Other	3!	1.1	3!	1.2	0*	.
None of the above	18	2.5	17	2.5	31!	14.0
Number of district responses	**311**		**287**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I5).

Table 2.7.3.30b. Personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities in districts and whose salaries, benefits, or contracts are supported by Part B special education program funds, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Nursing/medical personnel	13	2.2	13	2.8	12	3.4
Paraprofessionals, such as teacher aides/instructional assistants, occupational therapy assistants, personal aides, or health aides	55	3.3	57	4.4	53	5.1
School psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	34	3.2	35	4.3	33	4.8
Preschool special education teachers, including itinerant teachers or coaches	41	3.3	44	4.4	37	5.0
Speech/communication therapists or pathologists	49	3.4	42	4.5	56*	5.2
Other related services personnel (for example, occupational or physical therapists)	33	3.2	32	4.1	35	5.0
Other	3!	1.1	5!	1.9	.	.
None of the above	18	2.5	16	3.3	19	4.0
Number of district responses	**311**		**184**		**127**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I5).

Table 2.7.3.30c. Personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities in districts and whose salaries, benefits, or contracts are supported by Part B special education program funds, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Nursing/medical personnel	13	2.2	14!	4.2	12	2.6
Paraprofessionals, such as teacher aides/instructional assistants, occupational therapy assistants, personal aides, or health aides	55	3.3	48	6.0	57	3.9
School psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	34	3.2	27	5.8	36	3.7
Preschool special education teachers, including itinerant teachers or coaches	41	3.3	35	5.7	42	3.8
Speech/communication therapists or pathologists	49	3.4	36	6.5	52*	3.9
Other related services personnel (for example, occupational or physical therapists)	33	3.2	25	5.3	35	3.8
Other	3!	1.1	.	.	3!	1.3
None of the above	18	2.5	33	6.2	14*	2.7
Number of district responses	**311**		**88**		**223**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I5).

Table 2.7.3.31. Direct services for preschool-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Special education or related services provided directly by the district	55	3.3
Special education or related services provided through contracted services	49	3.3
Contracted student placements outside of the school district	10	2.0
Other	3!	1.4
None of the above	20	2.6
Number of district responses	**313**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I6).

Table 2.7.3.31a. Direct services for preschool-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Special education or related services provided directly by the district	55	3.3	56	3.4	42!	14.8
Special education or related services provided through contracted services	49	3.3	50	3.4	.	.
Contracted student placements outside of the school district	10	2.0	10	2.0	.	.
Other	3!	1.4	3!	1.4	0*	.
None of the above	20	2.6	19	2.6	44!	15.4
Number of district responses	**313**		**289**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I6).

Table 2.7.3.31b. Direct services for preschool-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Special education or related services provided directly by the district	55	3.3	63	4.2	46*	5.2
Special education or related services provided through contracted services	49	3.3	44	4.4	54	5.1
Contracted student placements outside of the school district	10	2.0	10	2.4	10!	3.2
Other	3!	1.4	.	.	.	.
None of the above	20	2.6	19	3.5	21	4.1
Number of district responses	**313**		**186**		**127**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I6).

Table 2.7.3.31c. Direct services for preschool-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Special education or related services provided directly by the district	55	3.3	46	6.3	57	3.8
Special education or related services provided through contracted services	49	3.3	27	6.0	54*	3.9
Contracted student placements outside of the school district	10	2.0	11!	4.3	9	2.2
Other	3!	1.4	.	.	3!	1.6
None of the above	20	2.6	37	6.9	15*	2.7
Number of district responses	**313**		**88**		**225**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I6).

Table 2.7.3.32. Supplies, equipment, or facility modifications for preschool-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Provide assistive technology or specialized equipment	47	3.4
Maintain, repair, manage, and upgrade assistive technology or specialized equipment	30	3.1
Make modifications to facilities to meet the unique needs of preschool-age children with disabilities	16	2.5
Provide instructional materials, specialized curriculum, or instructional software	50	3.4
Provide non-instructional software, supplies, and equipment	23	2.9
Other	3!	1.3
None of the above	33	3.3
Number of district responses	**310**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I7).

Table 2.7.3.32a. Supplies, equipment, or facility modifications for preschool-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Provide assistive technology or specialized equipment	47	3.4	47	3.5	39!	15.0
Maintain, repair, manage, and upgrade assistive technology or specialized equipment	30	3.1	30	3.1	.	.
Make modifications to facilities to meet the unique needs of preschool-age children with disabilities	16	2.5	16	2.6	0*	.
Provide instructional materials, specialized curriculum, or instructional software	50	3.4	51	3.5	28!	13.3
Provide non-instructional software, supplies, and equipment	23	2.9	23	2.9	.	.
Other	3!	1.3	3!	1.3	0*	.
None of the above	33	3.3	33	3.3	36!	14.8
Number of district responses	**310**		**286**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I7).

Table 2.7.3.32b. Supplies, equipment, or facility modifications for preschool-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Provide assistive technology or specialized equipment	47	3.4	47	4.5	48	5.2
Maintain, repair, manage, and upgrade assistive technology or specialized equipment	30	3.1	34	4.3	25	4.4
Make modifications to facilities to meet the unique needs of preschool-age children with disabilities	16	2.5	16	3.4	15	3.7
Provide instructional materials, specialized curriculum, or instructional software	50	3.4	55	4.5	45	5.2
Provide non-instructional software, supplies, and equipment	23	2.9	27	4.1	19	4.0
Other	3!	1.3	3!	1.6	.	.
None of the above	33	3.3	32	4.3	33	5.0
Number of district responses	**310**		**184**		**126**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I7).

Table 2.7.3.32c. Supplies, equipment, or facility modifications for preschool-age children with disabilities that are supported by Part B special education program funds in districts, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Provide assistive technology or specialized equipment	47	3.4	44	6.8	48	3.9
Maintain, repair, manage, and upgrade assistive technology or specialized equipment	30	3.1	27	5.9	30	3.5
Make modifications to facilities to meet the unique needs of preschool-age children with disabilities	16	2.5	18	4.9	15	2.8
Provide instructional materials, specialized curriculum, or instructional software	50	3.4	44	6.7	52	3.9
Provide non-instructional software, supplies, and equipment	23	2.9	19	5.5	24	3.3
Other	3!	1.3	.	.	3!	1.5
None of the above	33	3.3	37	6.7	32	3.7
Number of district responses	**310**		**88**		**222**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I7).

Table 2.7.3.33. Percentage of districts with regional cooperative, intermediate, or service centers that provide services to preschool-age children with special education needs

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	60	3.4
Yes	40	3.4
Number of district responses	**316**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I9).

Table 2.7.3.33a. Percentage of districts with regional cooperative, intermediate, or service centers that provide services to preschool-age children with special education needs, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	60	3.4	59	3.5	75	13.0
Yes	40	3.4	41	3.5	.	.
Number of district responses	**316**		**293**		**23**	

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I9).

Table 2.7.3.33b. Percentage of districts with regional cooperative, intermediate, or service centers that provide services to preschool-age children with special education needs, by district size

Response	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	60	3.4	64	4.4	55	5.3
Yes	40	3.4	36	4.4	45	5.3
Number of district responses	**316**		**188**		**128**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I9).

Table 2.7.3.33c. Percentage of districts with regional cooperative, intermediate, or service centers that provide services to preschool-age children with special education needs, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	60	3.4	64	5.9	59	4.0
Yes	40	3.4	36	5.9	41	4.0
Number of district responses	**316**		**87**		**229**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I9).

Table 2.7.3.34. Percentage of districts in which Part B special education funding supports regional cooperative, intermediate, or service centers for preschool-age children with special education needs

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
No	42	5.2
Yes	58	5.2
Number of district responses	**118**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having regional cooperative, intermediate, and/or service centers that provide services to preschool-age children with special education needs (n=122). Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I10).

Table 2.7.3.35. Special education supports districts provide to preschool-age children through regional cooperative, intermediate, or service centers

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Child Find disability screening	59	4.8
Evaluations and diagnostic services	65	5.0
Case management and referrals to services	50	5.2
Equipment and assistive technologies	51	5.5
Transportation services	30	4.9
Mental and behavioral health services	33	5.2
Personal aide services	23	4.5
Occupational therapy	59	4.6
Physical therapy	60	4.4
Speech or language therapy	62	4.8
Professional development for staff supporting preschool-age children with IEPs	55	5.2
Specialized instruction (for example, Braille, orientation and mobility, sign language, or applied behavioral analysis)	55	5.2
Other	6!	2.2
Number of district responses	**122**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having regional cooperative, intermediate, and/or service centers that provide services to preschool-age children with special education needs (n=122). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I11).

Table 2.7.3.36. Ages of preschool-age children with disabilities served by regional cooperative, intermediate, or service centers

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
3-year-olds	95	2.2
4-year-olds	96	2.2
5-year-olds	80	4.2
Number of district responses	**122**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having regional cooperative, intermediate, and/or service centers that provide services to preschool-age children with special education needs (n=122). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question I12).

2.8.1. Personnel allocation: Qualification standards

Table 2.8.1.1. State agencies responsible for licensing and certification of special education classroom teachers

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
State education agency (SEA)	42	6
State licensing and certification agency that is not part of the SEA	11	3
Other	0	1
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

SEA = state education agency.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question N1).

Table 2.8.1.2a. Ways in which special education classroom teachers can qualify for traditional certification (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of states where this is required	Number of states where this is optional	Number of states where this is not applicable
Portfolio	5	8	36
Exam/proficiency test	44	4	3
Undergraduate or graduate degree program	42	8	0
Coursework (not leading to a degree)	16	19	15
Other	4	7	38
Number of state responses	**51**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia. Respondents were asked not to include emergency certifications.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question N2).

Table 2.8.1.2b. Ways in which special education classroom teachers can qualify for traditional certification (entities)

Response category	Number of entities where this is required	Number of entities where this is optional	Number of entities where this is not applicable
Portfolio	2	2	5
Exam/proficiency test	6	0	2
Undergraduate or graduate degree program	9	0	0
Coursework (not leading to a degree)	4	1	4
Other	1	1	7
Number of entity responses	**9**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked not to include emergency certifications.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question N2).

Table 2.8.1.3a. Ways in which special education classroom teachers can qualify for certification through alternative routes (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of states where this is required	Number of states where this is optional	Number of states where this is not applicable
Portfolio	4	7	37
Exam/proficiency test	31	9	10
Undergraduate or graduate degree program	29	13	8
Coursework (not leading to a degree)	13	19	17
Other	5	7	36
Number of state responses	**50**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia. Respondents were asked not to include emergency certifications.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question N3).

Table 2.8.1.3b. Ways in which special education classroom teachers can qualify for certification through alternative routes (entities)

Response category	Number of entities where this is required	Number of entities where this is optional	Number of entities where this is not applicable
Portfolio	1	1	7
Exam/proficiency test	1	0	7
Undergraduate or graduate degree program	5	0	4
Coursework (not leading to a degree)	2	0	7
Other	1	1	7
Number of entity responses	**9**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked not to include emergency certifications.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question N3).

Table 2.8.1.4. Number of states that allow special education classroom teachers to transfer certification from a reciprocating state

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	7	5
Yes	43	4
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question N4).

Table 2.8.1.5a. Ways (required or optional) in which states measure subject matter knowledge for special education teachers at the elementary school level (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of states where this measure is required	Number of states where this measure is optional	Number of states where this measure is not applicable
Performance evaluation	22	8	20
Portfolio	2	12	36
Classroom experience	11	14	25
Student achievement data	7	9	34
Content area test scores (for example, PRAXIS, state-developed tests)	42	6	2
National Board certification	2	33	15
Completion of professional development, including additional coursework	20	15	15
Other	1	1	46
Number of state responses	**50**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia. For the purpose of this question, respondents were told that elementary schools are schools for which the lowest grade is 3 or lower, and the highest grade is 8 or lower.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question N5).

Table 2.8.1.5b. Ways (required or optional) in which entities measure subject matter knowledge for special education teachers at the elementary school level (entities)

Response category	Number of entities where this measure is required	Number of entities where this measure is optional	Number of entities where this measure is not applicable
Performance evaluation	5	1	2
Portfolio	2	1	5
Classroom experience	3	1	4
Student achievement data	1	3	5
Content area test scores (for example, PRAXIS, state-developed tests)	5	1	2
National Board certification	2	3	3
Completion of professional development, including additional coursework	4	4	1
Other	0	0	8
Number of entity responses	**9**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. For the purpose of this question, respondents were told that elementary schools are schools for which the lowest grade is 3 or lower, and the highest grade is 8 or lower.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question N5).

Table 2.8.1.6a. Ways (required or optional) in which states measure subject matter knowledge for special education teachers at the middle school level (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of states where this measure is required	Number of states where this measure is optional	Number of states where this measure is not applicable
Performance evaluation	22	10	18
Portfolio	4	9	36
Classroom experience	11	13	26
Student achievement data	5	11	34
Content area test scores (for example, PRAXIS, state-developed tests)	39	9	2
National Board certification	0	35	15
Completion of professional development, including additional coursework	23	12	15
Other	1	1	46
Number of state responses	**50**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia. For the purpose of this question, respondents were told that middle schools are schools for which the lowest grade is between 4 and 7, and the highest grade is between 4 and 9.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question N6).

Table 2.8.1.6b. Ways (required or optional) in which entities measure subject matter knowledge for special education teachers at the middle school level (entities)

Response category	Number of entities where this measure is required	Number of entities where this measure is optional	Number of entities where this measure is not applicable
Performance evaluation	5	1	2
Portfolio	2	1	5
Classroom experience	2	2	4
Student achievement data	0	3	5
Content area test scores (for example, PRAXIS, state-developed tests)	5	1	2
National Board certification	2	3	3
Completion of professional development, including additional coursework	3	4	1
Other	0	0	9
Number of entity responses	**9**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. For the purpose of this question, respondents were told that middle schools are schools for which the lowest grade is between 4 and 7, and the highest grade is between 4 and 9.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question N6).

Table 2.8.1.7a. Ways (required or optional) in which states measure subject matter knowledge for special education teachers at the high school level (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of states where this measure is required	Number of states where this measure is optional	Number of states where this measure is not applicable
Performance evaluation	22	9	19
Portfolio	4	11	35
Classroom experience	12	12	26
Student achievement data	6	12	32
Content area test scores (for example, PRAXIS, state-developed tests)	39	9	2
National Board certification	0	35	15
Completion of professional development, including additional coursework	22	12	16
Other	2	1	45
Number of state responses	**50**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia. For the purpose of this question, respondents were told that high schools are schools for which the lowest grade is 7 or higher and the highest grade is 12.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question N7).

Table 2.8.1.7b. Ways (required or optional) in which entities measure subject matter knowledge for special education teachers at the high school level (entities)

Response category	Number of entities where this measure is required	Number of entities where this measure is optional	Number of entities where this measure is not applicable
Performance evaluation	6	0	2
Portfolio	1	2	5
Classroom experience	2	2	4
Student achievement data	0	3	5
Content area test scores (for example, PRAXIS, state-developed tests)	5	1	2
National Board certification	2	3	3
Completion of professional development, including additional coursework	4	3	1
Other	0	0	8
Number of entity responses	**8**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. For the purpose of this question, respondents were told that high schools are schools for which the lowest grade is 7 or higher and the highest grade is 12.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question N7).

Table 2.8.1.8. State agencies responsible for licensing and certification of preschool special education teachers

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
State education agency (SEA)	45	5
State licensing and certification agency that is not part of the SEA	11	2
Other	0	2
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

SEA = state education agency.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question L1).

Table 2.8.1.9. Credentials required for preschool special educators in states

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No certification, licensure, or other credential is required	0	0
General early childhood certification or credential (no special education requirements)	0	1
General early childhood certification or credential (including special education requirements)	2	1
General early childhood certification/credential plus preschool special education add-on or endorsement	3	0
Blended early childhood/early childhood special education certification or credential	8	0
Early childhood special education certification or credential	14	1
Special education certification or credential	13	2
Special education certification/credential plus preschool special education add-on or endorsement	2	1
Other	9	3
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question L2).

Table 2.8.1.10a. Ways in which preschool special education classroom teachers can qualify for traditional certification (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of states where this is required	Number of states where this is optional	Number of states where this is not applicable
Portfolio	12	6	32
Exam/proficiency test	42	4	5
Undergraduate/graduate degree	47	4	0
Coursework (not leading to a degree)	12	12	27
Other	2	7	42
Number of state responses	**51**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia. Respondents were asked not to include emergency certifications.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question L3).

Table 2.8.1.10b. Ways in which preschool special education classroom teachers can qualify for traditional certification (entities)

Response category	Number of entities where this is required	Number of entities where this is optional	Number of entities where this is not applicable
Portfolio	1	1	7
Exam/proficiency test	5	0	4
Undergraduate/graduate degree	6	0	3
Coursework (not leading to a degree)	4	1	4
Other	1	0	7
Number of entity responses	**9**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked not to include emergency certifications.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question L3).

Table 2.8.1.11a. Ways in which preschool special education classroom teachers can qualify for certification through alternative routes (50 states and DC)

Response category	Number of states where this is required	Number of states where this is optional	Number of states where this is not applicable
Portfolio	8	3	39
Exam/proficiency test	27	6	18
Undergraduate/graduate degree	30	8	13
Coursework (not leading to a degree)	7	13	31
Other	5	4	42
Number of state responses	**51**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (n=51). Surveys were sent to 50 states and District of Columbia. Respondents were asked not to include emergency certifications.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question L4).

Table 2.8.1.11b. Ways in which preschool special education classroom teachers can qualify for certification through alternative routes (entities)

Response category	Number of entities where this is required	Number of entities where this is optional	Number of entities where this is not applicable
Portfolio	3	0	6
Exam/proficiency test	3	0	6
Undergraduate/graduate degree	6	0	3
Coursework (not leading to a degree)	4	0	5
Other	0	1	7
Number of entity responses	**9**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (n=9). Surveys were sent to nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked not to include emergency certifications.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question L4).

Table 2.8.1.12. Number of states that allow preschool special education classroom teachers to transfer certification from a reciprocating state

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
No	11	3
Yes	39	4
Number of responses	**50**	**7**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question L5).

Table 2.8.1.13. State or lead agencies responsible for licensing and certification of early intervention service providers

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Part C early intervention lead agency	29	2
State education agency (SEA) (if not lead agency)	19	3
State licensing/certification agency that is not part of the SEA or the early intervention lead agency	34	1
Other	4	1
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

SEA = state education agency.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question J1).

Table 2.8.1.14. Ways in which early intervention service providers qualify for licensing or certification

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Portfolio	10	1
Exam/proficiency test	23	2
Undergraduate or graduate degree program	44	3
Coursework (not leading to a degree)	19	2
Background check	29	2
Certification transfer from reciprocating state	18	5
Other	11	1
None of the above	1	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question J2).

Table 2.8.1.15. Age ranges for which special educator (early intervention service provider) certification or credential is applicable in states

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Birth to age 3	20	3
Birth to age 5	11	1
Birth to age 8	9	0
Other	8	2
Number of responses	**48**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question J3).

Table 2.8.1.16. Frequency of training schools offer for general education teachers that focuses on working with students with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
At least once a month	9	1.2
Once every two months	10	1.3
Twice a year	27	1.6
Once a year	30	1.8
Less than every year	17	1.5
Never	7	1.0
Number of school responses	**1,355**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G8).

Table 2.8.1.16a. Frequency of training schools offer for general education teachers that focuses on working with students with disabilities, by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
At least once a month	9	1.2	9	1.3	6!	2.0	6!	1.8
Once every two months	10	1.3	10	1.4	8	2.5	19*	3.6
Twice a year	27	1.6	27	1.7	29	3.8	36	4.4
Once a year	30	1.8	30	1.9	31	4.3	19*	3.4
Less than every year	17	1.5	17	1.6	17	3.5	16	3.3
Never	7	1.0	7	1.1	9	2.4	5!	1.8
Number of school responses	**1,355**		**969**		**176**		**210**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G8).

Table 2.8.1.16b. Frequency of training schools offer for general education teachers that focuses on working with students with disabilities, by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
At least once a month	9	1.2	11	2.2	7	1.1
Once every two months	10	1.3	11	2.4	9	1.3
Twice a year	27	1.6	24	2.3	30	2.3
Once a year	30	1.8	31	2.9	29	2.2
Less than every year	17	1.5	15	2.3	19	1.9
Never	7	1.0	8	1.8	6	1.1
Number of school responses	**1,355**		**652**		**703**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G8).

Table 2.8.1.16c. Frequency of training schools offer for general education teachers that focuses on working with students with disabilities, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response category	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
At least once a month	9	1.2	9	1.6	9	2.0
Once every two months	10	1.3	10	1.7	10	2.0
Twice a year	27	1.6	30	2.4	23	2.3
Once a year	30	1.8	28	2.2	32	3.1
Less than every year	17	1.5	17	1.9	17	2.3
Never	7	1.0	6	1.1	8	1.9
Number of school responses	**1,355**		**812**		**522**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G8).

Table 2.8.1.17. Typical lengths of schools' training sessions for general education teachers that focus on working with students with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Less than an hour	15	1.5
One hour	37	2.0
Two hours	29	1.9
Three to five hours	13	1.6
Six to eight hours	5	1.0
More than eight hours	.	.
Number of school responses	**1,256**	

. Value not reported because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering training for general education teachers that focuses on working with students with disabilities (n=1,257). If the session lengths vary, respondents were asked to select the answer that is closest to the average length. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G9).

Table 2.8.1.18. Topics included in schools' training sessions for general education teachers focused on working with students with disabilities during the 2018–2019 school year (including summer 2018)

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Addressing the needs of students with a specific type of disability	24	1.8
Implementing co-teaching models in the classroom	44	2.5
Delivering an intervention focused on language/literacy skills	47	2.4
Delivering an intervention focused on math/science skills	40	2.1
Delivering a curriculum or intervention focused on social-emotional/behavioral skills	44	2.0
Effective implementation of behavioral support plans and high quality Functional Behavioral Analysis	31	2.0
Effective implementation of assistive technology	14	1.6
Following behavioral plans for students with disabilities	46	2.1
New policies/regulations/guidelines for serving students with disabilities	34	2.4
Provision of accommodations	50	2.1
Risk factors or signs of disability	18	1.6
Use and benefits of Universal Design for Learning	19	2.0
Using assessments to inform instructional planning and data-based decision making	41	2.0
Using evidence-based practices for serving students with disabilities	34	2.1
Other topics related to serving students with disabilities	6	0.9
Number of school responses	**1,257**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering training for general education teachers that focuses on working with students with disabilities (n=1,257). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G10).

2.8.2. Personnel allocation: Staffing shortages and initiatives

Table 2.8.2.1. Disciplines for which statewide early intervention systems had difficulty finding qualified Part C early intervention professionals during the 2018, 2019, or 2020 fiscal years

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Audiologists	18	2
Behavioral analysts or experts	22	4
Family therapists	11	1
Nurses	11	1
Occupational therapists	34	5
Orientation/mobility specialists	15	1
Pediatricians and other physicians	3	1
Physical therapists	38	4
Psychologists	14	3
Registered dietitians	10	2
Service coordinators	16	3
Social workers	12	1
Special instructors	27	3
Speech/language pathologists	37	3
Vision specialists including ophthalmologists and optometrists	22	1
Other	9	0
None of the above	1	0
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question K1).

Table 2.8.2.2. Disciplines for which statewide early intervention systems had difficulty retaining qualified Part C early intervention professionals during the 2018, 2019, or 2020 fiscal years

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Audiologists	5	2
Behavioral analysts or experts	9	2
Family therapists	5	2
Nurses	7	1
Occupational therapists	27	5
Orientation/mobility specialists	1	1
Pediatricians and other physicians	2	1
Physical therapists	31	4
Psychologists	9	1
Registered dietitians	5	2
Service coordinators	22	3
Social workers	10	1
Special instructors	22	2
Speech/language pathologists	31	3
Vision specialists including ophthalmologists and optometrists	5	1
Other	3	0
None of the above	6	0
Number of responses	**50**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question K2).

Table 2.8.2.3. Types of effective special education personnel who work with school-age children that districts had difficulty finding and retaining during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020)

Response category	Percentage of districts that had difficulty finding personnel	Percentage of districts that had difficulty retaining personnel	Percentage of districts that had no difficulty finding or retaining personnel
Special education teachers who serve children in:			
Elementary school (SE)	43 (3.0)	24 (2.5)	51 (3.0)
Middle school (SE)	44 (3.1)	24 (2.6)	48 (3.1)
High school (SE)	45 (3.0)	27 (2.7)	49 (3.0)
Vocational or alternative school (SE)	36 (3.1)	19 (2.5)	59 (3.1)
Special education teachers who primarily serve children with:			
Developmental delays (SE)	41 (3.1)	19 (2.4)	55 (3.1)
Specific learning disabilities (SE)	37 (2.9)	19 (2.3)	58 (3.0)
Emotional disturbance/behavior disorders (SE)	56 (2.9)	34 (2.8)	35 (2.8)
Intellectual disability (SE)	44 (3.0)	23 (2.6)	50 (3.1)
Autism (SE)	50 (3.0)	29 (2.7)	43 (2.9)
Speech or language impairment (SE)	42 (2.9)	17 (2.2)	56 (2.9)
Traumatic brain injury (SE)	41 (3.1)	16 (2.3)	55 (3.1)
Sensory impairments (hearing/vision) (SE)	46 (3.1)	18 (2.5)	51 (3.2)
Other low-incidence disabilities (for example, other health impairments, orthopedic impairments, or multiple disabilities) (SE)	45 (3.1)	21 (2.5)	50 (3.1)
Other disability (SE)	15 (2.1)	10 (1.7)	84 (2.1)
Secondary school special education teachers of:			
English/language arts (SE)	36 (2.9)	17 (2.4)	59 (3.0)
Mathematics (SE)	50 (3.1)	21 (2.5)	45 (3.1)
Science (SE)	48 (3.1)	19 (2.5)	48 (3.1)
Social studies (including history, civics, geography and economics) (SE)	34 (3.0)	18 (2.4)	60 (3.0)
Other subjects (SE)	8 (1.8)	6 (1.5)	92 (1.8)
Specialized Instructional Support Personnel:			
Audiologists (SE)	29 (2.9)	9 (1.8)	70 (3.0)
Behavioral analysts or experts (SE)	41 (3.3)	15 (2.3)	55 (3.3)
Family therapists/mental health providers (SE)	31 (3.3)	12 (2.2)	64 (3.4)
Nurses (SE)	29 (2.8)	14 (2.1)	66 (2.9)
Pediatricians and other physicians (SE)	17 (2.7)	7 (1.9)	80 (2.8)
Physical therapists (SE)	29 (2.9)	12 (2.2)	68 (2.9)
Psychologists (SE)	40 (3.0)	15 (2.2)	57 (3.0)
Occupational therapists (SE)	28 (2.8)	13 (2.2)	68 (2.9)
Orientation/mobility specialists (SE)	33 (3.1)	10 (1.9)	65 (3.1)
Registered dieticians (SE)	20 (2.9)	7 (1.8)	78 (2.9)
Service coordinators (SE)	21 (2.8)	7 (1.8)	77 (2.9)
Speech/language therapists/pathologists (SE)	40 (2.8)	17 (2.2)	57 (2.9)
Social workers (SE)	28 (2.9)	9 (1.9)	69 (3.0)
Teacher aides, paraprofessionals, or personal care assistants (SE)	44 (3.0)	28 (2.7)	48 (3.0)
Transition specialists (SE)	20 (2.7)	8 (1.8)	77 (2.8)
Vision specialists, including ophthalmologists and optometrists (SE)	32 (3.0)	9 (1.9)	65 (3.1)
Sign language interpreters (SE)	44 (3.2)	12 (2.0)	54 (3.2)
Bilingual staff (SE)	61 (3.1)	16 (2.2)	36 (3.0)
Other staff (SE)	11 (1.9)	8 (1.6)	88 (1.9)

Table 2.8.2.3. Types of effective special education personnel who work with school-age children that districts had difficulty finding and retaining during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020) (continued)

Response category	Percentage of districts that had difficulty finding personnel	Percentage of districts that had difficulty retaining personnel	Percentage of districts that had no difficulty finding or retaining personnel
Number of district responses	**432**		

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response. The response rate for this survey question is below 85 percent for five rows of table (the rows for teachers who serve children in vocational or alternative schools, family therapist/mental health providers, orientation/mobility specialists, service coordinators, and transition specialists). Missing data have not been imputed. Differences in the characteristics of responders and the full population of districts do not show evidence of potential nonresponse bias except for the row for teachers who serve children in vocational or alternative schools.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L3).

Table 2.8.2.4. Types of effective special education personnel who work with preschool-age children that districts had difficulty finding and retaining during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020)

Response category	Percentage of districts that had difficulty finding personnel	Percentage of districts that had difficulty retaining personnel	Percentage of districts that had no difficulty finding or retaining personnel
Early childhood special educators (SE)	41 (3.2)	18 (2.6)	56 (3.3)
Special education teachers who primarily serve children with:			
Developmental delays (SE)	35 (3.3)	12 (2.3)	61 (3.4)
Specific learning disabilities (SE)	33 (3.3)	10 (2.0)	65 (3.3)
Emotional disturbance/behavior disorders (SE)	43 (3.5)	22 (2.8)	50 (3.5)
Intellectual disability (SE)	38 (3.4)	13 (2.4)	60 (3.4)
Autism (SE)	44 (3.5)	15 (2.4)	53 (3.5)
Speech or language impairment (SE)	39 (3.3)	14 (2.4)	57 (3.4)
Traumatic brain injury (SE)	38 (3.5)	11 (2.1)	59 (3.5)
Sensory impairments (hearing/vision) (SE)	42 (3.5)	11 (2.2)	55 (3.5)
Other low-incidence disabilities (for example, other health impairments, orthopedic impairments, or multiple disabilities) (SE)	42 (3.3)	11 (2.1)	56 (3.4)
Other disability (SE)	18 (2.6)	9 (2.0)	82 (2.6)
Specialized Instructional Support Personnel:			
Audiologists (SE)	28 (3.1)	7 (1.8)	71 (3.2)
Behavioral analysts or experts (SE)	35 (3.4)	10 (2.0)	63 (3.4)
Family therapists/mental health providers (SE)	31 (3.3)	9 (2.0)	67 (3.4)
Nurses (SE)	30 (3.1)	9 (1.9)	68 (3.2)
Pediatricians and other physicians (SE)	19 (2.8)	5! (1.6)	81 (2.8)
Physical therapists (SE)	31 (3.1)	12 (2.3)	66 (3.2)
Psychologists (SE)	37 (3.4)	16 (2.6)	59 (3.4)
Occupational therapists (SE)	28 (3.0)	9 (2.0)	69 (3.1)
Orientation/mobility specialists (SE)	33 (3.3)	8 (1.9)	64 (3.3)
Registered dieticians (SE)	20 (2.9)	5! (1.6)	79 (3.0)
Service coordinators (SE)	18 (2.7)	9 (2.0)	79 (2.8)
Speech/language therapists/pathologists (SE)	41 (3.2)	18 (2.6)	54 (3.3)
Social workers (SE)	22 (2.9)	10 (2.2)	74 (3.1)
Teacher aides, paraprofessionals, or personal care assistants (SE)	40 (3.3)	27 (3.1)	50 (3.4)
Transition specialists (SE)	22 (2.9)	9 (2.0)	75 (3.0)
Vision specialists, including ophthalmologists and optometrists (SE)	33 (3.3)	8 (1.9)	66 (3.3)
Sign language interpreters (SE)	45 (3.5)	10 (2.0)	54 (3.5)
Bilingual staff (SE)	55 (3.4)	12 (2.3)	42 (3.4)
Other staff (SE)	18 (2.7)	12 (2.3)	80 (2.8)
Number of district responses	**320**		

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question J1).

Table 2.8.2.5. Percentage of schools with unfilled position for special education teacher or other specialized instructional support personnel in the 2019–2020 school year

Response category	No	Yes
Special education teacher (SE)	82 (1.7)	18 (1.7)
Specialized instructional support personnel (SE)	83 (1.5)	17 (1.5)
Number of school responses	**1,362**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G1).

Table 2.8.2.6. Types of effective special education personnel whom schools had difficulty finding or retaining during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020)

Response category	Percentage of schools in which the district is responsible for hiring and retaining this type of personnel	Percentage of schools that had difficulty finding personnel	Percentage of schools that had difficulty retaining personnel	Percentage of schools that had no issues finding or retaining personnel
Audiologists (SE)	59 (2.1)	12 (1.3)	5 (0.8)	27 (2.0)
Behavioral analysts or experts (SE)	65 (2.2)	10 (1.2)	5 (0.9)	24 (1.9)
Nurses (SE)	56 (2.2)	6 (0.8)	4 (0.7)	36 (2.1)
Occupational therapists (SE)	65 (2.2)	6 (0.9)	3 (0.7)	28 (2.0)
Orientation/mobility specialists (SE)	76 (1.9)	4 (0.8)	2 (0.4)	19 (1.7)
Physical therapists (SE)	70 (2.1)	5 (0.7)	2 (0.6)	25 (1.9)
Psychologists (SE)	65 (2.2)	7 (1.0)	4 (0.8)	28 (2.0)
Service coordinators (SE)	72 (2.1)	3 (0.7)	2 (0.5)	24 (1.9)
Sign language interpreters (SE)	78 (1.7)	6 (0.9)	2! (0.7)	16 (1.6)
Speech/language pathologists (SE)	59 (2.3)	7 (0.9)	5 (0.8)	33 (2.2)
Social workers (SE)	65 (2.4)	6 (0.9)	3 (0.7)	28 (2.2)
Teacher aides, paraprofessionals, or personal care assistants (SE)	19 (1.7)	30 (1.9)	19 (1.6)	47 (2.3)
Transition specialists (SE)	78 (1.8)	3 (0.6)	1 (0.3)	19 (1.7)
Other (SE)	90 (1.2)	8 (1.1)	5 (0.9)	2 (0.6)
Number of school responses	**1,361**			

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G2).

Table 2.8.2.7. Types of effective special education personnel who work with preschool-age children that schools had difficulty finding or retaining during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020)

Response category	Percentage of schools in which the district is responsible for hiring and retaining this type of personnel	Percentage of schools that had difficulty finding personnel	Percentage of schools that had difficulty retaining personnel	Percentage of schools that had no issues finding or retaining personnel
Audiologists (SE)	81 (2.4)	3! (1.0)	1! (0.4)	15 (2.2)
Behavioral analysts or experts (SE)	76 (2.8)	6 (1.3)	2! (0.6)	17 (2.4)
Early childhood special educators (SE)	39 (3.1)	11 (1.9)	6 (1.6)	46 (3.1)
Nurses (SE)	57 (3.8)	6 (1.2)	3 (0.7)	36 (3.5)
Occupational therapists (SE)	71 (3.2)	4 (0.9)	1! (0.4)	25 (2.9)
Orientation/mobility specialists (SE)	82 (2.4)	3! (0.9)	1! (0.4)	14 (2.1)
Physical therapists (SE)	75 (2.8)	4 (1.0)	2! (0.5)	20 (2.5)
Psychologists (SE)	74 (2.9)	5 (1.0)	2 (0.6)	21 (2.6)
Service coordinators (SE)	78 (2.7)	3! (0.9)	1! (0.3)	19 (2.5)
Sign language interpreters (SE)	82 (2.3)	5 (1.3)	.	13 (2.0)
Speech/language pathologists (SE)	62 (3.2)	7 (1.3)	3 (0.7)	30 (3.0)
Social workers (SE)	71 (3.1)	5 (1.3)	1! (0.4)	23 (2.9)
Teacher aides, paraprofessionals, or personal care assistants (SE)	21 (2.3)	21 (2.5)	16 (2.2)	54 (3.0)
Transition specialists (SE)	83 (2.3)	2! (0.9)	.	14 (2.1)
Other (SE)	98 (0.8)	2! (0.7)	.	.
Number of school responses	**516**			

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering prekindergarten (n=521). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G3).

Table 2.8.2.8. Special education teacher positions for which schools had difficulty finding effective applicants during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020)

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Autism	18	1.4
Developmental delays	12	1.2
Emotional disturbance/behavior disorders	23	1.7
Intellectual disability	18	1.7
Learning disabilities	25	1.9
Sensory impairments (hearing/vision)	9	1.1
Other low incidence disabilities (for example, other health impairments, orthopedic impairments, or multiple disabilities)	12	1.3
Other	5	0.9
Had no difficulties filling these positions	56	2.3
Number of school responses	**1,356**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G4).

Table 2.8.2.8a. Special education teacher positions for which schools had difficulty finding effective applicants during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by school type

Response category	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Autism	18	1.4	17	1.5	27*	4.1	27*	3.8
Developmental delays	12	1.2	12	1.3	16	3.6	18	3.5
Emotional disturbance/behavior disorders	23	1.7	23	1.8	29	3.7	31	4.1
Intellectual disability	18	1.7	18	1.8	18	3.2	22	3.7
Learning disabilities	25	1.9	24	2.0	26	3.3	30	4.1
Sensory impairments (hearing/vision)	9	1.1	9	1.1	14	3.0	11	2.8
Other low incidence disabilities (for example, other health impairments, orthopedic impairments, or multiple disabilities)	12	1.3	12	1.4	17	3.5	15	3.2
Other	5	0.9	5	1.0	5!	1.9	6!	2.1
Had no difficulties filling these positions	56	2.3	57	2.4	52	4.5	46*	4.4
Number of school responses	**1,356**		**969**		**178**		**209**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional schools ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G4).

Table 2.8.2.8b. Special education teacher positions for which schools had difficulty finding effective applicants during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by school rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Autism	18	1.4	17	2.3	18	1.7
Developmental delays	12	1.2	11	1.8	13	1.6
Emotional disturbance/behavior disorders	23	1.7	24	3.0	23	1.9
Intellectual disability	18	1.7	21	3.1	16	1.7
Learning disabilities	25	1.9	26	3.4	23	2.0
Sensory impairments (hearing/vision)	9	1.1	9	1.8	9	1.3
Other low incidence disabilities (for example, other health impairments, orthopedic impairments, or multiple disabilities)	12	1.3	11	1.9	13	1.8
Other	5	0.9	5	1.2	5	1.3
Had no difficulties filling these positions	56	2.3	55	4.2	57	2.3
Number of school responses	**1,356**		**650**		**706**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G4).

Table 2.8.2.8c. Special education teacher positions for which schools had difficulty finding effective applicants during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

Response category	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error	Percentage of schools	Standard error
Autism	18	1.4	18	1.9	17	2.1
Developmental delays	12	1.2	11	1.5	14	2.0
Emotional disturbance/behavior disorders	23	1.7	22	2.2	25	2.8
Intellectual disability	18	1.7	15	1.9	22*	2.7
Learning disabilities	25	1.9	24	2.4	26	2.9
Sensory impairments (hearing/vision)	9	1.1	9	1.5	9	1.5
Other low incidence disabilities (for example, other health impairments, orthopedic impairments, or multiple disabilities)	12	1.3	10	1.6	14	2.1
Other	5	0.9	5	1.3	5	1.2
Had no difficulties filling these positions	56	2.3	58	2.6	54	3.7
Number of school responses	**1,356**		**815**		**520**	

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for schools eligible for Title I ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G4).

Table 2.8.2.9. Secondary school special education teacher positions for which schools had difficulty finding effective applicants during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020)

Response category	Percentage of schools	Standard error
English/language arts	20	2.5
Mathematics	35	3.4
Science	25	3.3
Social Studies (including history, civics, geography, and economics)	12	2.1
Other	4	1.0
Had no difficulties filling these positions	55	3.4
Number of school responses	**446**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all schools that reported offering grades 9, 10, 11, or 12 (n=454). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G5).

Table 2.8.2.10. Number of special education teachers who served students with disabilities ages 3-21 in schools during the 2018–2019 school year

Age group	Mean	Standard error
Ages 3-5	1	0.1
Ages 6-21	5	0.3
Number of school responses	**1,343**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Respondents were asked to indicate the number in full-time equivalents. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G6).

Table 2.8.2.10a. Number of special education teachers who served students with disabilities ages 3-21 in schools during the 2018–2019 school year, by school type

	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
Age group	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error
Ages 3-5	1	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.2	1	0.2
Ages 6-21	5	0.3	5	0.3	6	0.7	6	0.6
Number of school responses	**1,343**		**961**		**175**		**207**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Respondents were asked to indicate the number in full-time equivalents. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G6).

Table 2.8.2.10b. Number of special education teachers who served students with disabilities ages 3-21 in schools during the 2018–2019 school year, by school rurality

	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
Age group	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error
Ages 3-5	1	0.1	1	0.2	1	0.1
Ages 6-21	5	0.3	6	0.5	5	0.3
Number of school responses	**1,343**		**645**		**698**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Respondents were asked to indicate the number in full-time equivalents. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G6).

Table 2.8.2.10c. Number of special education teachers who served students with disabilities ages 3-21 in schools during the 2018–2019 school year, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
Age group	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error
Ages 3-5	1	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.2
Ages 6-21	5	0.3	5	0.3	6	0.4
Number of school responses	**1,343**		**805**		**517**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Respondents were asked to indicate the number in full-time equivalents. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G6).

Table 2.8.2.11. Number of special education teachers serving students with disabilities ages 3-21 who left schools for any reason after the 2018–2019 school year

Age group	Mean	Standard error
Ages 3-5	<0.5	0.1
Ages 6-21	2	0.1
Number of school responses	**1,336**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (n=1,366). Respondents were asked to indicate the number in full-time equivalents. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G7).

Table 2.8.2.11a. Number of special education teachers serving students with disabilities ages 3-21 who left schools for any reason after the 2018–2019 school year, by school type

	All		Traditional school		Charter operated by a traditional district		Charter operating as its own district	
Age group	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error
Ages 3-5	<0.5	0.1	<0.5	0.1	<0.5	<0.05	<0.5	0.1
Ages 6-21	2	0.1	2	0.1	1	0.2	2	0.4
Number of school responses	**1,336**		**956**		**174**		**206**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; traditional schools: n=977; charter schools in traditional district: n=178; charter schools in own district: n=211). Respondents were asked to indicate the number in full-time equivalents. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G7).

Table 2.8.2.11b. Number of special education teachers serving students with disabilities ages 3-21 who left schools for any reason after the 2018–2019 school year, by school rurality

	All		Nonrural schools		Rural schools	
Age group	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error
Ages 3-5	<0.5	0.1	<0.5	0.1	<0.5	<0.05
Ages 6-21	2	0.1	2	0.3	1	0.1
Number of school responses	**1,336**		**642**		**694**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; nonrural schools: n=656; rural schools: n=710). Respondents were asked to indicate the number in full-time equivalents. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G7).

Table 2.8.2.11c. Number of special education teachers serving students with disabilities ages 3-21 who left schools for any reason after the 2018–2019 school year, by school economic disadvantage (Title I schoolwide status)

	All		Eligible for Title I		Not eligible for Title I	
Age group	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error	Mean	Standard error
Ages 3-5	<0.5	0.1	<0.5	<0.05	<0.5!	0.1
Ages 6-21	2	0.1	2	0.2	2	0.2
Number of school responses	**1,336**		**803**		**513**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all school principals or lead special education staff (all: n=1,366; eligible for Title I: n=819; not eligible for Title I: n=526; 21 schools for which Title I eligibility is unknown are only included in the responses for all schools). Respondents were asked to indicate the number in full-time equivalents. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 school survey focused on IDEA programs for preschool- and school-age children (question G7).

2.8.3. Personnel allocation: Staff retention and initiatives to address retention challenges

Table 2.8.3.1. Strategies state agencies used to increase the number of effective special education teachers during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Collaborated with universities to develop programs and curricula to prepare providers in specific shortage areas	42	5
Paid fees for tests/licensure exams	7	1
Paid for tutoring to prepare teachers for certification tests/licensure exams	2	0
Provided time or funding for teachers to participate in professional development opportunities (for example, institute of higher education tuition, workshop fees)	28	8
Provided alternative routes to certification in special education for any person with a bachelor's degree	29	3
Other	8	0
None of the above	4	0
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked not to include strategies initiated at the district or school level.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question O1).

Table 2.8.3.2. Initiatives or incentives states used to retain effective special education teachers during the 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 school years

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Have not had problems with retention	5	2
Cover continuing education costs to attain a higher degree	7	3
Cover continuing education costs to maintain certification	5	1
Provide mentoring or induction programs	31	3
Offer full-time teaching positions	4	5
Offer part-time teaching positions	4	2
Provide additional planning or release time	2	2
Provide smaller caseloads	1	1
Provide smaller class sizes	1	2
Offer student loan forgiveness	10	0
Offer tuition pay back or partial reimbursement	10	1
Other	7	0
Number of responses	**50**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked not to include initiatives or incentives at the district or school level. Tuition pay back: for every year of tuition, teachers owe the district a year of service.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for school-age children (question O2).

Table 2.8.3.3. Strategies state agencies used to increase the number of effective preschool special education teachers during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Collaborated with universities to develop programs and curricula to prepare providers in specific shortage areas	26	6
Paid fees for tests/licensure exams	6	0
Paid for tutoring to prepare teachers for certification tests/licensure exams	3	0
Provided time or funding for teachers to participate in professional development opportunities (for example, institute of higher education tuition, workshop fees)	12	5
Provided alternative routes to certification in preschool special education for any person with a bachelor's degree	16	1
Provided alternative routes to certification in preschool special education for persons with a special education degree	16	0
Other	7	0
None of the above	13	2
Number of responses	**51**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked not to include strategies initiated at the district or school level.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question M1).

Table 2.8.3.4. Initiatives or incentives state agencies used to retain effective preschool special education teachers during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020)

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Have not had problems with retention	9	2
Cover continuing education costs to attain a higher degree	2	3
Cover continuing education costs to maintain certification	2	2
Provide mentoring or induction programs	10	0
Offer full-time positions	5	3
Offer part-time positions	3	0
Offer same salary levels as K-12 educators	18	4
Provide additional planning or release time	2	0
Provide smaller caseloads	0	1
Provide smaller class sizes	2	1
Offer student loan forgiveness	4	1
Offer tuition pay back or partial reimbursement	6	0
Other	9	0
All initiatives and incentives implemented at the local level	8	0
Number of responses	**48**	**9**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state special education coordinators responsible for preschool-age children (states: n=51; entities: n=9). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and nine entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked not to include initiatives or incentives at the district or school level. Tuition pay back: for every year of tuition, teachers owe the district a year of service.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question M2).

Table 2.8.3.5. Strategies lead agencies used to increase the number of qualified Part C early intervention professionals in the 2019 and 2020 fiscal years

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Collaborated with universities to develop programs and curricula to prepare providers in specific shortage areas	28	1
Paid fees for tests/licensure exams	2	0
Paid for tutoring to prepare individual providers for certification tests/licensure exams	0	0
Provided time or funding for individual providers to participate in professional development opportunities (for example, institute of higher education tuition, workshop fees)	19	2
Provided alternative routes to certification for any person with a bachelor's degree	13	1
Provided alternative routes to certification for persons with an early childhood or general education degree	13	1
Provided alternative routes to certification for persons with a special education degree	10	1
Other	16	1
None of the above	10	3
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked not to include strategies initiated at the local level.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question K3).

Table 2.8.3.6. Initiatives or incentives lead agencies used to retain qualified Part C professionals during the 2019 and 2020 fiscal years

Response category	Number of states, including DC	Number of entities
Have not had problems with retention	5	0
Cover continuing education costs to attain a higher degree	4	0
Cover continuing education costs to maintain certification	5	1
Provide mentoring or induction programs	8	0
Offer full-time positions	14	0
Offer part-time positions	16	0
Offer same salary levels as pre-K-12 educators	3	0
Provide smaller caseloads	5	0
Offer student loan forgiveness	0	0
Offer tuition pay back or partial reimbursement	2	0
Other	9	2
None of the above	17	3
Number of responses	**51**	**6**

Note: The sample for this table includes all state lead agency coordinators responsible for early intervention services for infants and toddlers (states: n=51; entities: n=6). Surveys were sent to 50 states, District of Columbia, and six entities: American Samoa, Bureau of Indian Education, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Respondents were asked not to include initiatives or incentives at the local level. Tuition pay back: for every year of tuition, educators owe the district a year of service.

Source: 2019-2020 state survey on IDEA programs for infants and toddlers (question K4).

Table 2.8.3.7. Factors districts consider when assigning specialized instructional support personnel, or non-teaching staff, to schools to work with students with disabilities

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Level of effort required based on IEPs of students in the school	72	2.5
Number of students in the school needing service	80	2.3
Distance from another school	6	1.3
Prior experience with the school staff	30	2.7
Tenure	7	1.4
Other	8	1.6
Number of district responses	**438**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L1).

Table 2.8.3.7a. Factors districts consider when assigning specialized instructional support personnel, or non-teaching staff, to schools to work with students with disabilities, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Level of effort required based on IEPs of students in the school	72	2.5	74	2.8	60*	5.9
Number of students in the school needing service	80	2.3	81	2.6	75	5.2
Distance from another school	6	1.3	7	1.5	.	.
Prior experience with the school staff	30	2.7	31	3.0	27	5.3
Tenure	7	1.4	8	1.6	.	.
Other	8	1.6	8	1.8	8!	3.1
Number of district responses	**438**		**334**		**104**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L1).

Table 2.8.3.7b. Factors districts consider when assigning specialized instructional support personnel, or non-teaching staff, to schools to work with students with disabilities, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Level of effort required based on IEPs of students in the school	72	2.5	77	3.6	69	3.7
Number of students in the school needing service	80	2.3	86	3.0	75*	3.5
Distance from another school	6	1.3	10	2.5	4!*	1.4
Prior experience with the school staff	30	2.7	34	4.1	27	3.5
Tenure	7	1.4	10	2.5	4!*	1.6
Other	8	1.6	10	2.6	7	2.0
Number of district responses	**438**		**216**		**222**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L1).

Table 2.8.3.7c. Factors districts consider when assigning specialized instructional support personnel, or non-teaching staff, to schools to work with students with disabilities, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Level of effort required based on IEPs of students in the school	72	2.5	72	4.4	72	3.1
Number of students in the school needing service	80	2.3	85	3.3	78	2.9
Distance from another school	6	1.3	6!	2.5	6	1.6
Prior experience with the school staff	30	2.7	31	5.1	30	3.2
Tenure	7	1.4	5!	2.0	8	1.8
Other	8	1.6	5!	1.8	10	2.1
Number of district responses	**438**		**155**		**283**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

IEP = Individualized Education Program.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L1).

Table 2.8.3.8. Personnel who work with school-age children with disabilities, employed either directly by districts or through contracts with independent providers

Response category	Percentage of districts that employ personnel directly	Percentage of districts that employ personnel through contracts with outside providers
Audiologists (SE)	6 (1.2)	80 (2.4)
Behavioral analysts or experts (SE)	26 (2.3)	68 (2.7)
Family therapists (SE)	3 (0.8)	65 (2.8)
Nurses (SE)	69 (2.5)	29 (2.6)
Pediatricians and other physicians (SE)	1! (0.6)	65 (2.8)
Physical therapists (SE)	17 (1.9)	79 (2.4)
Psychologists (SE)	49 (2.5)	55 (2.6)
Occupational therapists (SE)	30 (2.5)	74 (2.5)
Orientation/mobility specialists (SE)	7 (1.3)	82 (2.2)
Registered dieticians (SE)	7 (1.4)	56 (2.9)
Service coordinators (SE)	29 (2.5)	47 (2.9)
Speech/language therapists/pathologists (SE)	65 (2.6)	48 (2.8)
Social workers (SE)	40 (2.5)	43 (2.7)
Teacher aides, paraprofessionals, or personal care assistants (SE)	93 (1.7)	10 (1.7)
Transition specialists (SE)	37 (2.5)	47 (2.8)
Vision specialists, including ophthalmologists and optometrists (SE)	8 (1.4)	78 (2.4)
Sign language interpreters (SE)	15 (2.0)	71 (2.6)
Other (SE)	5 (1.3)	12 (1.8)
Number of district responses	**436**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

SE = standard error.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L2).

Table 2.8.3.9. Strategies districts used to increase the number of effective special education teachers during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Collaborated with universities to develop programs and curricula to prepare teachers in specific shortage areas	27	2.5
Paid fees for tests/licensure exams	19	2.1
Paid for tutoring to prepare teachers for certification tests/licensure exams	6	1.4
Provided free or subsidized training for secondary school teachers to obtain special education credentials	12	1.9
Provided free or subsidized training for special education teachers to obtain content area credentials	17	2.2
Provided time or funding for teachers to participate in professional development opportunities (for example, institute of higher education tuition, workshop fees)	57	2.9
Supported participation in dual certification preparation programs	17	2.2
Other	5	1.3
None of the above	13	2.0
Not applicable	15	2.2
Number of district responses	**436**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.
Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L4).

Table 2.8.3.9a. Strategies districts used to increase the number of effective special education teachers during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Collaborated with universities to develop programs and curricula to prepare teachers in specific shortage areas	27	2.5	28	2.8	19	4.9
Paid fees for tests/licensure exams	19	2.1	17	2.3	32*	5.7
Paid for tutoring to prepare teachers for certification tests/licensure exams	6	1.4	7	1.6	.	.
Provided free or subsidized training for secondary school teachers to obtain special education credentials	12	1.9	12	2.1	14	4.2
Provided free or subsidized training for special education teachers to obtain content area credentials	17	2.2	18	2.4	16	4.5
Provided time or funding for teachers to participate in professional development opportunities (for example, institute of higher education tuition, workshop fees)	57	2.9	57	3.3	52	6.1
Supported participation in dual certification preparation programs	17	2.2	17	2.4	18	4.7
Other	5	1.3	5	1.4	.	.
None of the above	13	2.0	13	2.1	18	4.6
Not applicable	15	2.2	15	2.5	12!	4.1
Number of district responses	**436**		**334**		**102**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L4).

Table 2.8.3.9b. Strategies districts used to increase the number of effective special education teachers during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Collaborated with universities to develop programs and curricula to prepare teachers in specific shortage areas	27	2.5	33	4.1	21*	3.1
Paid fees for tests/licensure exams	19	2.1	20	3.2	18	2.9
Paid for tutoring to prepare teachers for certification tests/licensure exams	6	1.4	7!	2.3	5!	1.8
Provided free or subsidized training for secondary school teachers to obtain special education credentials	12	1.9	10	2.6	14	2.7
Provided free or subsidized training for special education teachers to obtain content area credentials	17	2.2	17	3.1	18	3.0
Provided time or funding for teachers to participate in professional development opportunities (for example, institute of higher education tuition, workshop fees)	57	2.9	61	4.2	52	4.0
Supported participation in dual certification preparation programs	17	2.2	22	3.7	14	2.6
Other	5	1.3	8	2.3	3!*	1.2
None of the above	13	2.0	11	2.7	15	2.8
Not applicable	15	2.2	8	2.4	20*	3.5
Number of district responses	**436**		**216**		**220**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L4).

Table 2.8.3.9c. Strategies districts used to increase the number of effective special education teachers during the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Collaborated with universities to develop programs and curricula to prepare teachers in specific shortage areas	27	2.5	25	4.5	27	3.1
Paid fees for tests/licensure exams	19	2.1	14	3.0	21	2.6
Paid for tutoring to prepare teachers for certification tests/licensure exams	6	1.4	.	.	7	1.8
Provided free or subsidized training for secondary school teachers to obtain special education credentials	12	1.9	7!	2.2	14*	2.4
Provided free or subsidized training for special education teachers to obtain content area credentials	17	2.2	13	3.2	19	2.7
Provided time or funding for teachers to participate in professional development opportunities (for example, institute of higher education tuition, workshop fees)	57	2.9	54	5.5	57	3.5
Supported participation in dual certification preparation programs	17	2.2	16	3.7	18	2.7
Other	5	1.3	6!	2.2	5!	1.5
None of the above	13	2.0	15	3.4	13	2.4
Not applicable	15	2.2	16!	4.9	14	2.5
Number of district responses	**436**		**153**		**283**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for urban or suburban school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L4).

Table 2.8.3.10. Supports or incentives districts used to recruit new special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A signing bonus	7	1.4
A bonus supplement to regular compensation	6	1.3
A permanent salary augmentation or adjustment to normal base salary	6	1.3
Placement of a teacher on a higher step of the salary schedule	14	2.0
Relocation assistance	2!	0.7
Payoff of student loans	2!	0.8
Finder's fee to existing staff for new teacher referrals	3	0.6
Mentoring or induction programs	43	2.9
Other	3!	1.0
None of the above	47	2.9
Number of district responses	**434**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (n=438). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L5).

Table 2.8.3.10a. Supports or incentives districts used to recruit new special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A signing bonus	7	1.4	6	1.5	13!	4.2
A bonus supplement to regular compensation	6	1.3	5	1.3	14!*	4.4
A permanent salary augmentation or adjustment to normal base salary	6	1.3	6	1.4	9!	3.1
Placement of a teacher on a higher step of the salary schedule	14	2.0	14	2.1	18	4.8
Relocation assistance	2!	0.7	2!	0.8	.	.
Payoff of student loans	2!	0.8	.	.	.	.
Finder's fee to existing staff for new teacher referrals	3	0.6	1!	0.2	16*	4.4
Mentoring or induction programs	43	2.9	45	3.2	33	5.8
Other	3!	1.0	3!	1.2	.	.
None of the above	47	2.9	48	3.3	43	6.1
Number of district responses	**434**		**333**		**101**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for traditional school districts ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; traditional districts: n=334; charter districts: n=104). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L5).

Table 2.8.3.10b. Supports or incentives districts used to recruit new special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A signing bonus	7	1.4	9	2.3	5!	1.6
A bonus supplement to regular compensation	6	1.3	6!	2.0	6	1.7
A permanent salary augmentation or adjustment to normal base salary	6	1.3	5!	1.6	8	2.0
Placement of a teacher on a higher step of the salary schedule	14	2.0	15	2.9	13	2.6
Relocation assistance	2!	0.7	3!	1.4	.	.
Payoff of student loans	2!	0.8	.	.	.	.
Finder's fee to existing staff for new teacher referrals	3	0.6	2!	0.8	3!	1.0
Mentoring or induction programs	43	2.9	53	4.2	35*	3.7
Other	3!	1.0	3!	1.6	3!	1.3
None of the above	47	2.9	40	4.2	54*	4.0
Number of district responses	**434**		**216**		**218**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; 1,000 or more students: n=216; fewer than 1,000 students: n=222). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L5).

Table 2.8.3.10c. Supports or incentives districts used to recruit new special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A signing bonus	7	1.4	8!	2.3	6	1.7
A bonus supplement to regular compensation	6	1.3	10	2.4	5!	1.5
A permanent salary augmentation or adjustment to normal base salary	6	1.3	8	2.2	6	1.6
Placement of a teacher on a higher step of the salary schedule	14	2.0	18	4.1	13	2.2
Relocation assistance	2!	0.7	3!	1.1	.	.
Payoff of student loans	2!	0.8	.	.	.	.
Finder's fee to existing staff for new teacher referrals	3	0.6	9	2.1	.	.
Mentoring or induction programs	43	2.9	42	5.3	43	3.4
Other	3!	1.0	.	.	4!	1.3
None of the above	47	2.9	44	5.5	49	3.5
Number of district responses	**434**		**152**		**282**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district special education directors responsible for school-age children and youth (all: n=438; nonrural districts: n=155; rural districts: n=283). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L5).

Table 2.8.3.11. Initiatives or incentives districts used to retain effective special education teachers in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Cover continuing education costs to get a higher degree	23	3.2
Cover continuing education costs to maintain certification	18	3.1
Provide mentoring or induction programs	55	4.0
Offer full-time teaching positions	46	3.9
Offer part-time teaching positions	13	2.6
Provide additional planning or release time	24	3.3
Provide smaller caseloads	21	3.2
Provide smaller class sizes	12	2.6
Offer student loan forgiveness	5!	1.7
Offer tuition pay back or partial reimbursement	14	2.7
Other	2!	1.2
None of the above	22	3.4
Number of district responses	**275**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having difficulty retaining effective special education personnel who work with school-age children in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020) (n=280). Tuition pay back: for every year of tuition, teachers owe the district a year of service. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey focused on IDEA programs for school-age children (question L6).

Table 2.8.3.12. Strategies districts used to increase the number of effective preschool special education teachers in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Collaborated with universities to develop programs and curricula to prepare teachers in specific shortage areas	20	2.7
Paid fees for tests/licensure exams	11	1.9
Paid for tutoring to prepare teachers for certification tests/licensure exams	5	1.4
Provided time or funding for teachers to participate in professional development opportunities (for example, institute of higher education tuition, workshop fees)	45	3.3
Supported participation in dual certification preparation programs	15	2.4
Other	7	1.5
None of the above	19	2.6
Not applicable	24	2.9
Number of district responses	**318**	

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question J2).

Table 2.8.3.12a. Strategies districts used to increase the number of effective preschool special education teachers in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Collaborated with universities to develop programs and curricula to prepare teachers in specific shortage areas	20	2.7	20	2.7	.	.
Paid fees for tests/licensure exams	11	1.9	11	2.0	.	.
Paid for tutoring to prepare teachers for certification tests/licensure exams	5	1.4	5	1.5	.	.
Provided time or funding for teachers to participate in professional development opportunities (for example, institute of higher education tuition, workshop fees)	45	3.3	45	3.4	39!	15.1
Supported participation in dual certification preparation programs	15	2.4	16	2.5	.	.
Other	7	1.5	7	1.6	.	.
None of the above	19	2.6	19	2.7	.	.
Not applicable	24	2.9	24	3.0	.	.
Number of district responses	**318**		**294**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question J2).

Table 2.8.3.12b. Strategies districts used to increase the number of effective preschool special education teachers in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Collaborated with universities to develop programs and curricula to prepare teachers in specific shortage areas	20	2.7	22	3.6	17	4.0
Paid fees for tests/licensure exams	11	1.9	12	2.7	9	2.8
Paid for tutoring to prepare teachers for certification tests/licensure exams	5	1.4	6!	2.1	4!	2.0
Provided time or funding for teachers to participate in professional development opportunities (for example, institute of higher education tuition, workshop fees)	45	3.3	49	4.5	41	4.9
Supported participation in dual certification preparation programs	15	2.4	14	2.9	17	3.9
Other	7	1.5	8	2.2	6!	2.2
None of the above	19	2.6	21	3.7	16	3.8
Not applicable	24	2.9	20	3.6	29	4.7
Number of district responses	**318**		**190**		**128**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question J2).

Table 2.8.3.12c. Strategies districts used to increase the number of effective preschool special education teachers in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020), by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Collaborated with universities to develop programs and curricula to prepare teachers in specific shortage areas	20	2.7	16!	4.9	21	3.1
Paid fees for tests/licensure exams	11	1.9	.	.	12	2.3
Paid for tutoring to prepare teachers for certification tests/licensure exams	5	1.4	.	.	6	1.8
Provided time or funding for teachers to participate in professional development opportunities (for example, institute of higher education tuition, workshop fees)	45	3.3	44	6.5	45	3.8
Supported participation in dual certification preparation programs	15	2.4	16	4.2	15	2.8
Other	7	1.5	8!	2.3	7	1.8
None of the above	19	2.6	16	4.5	19	3.1
Not applicable	24	2.9	29	5.9	23	3.3
Number of district responses	**318**		**88**		**230**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question J2).

Table 2.8.3.13. Supports or incentives districts used to recruit new preschool special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A signing bonus	4!	1.3
A bonus supplement to regular compensation	4	1.1
A permanent salary augmentation or adjustment to normal base salary	4!	1.2
Placement of a teacher on a higher step of the salary schedule	9	1.9
Relocation assistance	.	.
Payoff of student loans	.	.
Finder's fee to existing staff for new teacher referrals	.	.
Mentoring or induction programs	31	3.0
Other	4!	1.3
None of the above	61	3.2
Number of district responses	**318**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (n=320). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question J3).

Table 2.8.3.13a. Supports or incentives districts used to recruit new preschool special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year, by district type

Response category	All		Traditional districts		Charter districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A signing bonus	4!	1.3	4!	1.3	.	.
A bonus supplement to regular compensation	4	1.1	4	1.1	.	.
A permanent salary augmentation or adjustment to normal base salary	4!	1.2	3!	1.2	.	.
Placement of a teacher on a higher step of the salary schedule	9	1.9	9	2.0	.	.
Relocation assistance	.	.	.	.	.	.
Payoff of student loans	.	.	.	.	0	.
Finder's fee to existing staff for new teacher referrals	.	.	.	.	.	.
Mentoring or induction programs	31	3.0	31	3.1	.	.
Other	4!	1.3	4!	1.3	.	.
None of the above	61	3.2	61	3.3	62	14.8
Number of district responses	**318**		**294**		**24**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; traditional districts: n=296; charter districts: n=24). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question J3).

Table 2.8.3.13b. Supports or incentives districts used to recruit new preschool special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year, by district size

Response category	All		1,000 or more students		Fewer than 1,000 students	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A signing bonus	4!	1.3	5!	1.8	.	.
A bonus supplement to regular compensation	4	1.1	4!	1.6	3!	1.5
A permanent salary augmentation or adjustment to normal base salary	4!	1.2	3!	1.4	5!	2.0
Placement of a teacher on a higher step of the salary schedule	9	1.9	10	2.7	7!	2.7
Relocation assistance	.	.	.	.	.	.
Payoff of student loans	.	.	.	.	.	.
Finder's fee to existing staff for new teacher referrals	.	.	.	.	0	.
Mentoring or induction programs	31	3.0	38	4.2	23*	4.3
Other	4!	1.3	5!	2.3	.	.
None of the above	61	3.2	53	4.4	69*	4.7
Number of district responses	**318**		**190**		**128**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

* Percentage is statistically different from the percentage for districts with at least 1,000 students ($p < .05$).

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; 1,000 or more students: n=192; fewer than 1,000 students: n=128). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question J3).

Table 2.8.3.13c. Supports or incentives districts used to recruit new preschool special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year, by district rurality

Response category	All		Nonrural districts		Rural districts	
	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error	Percentage of districts	Standard error
A signing bonus	4!	1.3	.	.	5!	1.6
A bonus supplement to regular compensation	4	1.1	3!	1.4	4!	1.3
A permanent salary augmentation or adjustment to normal base salary	4!	1.2	.	.	4!	1.4
Placement of a teacher on a higher step of the salary schedule	9	1.9	7!	3.1	9	2.3
Relocation assistance	.	.	.	.	.	.
Payoff of student loans	.	.	.	.	.	.
Finder's fee to existing staff for new teacher referrals	.	.	.	.	.	.
Mentoring or induction programs	31	3.0	31	5.6	30	3.5
Other	4!	1.3	.	.	4!	1.6
None of the above	61	3.2	62	5.9	60	3.7
Number of district responses	**318**		**88**		**230**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all district preschool special education coordinators (all: n=320; nonrural districts: n=89; rural districts: n=231). Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question J3).

Table 2.8.3.14. Initiatives or incentives districts used to retain effective preschool special education teachers in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020)

Response category	Percentage of districts	Standard error
Cover continuing education costs to get a higher degree	15	3.5
Cover continuing education costs to maintain certification	13	3.0
Provide mentoring or induction programs	41	4.7
Offer full-time teaching positions	43	4.5
Offer part-time teaching positions	8!	2.6
Offer same salary levels as K-12 educators	39	4.7
Provide additional planning or release time	17	3.8
Provide smaller caseloads	12	3.1
Provide smaller class sizes	10	3.0
Offer student loan forgiveness	.	.
Offer tuition pay back or partial reimbursement	7!	2.6
Other	.	.
None of the above	28	4.3
Number of district responses	**181**	

! Interpret data with caution. Estimate is unstable because the standard error represents more than 30 percent of the estimate.

. Value not reported due to small sample sizes (only 1 or 2 responses), or because the standard error is more than 50 percent of the estimate.

Note: The sample for this table includes all districts that reported having difficulty retaining effective special education personnel who work with preschool-age children in the past three school years (2017–2018 through 2019–2020) (n=185). Tuition pay back: for every year of tuition, teachers owe the district a year of service. Percentages do not sum to 100 because respondents responded to each item separately. Findings are weighted to account for survey design and non-response.

Source: 2019-2020 district survey on IDEA programs for preschool-age children (question J4).

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Chapter 3. Survey Instruments

Overview

This chapter contains the survey instruments for state agency, district, and school surveys for the 2019 data collection. All surveys were web-based, but respondents could opt to complete a hard copy.

State education agency survey on IDEA implementation for school-age children

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) State and Local Implementation Study 2019

STATE PART B 611

November 2019

NOTE: The hardcopy version of this survey is for reference purposes only. All instructions and FAQs pertain to the online version of the survey. To access the survey online, please use the link below. Enter the username and password provided to you in the letter included in the mailing packet.

Survey Link: IDEA-Survey.com/State611

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995
According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1850-0949. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 60 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (Education Department General Administrative Regulations Section, 34 C.F.R. § 76.591). If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this survey, please contact the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20202-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov directly. [Note: Please do not return the completed survey to this address.]

Notice of Confidentiality
Responses to this data collection will be used only for statistical purposes. All information that would permit identification of the state or individual respondent will be kept confidential (per The Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002), will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey, and will not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose except as required by law. Study reports may present information by state.

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) State and Local Implementation Study 2019, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), is an important study that will develop a national picture of state, district, and school implementation of IDEA. It will provide (1) the Department of Education, Congress, and other stakeholders with knowledge that can inform how special education and related services are provided to children, and (2) states, districts, and schools with an understanding of how others are implementing IDEA.

The IDEA Implementation Study is not a compliance study, nor a study of the results of effectiveness of IDEA.

We are requesting you complete this questionnaire because you and your staff have the most knowledge about special education policies and practices in your state. If there are questions you are not able to answer, please feel free to draw on the expertise and knowledge of others within your department. As grantees under IDEA, state education agencies are expected to participate in this data collection (34 C.F.R. § 76.591). With your contribution, ED and Congress will gain a more accurate and complete understanding of how IDEA is being implemented for school-age students at the state level.

Please note that data on state policies and resources/supports may be reported by state. Thus, while personally identifiable information about individual respondents will not be released, data displayed by state could be attributed to the state agency or possibly to an individual respondent.

Thank you for joining us in our effort to understand the current implementation of IDEA.
We appreciate your time and cooperation.

Please see the next pages for instructions for completing this survey, as well as a set of key definitions and frequently asked questions.

If you have any questions, contact:
Lisbeth Goble, 833-238-7224
email: IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com

Before you answer the questions, please carefully read the instructions, key definitions, and frequently asked questions. You can refer back to these as you complete the survey by clicking on the Instructions, Key Definitions, and FAQs link on the upper right-hand side of the screen.

INSTRUCTIONS

- When completing the survey, please consider "school-age children with disabilities" as students who are in kindergarten or age 6 or older.
- All items request information pertaining to the 2019–2020 school year unless otherwise specified.
- The primary respondent for this survey is intended to be the person most knowledgeable about special education policies and practices in your state. In most cases, the primary respondent will be the state director of special education.
- Certain questions may require the help of other staff, such as other staff in your state education agency. If you need input from other staff, you may share your unique survey hyperlink, which will give them full access to the survey, or you can print off specific questions for them to answer on paper and then fill in the online responses yourself.
- There may be questions where the districts or schools are also doing work in a given area. Unless otherwise specified, please indicate **only** the activities the state agency initiates or engages in.
- Throughout the survey, you'll see some terms in blue. You can click on those to see a definition of the term.
- Items on this survey cover the following topics: Agency Role; Identification for Special Education and Related Services; Significant Disproportionality; IEP Development and Quality; Access to General Education Programs and Supports; Collection and Use of Outcome Data; Support for Transitions; Coordination and Collaboration; Discipline and Safety; Addressing Linguistic and Cultural Diversity; Family Engagement; Special Educator Credentials; Funding Allocation; Activities Funds; and Evidence from Research

KEY DEFINITIONS

Students with disabilities is used to reflect school-age students with intellectual disabilities; hearing impairments, including deafness; speech or language impairments; visual impairments, including blindness; serious emotional disturbance (hereafter referred to as emotional disturbance); orthopedic impairments; autism; traumatic brain injuries; developmental delays; other health impairments; specific learning disabilities; deaf-blindness; or multiple disabilities, and who, by reason thereof, receives special education and related services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) according to an Individualized Education Program (IEP).

Special education teachers are teachers employed and contracted to work with children with disabilities. For this survey, we would like you to consider teachers who work with students who are in kindergarten through high school graduation or age 21. If your state's IDEA eligibility extends past age 21, please consider the highest age for which teachers serve students with disabilities**.**

Professional development includes a range of learning and support activities designed to prepare individuals to work with, and on behalf of, children and their families, as well as ongoing experiences to enhance this work. Professional development encompasses education, training, and technical assistance.

Training is a learning experience, or series of experiences, specific to an area of inquiry and related set of skills, delivered by a professional(s) with subject matter and adult learning knowledge and skills. This could include seminars, workshops, or courses about specific topics or key concepts.

Technical assistance (TA) is the provision of targeted and customized supports by a professional(s) with subject matter and adult learning knowledge and skills with the goal of developing or strengthening processes, knowledge application, or implementation of services by recipients. This could include coaching, consulting, or other ongoing support.

School levels are defined as follows:

- **Elementary schools** are schools that can serve students in kindergarten to grades 4–8, depending on state and school district policy.
- **Middle schools** are schools that can serve students between grades 4 and 9, with most in the grade 6–8 range. Middle schools in the upper grade range (7–9) are sometimes referred to as junior high schools**.**
- **High schools** are schools that can serve students between grades 7 and 12 with most in the grade 9–12 range.
- **Other schools** are all other grade configurations, including schools that are completely ungraded.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

How do I navigate the survey? You can access the survey by clicking on the unique hyperlink we provided to you via email. Once you have started the survey, you can navigate through it by answering each question and clicking the NEXT button at the bottom of the page. To navigate between survey sections, click on the [Survey Menu] button at the top right of your screen. This will allow you go to select the section you wish to complete. To go back to a previous page, click the BACK button. Do not use your internet browser back/forward buttons to move through the survey.

Do I have to complete the survey all at one time? No. You can revisit the website as many times as needed to complete the survey. However, if you need to stop before finishing the survey, **please be sure to click on the NEXT button before closing out so that your response(s) on that page are saved**. You will resume at the next unanswered question when you return to the survey. Once you have finished and submitted your survey, you will no longer have access to it. **Please note that each session will time out after 30 minutes of inactivity**.

Can I complete the survey on my tablet or smartphone? Yes. The survey has been optimized to run on desktop computers, tablets, or smartphones. The survey is best viewed in the latest versions of Chrome, Safari, Firefox, or Internet Explorer (IE 11 or Edge).

How long does the survey take? About 60 minutes. You can preview the questions and are not required to complete the survey all at once. The data you provide each time you log in will be securely stored and available when you return to complete the survey.

Do I have to answer all the questions? Please try to answer all questions that are relevant for your state, so the U.S. Department of Education can gain a more accurate and complete understanding of how IDEA is being implemented. You will automatically be skipped past some questions that do not apply to your situation, depending on your answer to an earlier question. You may choose to skip any question in the survey that you cannot or do not wish to answer. To skip a question, leave the question blank and then click the NEXT button to proceed.

Can I have my staff complete some of the questions instead of me? Yes. Certain questions may require the help of other staff. You may share your unique survey hyperlink with these individuals, which will give them full access to the survey, or you can print off specific questions and fill in the responses yourself at a later time.

Can multiple people work on completing the survey at the same time? No. If multiple people are logged into the same survey at the same time, responses may not be recorded correctly. Only one person on one computer should be completing the survey at any given time.

Can I print individual questions? Yes. You may print an individual page at any time by using your computer's usual method of printing.

Can I print a copy of the questionnaire when I am finished? If you would like a copy of your responses once you complete the survey, please email IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com and we will send you a copy of the survey with your responses.

Can I obtain a paper version of the questionnaire? Yes. If you would like to see a paper version for reference purposes, please email IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com and we will send you a copy.

Will my answers be kept confidential? Yes. All information that would permit identification of the district, school, or individual respondent will be held in strict confidence, will be used only by persons engaged in the survey and only for the purposes of the survey, and will not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose except as required by law. Study reports may present information by state.

Whom should I contact if I have a question? If you have any questions, please contact Lisbeth Goble at 833-238-7224 or at IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com. When sending emails, in addition to the question, please be sure to include your name and a phone number where you can be reached.

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

CONTACT INFORMATION

Please enter the contact information of the primary respondent below in case we need to contact your agency to clarify responses to any questions.

First Name: _____

Last Name: _____

Title/Position: _____

Phone: |___|___|___| - |___|___|___| - |___|___|___|___|

Email Address:_____

State Name:_____

Best days and times to reach you (in case of questions):

_____

A. AGENCY ROLE

The first question is about your role in your state agency.

A1. As the designated state special education director, which of the following describes the population(s) of students for which you have responsibility?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ School-age children with disabilities

2 ☐ Preschool-age children with disabilities

3 ☐ Children, birth through age 2, with disabilities

4 ☐ School-age children without disabilities

5 ☐ Preschool-age children without disabilities

6 ☐ Children, birth through age 2, without disabilities

7 Other *(Please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

B. IDENTIFICATION FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND RELATED SERVICES

The next questions focus on eligibility criteria and the identification of school-age children for special education.

B1. Please enter the web address where we may view your state's current eligibility criteria for special education and related services.

If this information is not available on a website, please select the response below and scan and email a hard copy to IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com.

1 ❍ Information available on a website

_____

0 ❍ Information not available on a website

B2. Does your state have public charter schools?

1 ☐ Yes, we have charter schools that are part of traditional school districts

2 ☐ Yes, we have charter schools that are their own school district

0 ❍ No

B3. Does your state have public virtual schools?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

ALL RESPONDENTS ADDRESS COLUMNS 1 AND 5. ADDITIONALLY:
IF B2 = 1, THEN ADDRESS COLUMN 2.
IF B2 = 2, THEN ADDRESS COLUMN 3.
IF B3 = 1, THEN ADDRESS COLUMN 4.

B4. Please indicate if your state agency provides any of the following *professional development* to district and/or school staff to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children in any of the following types of schools.

Select all that apply

	Traditional public schools	Public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district	Public charter schools that are their own school district	Public virtual schools	Private schools	N/A
a. Professional development on *referrals*	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
b. Professional development on *identification*	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
c. Professional development on *using data* from research-based intervention strategies to inform referrals or identification	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍

ALL RESPONDENTS ADDRESS COLUMNS 1 AND 5. ADDITIONALLY:
IF B2 = 1, THEN ADDRESS COLUMN 2.

IF B2 = 2, THEN ADDRESS COLUMN 3.
IF B3 = 1, THEN ADDRESS COLUMN 4.

B5. Please indicate if your state agency provides any of the following *written materials and resources* to district and/or school staff to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children in any of the following types of schools.

Select all that apply

	Traditional public schools	Public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district	Public charter schools that are their own school district	Public virtual schools	Private schools	N/A
a. Written materials and resources *on referrals* to district and/or school staff	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
b. Written materials and resources *on identification* to district and/or school staff	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
c. Written materials and resources on *using data* from research-based intervention strategies to inform referrals or identification	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍

ALL RESPONDENTS ADDRESS OPTIONS 1 AND 5. ADDITIONALLY:
IF B2 = 1, THEN ADDRESS OPTION 2.
IF B2 = 2, THEN ADDRESS OPTION 3.
IF B3 = 1, THEN ADDRESS OPTION 4.

B6. Does your state agency provide written materials and resources on referrals or identification to *parents/guardians* of school-age children in any of the following types of schools?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Yes, for parents/guardians of students who attend traditional public schools
2 ☐ Yes, for parents/guardians of students who attend public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district
3 ☐ Yes, for parents/guardians of students who attend public charter schools that are their own school district
4 ☐ Yes, for parents/guardians of students who attend public virtual schools
5 ☐ Yes, for parents/guardians of students who attend private schools
6 ❍ No

ALL RESPONDENTS ADDRESS COLUMNS 1 AND 5. ADDITIONALLY:
IF B2 = 1, THEN ADDRESS COLUMN 2.
IF B2 = 2, THEN ADDRESS COLUMN 3.
IF B3 = 1, THEN ADDRESS COLUMN 4.

B7. Please indicate if your state agency requires Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children in any of the following types of schools.

Select all that apply

	Traditional public schools	Public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district	Public charter schools that are their own school district	Public virtual schools	Private schools	N/A
a. State requires MTSS be used for *referral purposes*	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
b. State requires MTSS be used for *identification purposes*	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍

ALL RESPONDENTS ADDRESS COLUMNS 1 AND 5. ADDITIONALLY:
IF B2 = 1, THEN ADDRESS COLUMN 2.
IF B2 = 2, THEN ADDRESS COLUMN 3.
IF B3 = 1, THEN ADDRESS COLUMN 4.

B8. Please indicate if your state agency monitors and provides targeted assistance on any of the following to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children in any of the following types of schools.

Select all that apply

	Traditional public schools	Public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district	Public charter schools that are their own school district	Public virtual schools	Private schools	N/A
a. State monitors data related to the *referral process* and provides targeted assistance	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
b. State monitors the *length of time between referral and eligibility determination* and provides targeted assistance	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
c. State monitors the *number of students identified as eligible for services* and provides targeted assistance	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍

ALL RESPONDENTS ADDRESS OPTIONS 1 AND 5. ADDITIONALLY:

IF B2 = 1, THEN ADDRESS OPTION 2.
IF B2 = 2, THEN ADDRESS OPTION 3.
IF B3 = 1, THEN ADDRESS OPTION 4.

B9. Does your state agency have a system in place for the following types of schools to notify the state if they identify a school-age child with a disability, to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Yes, we have a system in place for traditional public schools

2 ☐ Yes, we have a system in place for public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district

3 ☐ Yes, we have a system in place for public charter schools that are their own school district

4 ☐ Yes, we have a system in place for public virtual schools

5 ☐ Yes, we have a system in place for private schools

6 ❍ No

B10. Does your state agency do anything else to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children with disabilities in *traditional public schools*?

1 ❍ Yes *(Please specify)*

_____

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO B2=1, THEN COMPLETE B11

B11. Does your state agency do anything else to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children with disabilities in *public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district*?

1 ❍ Yes *(Please specify)*

_____

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO B2=2, THEN COMPLETE B12

B12. Does your state agency do anything else to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children with disabilities in *public charter schools that are their own school district*?

1 ❍ Yes *(Please specify)*

_____

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO B3=1, THEN COMPLETE B13

B13. Does your state agency do anything else to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children with disabilities in *public virtual schools*?

1 ❍ Yes *(Please specify)*

_____

0 ❍ No

B14. Does your state agency do anything else to ensure appropriate referrals and identification of school-age children with disabilities in *private schools*?

1 ❍ Yes *(Please specify)*

_____

0 ❍ No

B15. During the eligibility determination period, is there anything your state agency does to help districts apply exclusionary criteria?

The purpose of this exclusionary clause is to help prevent the improper determination of eligibility of children for special education services, especially those from distinct cultures who have acquired learning styles, language, or behaviors that are not compatible with academic requirements of schools in the dominant culture.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Develop procedures for application of exclusionary criteria
2 ☐ Provide professional development for school staff
3 ☐ Provide written materials to school staff
4 ☐ Provide guidelines for staff to follow before screening children who are English Learners
5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

B16. How does your state agency work with other state and local agencies and programs (such as public health, substance abuse treatment, mental health, social services) to identify and determine eligibility of school-age children who have experienced the following emerging health concerns?

Select all that apply

	Have occasional or regular conversations	Jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	Hold joint professional development for personnel	Share identification and screening data	Establish interagency agreements	Don't work with other agencies/ programs on this condition
a. Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs)	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
b. Fetal alcohol spectrum disorders	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
c. Lead or other heavy metal poisoning	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
d. Neonatal abstinence syndrome	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
e. Opioid addiction	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
f. Perinatal substance use	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
g. Zika virus	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

C. MULTI-TIERED SYSTEMS OF SUPPORT

The next questions ask about Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS).

C1. Which of the following describe state-level activities related to Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), including Response to Intervention (RtI)?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ The state has a state-level MTSS task force, commission, or internal working group

2 ☐ The state agency has a dedicated full-time position related to MTSS

3 ☐ The state agency has an outside advisory group related to MTSS

4 ☐ The state agency has provided resources to school districts (for example, issued grants or RFPs) to explore the use of MTSS (for example, to identify or try model MTSS programs; to plan or begin implementation)

5 ☐ The state agency has issued guidelines on MTSS

6 ☐ The state agency has organized trainings on MTSS that were conducted by consultants or contractors

7 ☐ State agency staff conduct trainings on MTSS

8 ☐ State agency staff provide technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) to LEAs and schools that are investigating or implementing MTSS

9 ☐ The state agency arranges technical assistance from consultants or contractors for districts and schools that are investigating or implementing MTSS

10 ☐ MTSS information is available on the state agency's website

11 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

12 ❍ None of the above

C2. Please describe any current state agency initiatives related to MTSS, including RtI, in *reading*.

Select one only

1 ❍ The state agency has no current initiatives related to implementation of MTSS

2 ❍ The state agency has a pilot initiative to implement MTSS in a limited number of districts or schools

3 ❍ The state agency has an initiative to expand the use of MTSS more broadly within the state

4 ❍ The state agency has an initiative to implement MTSS statewide

C2a. Please describe any current state agency initiatives related to MTSS, including RtI, in *math*.

Select one only

1 ❍ The state agency has no current initiatives related to implementation of MTSS

2 ❍ The state agency has a pilot initiative to implement MTSS in a limited number of districts or schools

3 ❍ The state agency has an initiative to expand the use of MTSS more broadly within the state

4 ❍ The state agency has an initiative to implement MTSS statewide

C2b. Please describe any current state agency initiatives related to MTSS, including RtI, in *behavior*.

Select one only

1 ❍ The state agency has no current initiatives related to implementation of MTSS

2 ❍ The state agency has a pilot initiative to implement MTSS in a limited number of districts or schools

3 ❍ The state agency has an initiative to expand the use of MTSS more broadly within the state

4 ❍ The state agency has an initiative to implement MTSS statewide

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C2 OR C2A OR C2B = 2, 3, OR 4, THEN COMPLETE C3.

C3. If your state has either a pilot or statewide initiative that promotes MTSS, including RtI in elementary schools, at what level are decisions made about each of the aspects of MTSS implementation described below?

Select all that apply

	State agency staff decide	District staff decide	School staff decide	Not done	Don't know
a. The research-based curricula to use in general education	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍	d ❍
b. The cut scores for determining risk status	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍	d ❍
c. The criteria for determining a student's responsiveness to intervention	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍	d ❍
d. The frequency and duration of progress monitoring	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍	d ❍
e. The choice of interventions to use for students determined to be at risk	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍	d ❍
f. The number of intervention sessions required prior to referral for special education	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍	d ❍
g. The decision rules for a referral for a special education evaluation	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍	d ❍
h. How to document intervention fidelity	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍	d ❍

C4. In determination of eligibility for special education under Specific Learning Disability (SLD), which best describes your state's policy with respect to MTSS, including RtI?

Select one only

1 ❍ The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility

2 ❍ The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) is used to determine eligibility

3 ❍ The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility

4 ❍ The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data may be used in determining eligibility

5 ❍ The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) may be used to determine eligibility

6 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

7 ❍ None of the above

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C4 = 3, 4, 5, 6, OR 7, THEN COMPLETE C5

C5. If your state permits the use of a discrepancy method in determining SLD, which best characterizes your state policy?

Select one only

1 ❍ The state agency has operationalized discrepancy criteria and any district using a discrepancy method must adhere to these criteria

2 ❍ Districts have discretion to choose the specific discrepancy criteria used

IF YOU ANSWER TO C4 = 3, 4, 5, 6, OR 7, THEN COMPLETE C6

C6. Does your state have a plan to eliminate the use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model as a determination of eligibility for special education under SLD by the 2020–2021 school year?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

C7. Does your state allow an approach other than MTSS or IQ-achievement discrepancy to determine the presence of SLD?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C7 = 1, THEN COMPLETE C8

C8. What other approach(es) does your state allow?

_____

(Please specify)

_____

(Please specify)

C9. Do your state policies and practices for the identification of students with SLD *differ by grade level*?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

D. SIGNIFICANT DISPROPORTIONALITY

The next questions ask about significant disproportionality in identification, placement, and discipline.

According to IDEA 2004 and the accompanying regulations, a local education agency (LEA) may choose to use up to 15% of its Part B funds for Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS). If an LEA is identified as having significant disproportionality in identification, placement, or discipline, it is required to reserve 15% of its Part B funds to provide Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS) to students in the LEA. Each state develops a definition of significant disproportionality for making this determination.

D1. What best describes the status of your state's progress in defining significant disproportionality for 2019–2020?

Select one only

1 ❍ Our state's definition of significant disproportionality is finalized and no changes are anticipated in the coming year

2 ❍ Our state's definition of significant disproportionality is finalized but we are planning modifications or revisions in the coming year

3 ❍ Our state's definition of significant disproportionality is in the process of being revised

D2. Please enter the web address where we may view your current definition of significant disproportionality.

If this information is not available on a website, please select the response below and scan and email a hard copy to IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com.

1 ❍ Information available on a website

_____

0 ❍ Information not available on a website

D3. Which of the following actions does your state agency take when a district is required to address significant disproportionality in *identification*?

Significant disproportionality in identification occurs when districts identify children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district.

Please include all actions that are used in the state, even if they are not used in all situations.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Develops or works with district to develop a specific plan for the district to address significant proportionality in identification

2 ☐ Reviews and approves a district-developed plan

3 ☐ Reviews or revises (if appropriate) policies, practices, and procedures

4 ☐ Provides or arranges training for the district

5 ☐ Provides or arranges technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for the district

6 ☐ Provides additional (beyond the 15% required by Part B) targeted monetary or staff resources to the district

7 ☐ Recommends focusing funds on elementary schools

8 ☐ Recommends focusing funds on middle schools

9 ☐ Recommends focusing funds on high schools

10 ☐ Recommends focusing funds on specific interventions

11 ☐ Recommends focusing funds on specific areas, such as literacy or comprehensive behavioral supports

12 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

13 ❍ None of the above

D4. Which of the following actions does your state agency take when a district is required to address significant disproportionality in *placement (Least Restrictive Environment)*?

Significant disproportionality in LRE placement occurs when districts place in more restrictive settings children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district.

Please include all actions that are used in the state, even if they are not used in all situations.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Develops or works with district to develop a specific plan for the district to follow to address significant disproportionality in placement

2 ☐ Reviews and approves a district-developed plan

3 ☐ Reviews or revises (if appropriate) policies, practices, and procedures

4 ☐ Provides or arranges training for the district

5 ☐ Provides or arranges technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for the district

6 ☐ Provides additional (beyond the 15% required by Part B) targeted monetary or staff resources to the district

7 ☐ Recommends focusing funds on elementary schools

8 ☐ Recommends focusing funds on middle schools

9 ☐ Recommends focusing funds on high schools

10 ☐ Recommends focusing funds on specific interventions

11 ☐ Recommends focusing funds on specific areas, such as literacy or comprehensive behavioral supports

12 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

13 ❍ None of the above

D5. Which of the following actions does your state agency take when a district is required to address significant disproportionality in *discipline*?

Significant disproportionality in discipline occurs when districts discipline children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district.

Please include all actions that are used in the state, even if they are not used in all situations.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Develops or works with district to develop a specific plan for the district to follow to address significant disproportionality in discipline

2 ☐ Reviews and approves a district-developed plan

3 ☐ Reviews or revises (if appropriate) policies, practices, and procedures

4 ☐ Provides or arranges training for the district

5 ☐ Provides or arranges technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for the district

6 ☐ Provides additional (beyond the 15% required by Part B) targeted monetary or staff resources to the district

7 ☐ Recommends focusing funds on elementary schools

8 ☐ Recommends focusing funds on middle schools

9 ☐ Recommends focusing funds on high schools

10 ☐ Recommends focusing funds on specific interventions

11 ☐ Recommends focusing funds on specific areas, such as literacy or comprehensive behavioral supports

12 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

13 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

E. IEP DEVELOPMENT AND QUALITY

The next questions focus on the development of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs).

E1. Does your state agency provide any *professional development* on any of the following topics to help promote the quality of the IEP process for school-age children with disabilities?

Professional development can occur either in person or online.

***A quality IEP** is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student.*

***Standards-based IEPs** are those that align goals for students with disabilities with the content and academic achievement standards that form the basis of each state's general education curriculum.*

***Appropriately ambitious goals** are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of their circumstances.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Developing standards-based IEP goals
2 ☐ Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals
3 ☐ Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals
4 ☐ Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process
5 ☐ Engaging staff from state or local community agencies or programs (for example, after-school program providers, employment and training providers) in the IEP process
6 ☐ Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data
7 ☐ Other professional development *(P**lease** specify)* _____
8 ❍ None of the above

E2. Does your state agency provide *written policy or guidelines* on any of the following topics to help promote the quality of the IEP process for school-age children with disabilities?

Appropriately ambitious goals *are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of their circumstances.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals

2 ☐ Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals

3 ☐ Engaging families in the IEP process

4 ☐ Engaging staff from local community agencies or programs (for example, after-school program providers, employment and training providers) in the IEP process

5 ☐ Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data

6 ☐ Other topics *(Please specify)* _____

7 ❍ None of the above

E3. Does your state agency provide any of the following *resources* to help promote the quality of the IEP process for school-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ A mandated standards-based IEP form or template

2 ☐ A suggested standards-based IEP form or template

3 ☐ A rubric or other resource describing features of quality IEPs, including appropriately ambitious IEP goals

4 ☐ A coach, mentor, or IEP facilitator to assist with writing the IEP

5 ☐ Other resources to promote the quality of IEPs *(Please specify)* _____

6 ❍ None of the above

The next questions will focus on how IEPs are managed at different types of schools.

IF YOUR ANSWER TO B2 = 1, THEN COMPLETE E4

E4. Which agency or entities are responsible for ensuring that the IEPs of school-age children with disabilities enrolled in *public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district* are developed and implemented appropriately?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ The charter school's authorizer
2 ☐ The charter school's district
3 ☐ The charter school
4 ☐ The student's local school district
5 ☐ The state
6 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO B2 = 1, THEN COMPLETE E5

E5. How does your state agency monitor the IEP goals established by *public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Reviews data from state data system (for example, data on planned and delivered IEP services)
2 ☐ Conducts on-site monitoring visits of public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district
3 ☐ Reviews a selection of IEPs from public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district
4 ☐ Surveys parents/guardians in public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district about IEP goals or services
5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
6 ❍ None of the above

IF YOUR ANSWER TO B2 = 2, THEN COMPLETE E6

E6. Which agency or entities are responsible for ensuring that the IEPs of school-age children with disabilities enrolled in *public charter schools that are their own school district* are developed and implemented appropriately?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ The charter school's authorizer
2 ☐ The charter school's district
3 ☐ The charter school
4 ☐ The student's local school district
5 ☐ The state
6 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO B2 = 2, THEN COMPLETE E7

E7. How does your state agency monitor the IEP goals established by *public charter schools that are their own school district*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Reviews data from state data system (for example, data on planned and delivered IEP services)
2 ☐ Conducts on-site monitoring visits of public charter schools that are their own school district
3 ☐ Reviews a selection of IEPs from public charter schools that are their own school district
4 ☐ Surveys parents/guardians in public charter schools that are their own school district about IEP goals or services
5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
6 ❍ None of the above

IF YOUR ANSWER TO B3 = 1, THEN COMPLETE E8

E8. Which agency or entities are responsible for ensuring that the IEPs of school-age children with disabilities enrolled in *public virtual schools* are developed and implemented appropriately?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ The authorizer (if virtual school is a charter school)
2 ☐ The local school district
3 ☐ The public virtual school
4 ☐ The state
5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO B3 = 1, THEN COMPLETE E9

E9. How does your state agency monitor the IEP goals established by *public virtual schools*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Reviews data from state data system (for example, data on planned and delivered IEP services)
2 ☐ Conducts on-site monitoring visits of public virtual schools
3 ☐ Reviews a selection of IEPs from public virtual schools
4 ☐ Surveys parents/guardians in public virtual schools about IEP goals or services
5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
6 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

F. ALTERNATE STANDARDS

The next questions ask about alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS). AA-AAAS are assessments used to evaluate the performance of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

F1. Does your state use a standardized AA-AAAS assessment?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

F2. Which of the following criteria does your state agency use to determine eligibility to participate in alternate assessments?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ The student has a significant cognitive disability

2 ☐ The student is learning content based on grade-level alternate achievement standards

3 ☐ The student requires extensive direct individualized instruction and supports to achieve measurable gains from year to year

4 ☐ The student performs substantially below grade-level expectations on the academic content standards for the grade in which they are enrolled, even with the use of adaptations

5 ☐ The student's demonstrated cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior are significantly below age expectations even with program modifications, adaptations, and accommodations

6 ☐ The school psychologist presents evidence that the student's cognitive and adaptive functioning is consistent with that of a student with a significant cognitive disability

7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

F3. Please enter the web address of a location where we may view your current guidelines for eligibility to be assessed using alternate academic achievement standards.

If this information is not available on a website, please select the response below and scan and email a hard copy to IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com.

1 ❍ Information available on a website

_____

0 ❍ Information not available on a website

F4. What strategies has your state used to stay within the 1% cap?

1% cap: Under ESSA, the total number of students assessed in a subject using an alternate assessment should not exceed 1 percent of the total number of students in the state who are assessed in that subject.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Our state requested a waiver from the 1% cap

2 ☐ The state revised its definition of "students with most significant cognitive disabilities"

3 ☐ The state's general assessment provided appropriate accessibility features and accommodations that enabled more students with disabilities to participate in the general assessment

4 ☐ The state reviewed cases with certain disability categories such as learning disabilities and speech-language impairments who participate in alternate assessments to confirm they are receiving the most appropriate assessment

5 ☐ The state reviewed English Learner cases who participate in alternate assessments to confirm they are receiving the most appropriate assessment

6 ☐ The state reviewed expressive communication skills of students who participate in alternate assessments to confirm they are receiving the most appropriate assessment

7 ☐ The state reviewed receptive communication skills of students who participate in alternate assessments to confirm they are receiving the most appropriate assessment

8 ☐ The state provided professional development for district staff to support understanding of alternate assessments

9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F4 = 8, THEN COMPLETE F5

F5. What topics were covered in professional development offered to district staff to support understanding of AA-AAAS?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Understanding federal or state AA-AAAS policy

2 ☐ The process for ensuring students with disabilities participate in AA-AAAS, as appropriate

3 ☐ Ensuring school staff administer AA-AAAS as appropriate

4 ☐ The long-term implications for students of participating in AA-AAAS (for example, eligibility for certain diploma types or training programs)

5 ☐ Explaining AA-AAAS results to parents/guardians

6 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

F6. Does your state offer an alternate diploma for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F6 = 1, THEN COMPLETE F7

F7. Is your state's alternate diploma standards-based and/or aligned with state requirements for the regular high school diploma?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Yes, it is standards-based

2 ☐ Yes, it is aligned with state requirements for the regular high school diploma

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F6 = 1, THEN COMPLETE F8

F8. Which of the following criteria does your state agency use to determine if school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities are eligible for your state's alternate diploma?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ The student participates in AA-AAAS

2 ☐ The student is learning content based on grade-level alternate achievement standards

3 ☐ The student requires extensive direct individualized instruction and supports to achieve measurable gains from year to year

4 ☐ The student performs substantially below grade-level expectations on the academic content standards for the grade in which they are enrolled, even with the use of adaptations

5 ☐ The student's demonstrated cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior are significantly below age expectations even with program modifications, adaptations, and accommodations

6 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F6 = 1, THEN COMPLETE F9

F9. Does your state agency offer professional development to district staff to support understanding and use of a state-defined alternate diploma?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F9 = 1, THEN COMPLETE F10

F10. What topics are covered in professional development offered to district staff to support understanding and use of a state-defined alternate diploma?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Understanding federal or state policy for awarding a state-defined alternate diploma

2 ☐ The process for ensuring eligible students receive a state-defined alternate diploma, as appropriate

3 ☐ Ensuring school staff award state-defined alternate diplomas, as appropriate

4 ☐ The long-term implications for students of receiving a state-defined alternate diploma (for example, eligibility for certain postsecondary education or training programs)

5 ☐ Explaining state-defined alternate diplomas to parents/guardians

6 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

G. ACCESS TO GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND SUPPORTS

The next questions focus on access to general education curriculum and standards for school-age children with disabilities.

G1. For which of the following groups of students does your state modify its general education standards?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ School age-children with significant cognitive disabilities
2 ☐ School age-children with disabilities, other than significant cognitive disabilities
3 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
4 ❍ We do not adapt our standards for students with disabilities

G2. Does your state agency provide professional development to districts and schools on how to engage school-age children with disabilities in the general education curriculum?

1 ❍ Yes
0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO G2 = 1, THEN COMPLETE G3

G3. Who is the target audience for professional development on how to engage school-age children with disabilities in the general education curriculum?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Superintendents
2 ☐ Principals
3 ☐ School administrative officials
4 ☐ Special education teachers
5 ☐ General education teachers
6 ☐ Reading specialists
7 ☐ Math specialists
8 ☐ Paraprofessional or instructional learning assistants
9 ☐ School counselors
10 ☐ School psychologists
11 ☐ School or district nurses
12 ☐ Speech and language therapists/pathologists
13 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO G2 = 1, THEN COMPLETE G4

G4. What topics are covered in professional development on how to engage school-age children with disabilities in the general education curriculum?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Accommodations for different challenges
2 ☐ Adapted curriculum materials
3 ☐ Appropriate use of paraprofessionals
4 ☐ Assistive technology
5 ☐ Cooperative learning
6 ☐ Evidence-based teaching strategies
7 ☐ Development of IEP goals and identification of supports and services
8 ☐ Instructional models: consultation
9 ☐ Instructional models: co-teaching
10 ☐ Instructional models: other
11 ☐ Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) model
12 ☐ Peer mentors
13 ☐ Universal Design for Learning (UDL)
14 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

G5. Has your state agency provided professional development to district *special education* staff on the following topics?

Select one only per row

	Yes, focused on all students with disabilities	Yes, focused only on students with the most significant cognitive disabilities	No
a. Evidence-based teaching strategies	1 ❍	2 ❍	0 ❍
b. Teaching grade-level content with appropriate complexity and breadth for students	1 ❍	2 ❍	0 ❍
c. Methodsfor determining grade-level content with appropriate complexity and breadth for students	1 ❍	2 ❍	0 ❍
d. Supporting school-agechildren with disabilities enrolled by parents/guardians in private schools	1 ❍	2 ❍	0 ❍

G6. Has your state agency provided professional development to district *general education* staff on the following topics?

Select one only per row

	Yes, focused on all students with disabilities	Yes, focused only on students with the most significant cognitive disabilities	No
a. Evidence-based teaching strategies	1 ❍	2 ❍	0 ❍
b. Teaching grade-level content with appropriate complexity and breadth for students	1 ❍	2 ❍	0 ❍
c. Methods for determining grade-level content with appropriate complexity and breadth for students	1 ❍	2 ❍	0 ❍
d. Supporting school-age children with disabilities enrolled by parents/guardians in private schools	1 ❍	2 ❍	0 ❍

G7. Does your state agency recommend the use of any programs, practices, or curricula to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of school-age children with disabilities?

1 ❍ Yes, my state recommends one specific program, practice, or curriculum

2 ❍ Yes, my state recommends several programs, practices, or curricula

0 ❍ No

G8. Does your state agency offer any of the following to districts or providers to promote the provision of services in least restrictive environments?

Consider only services that aim to enable participation in daily routines and activities and allow the child to make progress in developmental areas.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Technical assistance
2 ☐ Written guidelines
3 ☐ Workshops
4 ☐ Mentors or coaches
5 ☐ Virtual opportunities including webinars or communities of practice
6 ☐ Additional funding
7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
8 ❍ None of the above

G9. Does your state do any of the following to help support districts and schools in the use of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) for school-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Technical assistance
2 ☐ Written guidelines
3 ☐ Workshops
4 ☐ Mentors or coaches
5 ☐ Virtual opportunities including webinars or communities of practice
6 ☐ Additional funding
7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
8 ❍ None of the above

G10. Does your state require that all state assessments, including alternate assessments, be developed using the principles of Universal Design for Learning?

1 ❍ Yes
0 ❍ No

G11. How does your state agency support district and school use of assistive technology (AT) for serving school-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Offer information about AT to families, such as through AT fairs
2 ☐ Provide designated funding to support AT devices and use
3 ☐ Provide lists of AT devices to districts for consideration
4 ☐ Provide guidelines for how to assess AT needs as part of IEP development
5 ☐ Provide specific guidelines for AT use
6 ☐ Provide professional development to general education teachers on use of AT
7 ☐ Provide professional development to special education teachers on use of AT
8 ☐ Provide professional development to Specialized Instructional Support Staff (SISP) on use of AT
9 ☐ Review or monitor IEPs to determine extent of AT use
10 ☐ Provide or lend AT devices or software to districts
11 ☐ Monitor use of AT to ensure effective implementation
12 ☐ Hire or contract with AT experts to promote effective implementation strategies
13 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

H. COLLECTION AND USE OF OUTCOME DATA

The next questions focus on the data your state collects and uses to measure child outcomes.

H1. What types of outcome data does your state agency examine for all school-age children with disabilities?

Adaptive behavior *refers to behavior that enables a person to get along in his or her environment with greatest success and least conflict with others.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Assessment score
2 ☐ Assessment type
3 ☐ Attendance
4 ☐ Course progress or completion
5 ☐ Discipline
6 ☐ Dropout rates
7 ☐ Functional performance or adaptive behavior
8 ☐ Grades
9 ☐ Graduation rates
10 ☐ Participation in AP or honors courses
11 ☐ Post-school outcomes (further education, employment)
12 ☐ Social-emotional skills development

H2. How does your state measure progress for school-age children with disabilities as part of your federal accountability under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)?

Select one only

1 ❍ By percentage of school-age children with disabilities meeting “proficient” level (minimal or expected proficiency levels for grade)
2 ❍ By percentage of school-age children with disabilities who moved up to the next level of proficiency from one year to the next
3 ❍ Other *(Please specify)* _____
4 ❍ We have no formal measure

These next questions ask about data related to the post-high school transition.

H3. To support the post-high school transition for school-age children with disabilities, how are data shared with and received from other programs or entities, such as postsecondary institutions, workforce agencies, vocational rehabilitation agencies, or social services?

If data are shared using more than one method, please select the method by which most data are shared.

Select one only

1 ❍ There is an integrated, longitudinal data system for storing data
2 ❍ Separate data systems are linked as needed using a common identifier or other matching process
3 ❍ Individual-level data from separate data systems are shared but cannot be linked
4 ❍ Aggregate data from separate data systems are shared
5 ❍ Other *(Please specify)* _____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H3 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE H4

H4. For which systems are you able to link data? For example, child welfare, K-12 or vocational rehabilitation.

_____

H5. How does your state agency obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes? (IDEA Part B Indicator 14)?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ State or district data systems
2 ☐ State or district surveys of providers who support former students after high school
3 ☐ State or district surveys of former students or their parents/guardians
4 ☐ Summary reports from other agencies
5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
6 ❍ We do not currently obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes

H6. What post-high school outcome data does your state agency collect in addition to the required outcomes for IDEA Part B Indicator 14 (enrollment in higher education, enrollment in other postsecondary education or training program, competitive employment, and other employment within one year of leaving high school)?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Enrollment in higher education more than one year after leaving high school

2 ☐ Enrollment in other postsecondary education or training program more than one year after leaving high school

3 ☐ Completion of higher education, other postsecondary education, or training program

4 ☐ Any employment more than one year after leaving high school

5 ☐ Competitive employment more than one year after leaving high school

6 ☐ Independent living arrangements

7 ☐ Supervised living arrangements

8 ☐ Incarceration

9 ☐ Hospitalization

10 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

11 ❍ Our state agency does not currently collect other transition data, but other state agencies do

12 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

I. SUPPORTS FOR TRANSITIONS

The next questions are related to supports provided to school-age children with disabilities during school transitions, both into and out of special education.

I1. For the 2019–2020 school year, in what ways is your state agency supporting the transition of preschool-age children with disabilities from *preschool to kindergarten/elementary school*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Developed or maintained agreements on transition between preschool services and elementary schools

2 ☐ Developed or maintained policies on transition from preschool to elementary school

3 ☐ Provided training to districts on transition

4 ☐ Provided technical assistance to districts on transition

5 ☐ Developed or disseminated materials for parents/guardians on transition from preschool to elementary school special education

6 ☐ Developed or maintained an electronic database of individual child records to allow children to be followed from preschool programs to elementary school special education

7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

8 ❍ None of the above

I2. By what age does your state agency require that post-high school transition planning begin for school-age children with disabilities?

Select one only

1 ❍ Age 13 or younger

2 ❍ Age 14

3 ❍ Age 15

4 ❍ Age 16

I3. For the 2019–2020 school year, in what ways is your state agency supporting the transition out of high school for school-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Developed or maintained agreements on transition between agencies providing post-high school or out-of-school services and high schools (such as the office of vocational rehabilitation)

2 ☐ Developed or maintained policies on transition from high school

3 ☐ Developed or maintained policies to improve the provision of pre-employment transition services

4 ☐ Provided technical assistance to high school staff on transition

5 ☐ Provided training for high school staff

6 ☐ Developed or disseminated materials for parents/guardians on the transition out of high school

7 ☐ Provided meetings or workshops for parents/guardians

8 ☐ Developed or maintained an electronic database of individual student records to allow children to be followed from high school to post-high school programs and jobs

9 ☐ Provided professional development for postsecondary agency staff (such as vocational rehabilitation and institutes of higher education)

10 ☐ Provided joint professional development for high school and postsecondary agency staff

11 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

12 ❍ None of the above

I4. For school-age children with disabilities who are preparing to transition from high school, how does your state agency ensure the quality of the transition component of IEPs?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Conduct on-site monitoring visits at school districts (for example, stakeholder interviews or observation of IEP meetings)

2 ☐ Identify school districts needing to improve transition processes

3 ☐ Provide technical assistance to school districts

4 ☐ Recommend or require that school districts needing improvement implement a quality improvement plan

5 ☐ Recommend or require that school districts use a transition planning rubric or guidance on best practices for compliance and quality

6 ☐ Recommend or require that school districts use a transition procedures manual

7 ☐ Review data on student outcomes by school district

8 ☐ Review a selection of IEPs from school districts

9 ☐ Survey parents/guardians about IEP transition outcomes or supports

10 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

J. COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION

The next questions focus on how your state agency collaborates and coordinates with other agencies and programs in addressing the needs of school-age children with disabilities transitioning out of high school.

J1. Does your state agency have formal agreements with any of the following agencies or programs to support the coordination of services for school-age children with disabilities transitioning out of high school?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Higher education and training
2 ☐ State independent living council
3 ☐ Health agency
4 ☐ Behavioral/mental health agency
5 ☐ Social services agency
6 ☐ State vocational rehabilitation agency
7 ☐ Developmental disabilities agency
8 ☐ Local disability advocacy groups, such as The Arc
9 ☐ Private therapists or therapy organizations (for example, trauma-informed therapists, applied behavior analysis providers
10 ☐ Juvenile justice
11 ☐ Foster care
12 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

J2. For school-age children with disabilities, what does your state agency share or coordinate with the following programs or entities to support the transition out of high school?

Select all that apply

	Share data	Share funding	Share personnel	Coordinate service provision	Share other information (such as IEPs)	No sharing or coordination occurs
a. Postsecondary education and training programs	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
b. Independent living agencies	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
c. Health care agencies	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
d. Mental health agencies	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
e. Social service agencies (for example, Department of Developmental Services)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
f. Vocational rehabilitation services (for example, Department of Rehabilitation Services)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
g. Employers or potential employers of students	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
h. Juvenile court or probation officers	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

K. DISCIPLINE

The next questions ask about your state's discipline policy.

When answering these questions, please assume manifestation determination review has taken place and it has been determined that the infraction is not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the IEP.

K1. Does your state agency provide districts with requirements or recommended guidelines around discipline?

1 ❍ Yes, the state provides districts with requirements

2 ❍ Yes, the state provides districts with recommended guidelines

0 ❍ No GO TO SECTION L

IF YOUR ANSWER TO K1 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE K2

K2. Please enterthe web address where we may view your state's current discipline policy.

If this information is not available on a website, please select the response below and scan and email a hardcopy to IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com.

1 ❍ Information available on a website

_____

0 ❍ Information not available on a website

IF YOUR ANSWER TO K1 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE K3

K3. Does your state have a zero-tolerance policy?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO K3 = 1 THEN COMPLETE K4

K4. Does your state's zero tolerance policy differ based on whether a student has a disability?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, it always differs for students with and without disabilities

2 ❍ Sometimes, it depends on the infraction

0 ❍ No, the policy is the same for all students

IF YOUR ANSWER TO K1 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE K5

K5. Does your state have a policy pertaining to *suspensions (both in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions*?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO K5 = 1, THEN COMPLETE K6

K6. Does your state's policy pertaining to *in-school suspensions* differ based on whether a student has a disability?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, it always differs for students with and without disabilities
2 ❍ Sometimes, it depends on the infraction
0 ❍ No, the policy is the same for all students

IF YOUR ANSWER TO K5 = 1, THEN COMPLETE K7

K7. Does your state's policy pertaining to *out-of-school suspensions* differ based on whether a student has a disability?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, it always differs for students with and without disabilities
2 ❍ Sometimes, it depends on the infraction
0 ❍ No, the policy is the same for all students

IF YOUR ANSWER TO K5 = 1, THEN COMPLETE K8

K8. Does your state's policy pertaining to *expulsions* differ based on whether a student has a disability?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, it always differs for students with and without disabilities
2 ❍ Sometimes, it depends on the infraction
0 ❍ No, the policy is the same for all students

IF YOUR ANSWER TO K1 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE K9

K9. Does your state have a policy restricting the use of *restraints and seclusion* in schools?

1 ❍ Yes
0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO K9 = 1, THEN COMPLETE K10

K10. Does yourstate's policy restricting the use of *restraints and seclusion* in schools differ based on whether a student has a disability?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, it always differs for students with and without disabilities
2 ❍ Sometimes, it depends on the infraction
0 ❍ No, the policy is the same for all students

IF YOUR ANSWER TO K1 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE K11

K11. Does your state agency collaborate with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for school-age children with disabilities?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO K11 = 1, THEN COMPLETE K12

K12. Which of the following agencies or organizations does your state agency work with to develop or support the implementation of behavioral supports to address disciplinary issues among school-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Behavioral/mental health agency

2 ☐ Developmental disabilities agency

3 ☐ Health agency

4 ☐ Local or state disability advocacy groups

5 ☐ Private therapists or therapy organizations (for example, trauma-informed therapists, applied behavior analysis providers)

6 ☐ Social services

7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO K1 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE K13

K13. Which of the following strategies, programs, or curricula does your state agency recommend to *manage behavioral issues* for school-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Mental health consultation

2 ☐ Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA)

3 ☐ Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)

4 ☐ Teacher training focused on managing student behavior

5 ☐ Technical assistance focused on managing student behavior

6 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

7 ❍ Not applicable, my state does not use any strategies or programs to manage the behavior of school-age children with disabilities

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

L. ADDRESSING LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY

The next questions focus on efforts made to address the linguistic and cultural diversity among families and school-age children with disabilities.

L1. Does your state agency do any of the following to ensure *non-English-speaking parents/guardians* understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes for school-age children?

Please select anything the state does or requires local school districts or providers to do.

Do not include activities initiated at the district or school level.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Parents/guardians are asked to state their primary language as part of standard procedure at intake

2 ☐ An interpreter is provided for parents/guardians as needed

3 ☐ Parents/guardians are encouraged to bring someone who can interpret for them

4 ☐ Parents/guardians are provided with translated written resources

5 ☐ A toll-free phone number staffed by multilingual staff is provided for non-English-speaking parents/guardians

6 ☐ A toll-free vendor interpreter service is used as needed

7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

L2. Does your state agency do any of the following to help ensure that *referrals and evaluations* are linguistically and culturally competent?

Linguistically and culturally competent *practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide professional development on culturally competent practices
2 ☐ Include parents/guardians on state advisory committees, task forces, or work groups representing diverse populations
3 ☐ Solicit periodic feedback from stakeholders and families representing diverse populations
4 ☐ Monitor how interpreters and translators are used
5 ☐ Monitor the use of culturally competent practices
6 ☐ Provide guidance specifically designed to support the use of linguistically and culturally competent practices (for example, written guidance or webinars)
7 ☐ Work with the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate

L3. Does your state agency do any of the following to help ensure that *services* are linguistically and culturally competent?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide professional development on culturally competent practices
2 ☐ Include parents/guardians on state advisory committees, task forces, or work groups representing diverse populations
3 ☐ Solicit periodic feedback from stakeholders and families representing diverse populations
4 ☐ Monitor how interpreters and translators are used
5 ☐ Monitor the use of culturally competent practices
6 ☐ Provide guidance specifically designed to support the use of linguistically and culturally competent practices (for example, written guidance or webinars)
7 ☐ Work with the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate

L4. What challenges has your state agency experienced in ensuring that *referrals and evaluations* are linguistically and culturally competent?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Addressing family reluctance to engage with schools around special education
2 ☐ Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status
3 ☐ Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals
4 ☐ Having an insufficient number of interpreters
5 ☐ Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes
6 ☐ Having assessments for evaluation that are not normed for other languages
7 ☐ Difficulty determining if eligibility for services is due to lack of skills in native language, rather than a disability
8 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
9 ❍ None of the above

L5. What challenges has your state agency experienced in ensuring that *services* are linguistically and culturally competent?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Addressing family reluctance to engage with schools around special education
2 ☐ Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status
3 ☐ Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals
4 ☐ Having an insufficient number of interpreters
5 ☐ Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes
6 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
7 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

M. FAMILY ENGAGEMENT

The next questions focus on engaging families of school-age children with disabilities in the special education system.

M1. Does your state require districts or schools provide parents/guardians with information about the Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center when a referral is made?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

M2. For the 2019–2020 school year, is your state agency offering any of the following to districts to promote the involvement of parents/guardians of children with IEPs?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Funds to districts to help parents/guardians participate in IEP meetings (for example, funds for transportation, child care, translators)

2 ☐ Training on increasing parent/guardian involvement

3 ☐ Technical assistance related to promoting parent/guardian involvement

4 ☐ Written guidelines related to parent/guardian involvement

5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

6 ❍ None of the above

M3. For the 2019–2020 school year, in what ways are state agency staff collaborating with the Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Development or delivery of trainings

2 ☐ Delivery of technical assistance

3 ☐ Dissemination of information regarding each other's services

4 ☐ Development of training/guidance materials

5 ☐ Family outreach efforts (for example, parents/guardians and siblings)

6 ☐ Promotion of alternative dispute resolution models

7 ☐ Involvement in the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

8 ☐ Implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

9 ☐ Assisting with conducting the required parent survey (Indicator C4 in the SPP/APR)

10 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

11 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

M4. For the 2019–2020 school year, in what ways is the state agency *supporting* the PTI?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Staff from the state agency meet with PTI staff on a regular basis
2 ☐ State agency and PTI have joint planning sessions to coordinate services provided
3 ☐ State agency and PTI offer joint professional development
4 ☐ State agency provides financial support for events or services
5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

N. SPECIAL EDUCATOR CREDENTIALS

The next questions focus on the qualification and credentialing criteria for special educators.

N1. Which state agency is responsible for licensing and certification of special education classroom teachers?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ State Education Agency (SEA)

2 ☐ State licensing and certification agency that is not part of the SEA

3 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

N2. In what ways can special education classroom teachers qualify for the *traditional certification*?

Please do not include emergency certifications.

Select one only per row

	Required	Optional	Not applicable
a. Portfolio	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
b. Exam/proficiency test	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
c. Undergraduate or graduate degree program	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
d. Coursework (not leading to a degree)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
e. Other (*Please specify)* _____	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍

N3. In what ways can special education classroom teachers qualify for certification *through alternative routes*?

Please do not include emergency certifications.

Select one only per row

	Required	Optional	Not applicable
a. Portfolio	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
b. Exam/proficiency test	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
c. Undergraduate or graduate degree program	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
d. Coursework (not leading to a degree)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
e. Other (*Please specify)* _____	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍

N4. Does your state allow for special education classroom teachers to transfer certification from a reciprocating state?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

N5. In what ways does your state measure subject matter knowledge for special education teachers at the *elementary school level*?

Please indicate whether the ways of demonstrating subject matter competency are required or optional.

Elementary schools are schools for which the lowest grade is 3 or lower, and the highest grade is 8 or lower.

Select one only per row

	Required	Optional	Not applicable
a. Performance evaluation	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
b. Portfolio	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
c. Classroom experience	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
d. Student achievement data	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
e. Content area test scores (for example, PRAXIS, state-developed tests)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
f. National Board certification	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
g. Completion of professional development, including additional coursework	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
h. Other (*Please specify)* _____	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍

N6. In what ways does your state measure subject matter knowledge for special education teachers at the *middle school level*?

Please indicate whether the ways of demonstrating subject matter competency are required or optional.

Middle schools are schools for which the lowest grade is between 4 and 7, and the highest grade is between 4 and 9.

Select one only per row

	Required	Optional	Not applicable
a. Performance evaluation	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
b. Portfolio	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
c. Classroom experience	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
d. Student achievement data	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
e. Content area test scores (for example, PRAXIS, state-developed tests)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
f. National Board certification	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
g. Completion of professional development, including additional coursework	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
h. Other (*Please specify)* _____	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍

N7. In what ways does your state measure subject matter knowledge for special education teachers at the *high school level*?

Please indicate whether the ways of demonstrating subject matter competency are required or optional.

High schools are schools for which the lowest grade is 7 or higher and the highest grade is 12.

Select one only per row

	Required	Optional	Not applicable
a. Performance evaluation	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
b. Portfolio	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
c. Classroom experience	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
d. Student achievement data	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
e. Content area test scores (for example, PRAXIS, state-developed tests)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
f. National Board certification	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
g. Completion of professional development, including additional coursework	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
h. Other (*Please specify)* _____	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

O. STAFFING

***The next questions focus on the availability of staff to provide services to school-age children with disabilities*.**

O1. During the current (2019–2020) and preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019), what strategies has your state used to *increase the number of effective special education teachers*?

Please do not include strategies initiated at the district or school level.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Collaborated with universities to develop programs and curricula to prepare providers in specific shortage areas

2 ☐ Paid fees for tests/licensure exams

3 ☐ Paid for tutoring to prepare teachers for certification tests/licensure exams

4 ☐ Provided time or funding for teachers to participate in professional development opportunities (for example, institute of higher education tuition, workshop fees)

5 ☐ Provided alternative routes to certification in special education for any person with a bachelor's degree

6 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

7 ❍ None of the above

O2. During the current (2019–2020) and past (2018–2019) school years, what initiatives or incentives has your *state* used to *retain* effective special education teachers?

Please do not include initiatives or incentives initiated at the district or school level.

Tuition "pay back": *For every year of tuition, teachers owe the district a year of service.*

Select all that apply

0 ☐ Our state has not had problems with retention

1 ☐ Cover continuing education costs to attain a higher degree

2 ☐ Cover continuing education costs to maintain certification

3 ☐ Provide mentoring or induction programs

4 ☐ Offer full-time teaching positions

5 ☐ Offer part-time teaching positions

6 ☐ Provide additional planning or release time

7 ☐ Provide smaller caseloads

8 ☐ Provide smaller class sizes

9 ☐ Offer student loan forgiveness

10 ☐ Offer tuition "pay back" or partial reimbursement

11 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

P. FUNDING ALLOCATION

The next questions focus on funding for special education services for school-age children with disabilities.

P1. What funding sources support services for school-age children with disabilities, as required by their IEPs?

*Please select **any funding sources** that support school-age children with disabilities.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ IDEA, Part B
2 ☐ State education funds
3 ☐ Local municipality or county funds
4 ☐ Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V
5 ☐ Medicaid/Title XIX
6 ☐ Private insurance
7 ☐ State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)
8 ☐ Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)
9 ☐ Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
10 ☐ TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)
11 ☐ Other federal funding sources *(Please specify)* _____
12 ☐ Other state funding sources *(Please specify)* _____
13 ☐ Other local funding sources *(Please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

P1a. IF YOU SELECTED **THREE OR MORE** ITEMS IN P1:
Please write a "1" for the source that provides the largest share of funding, a "2" for the source that provides the next largest share of funding, and a "3" for the third largest funding source, based on the responses provided in P1.

IF YOU SELECTED **TWO** ITEMS IN P1**:**
Please write a "1" for the source listed below that provides the largest share of funding, and a "2" for the source that provides the next largest share of funding, based on the responses provided in P1.

IF YOU SELECTED **ONE** ITEM IN P1:
Please write a "1" next to the source selected in P1, and continue to the next survey item.

	Rank 1, 2, and 3 by share of funding. Use each number only once.
a. IDEA, Part B	|___|
b. State education funds	|___|
c. Local municipality or county funds	|___|
d. Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	|___|
e. Medicaid/Title XIX	|___|
f. Private insurance	|___|
g. State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)	|___|
h. Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)	|___|
i. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	|___|
j. TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	|___|
k. Other federal funding sources *(Please specify)* _____	|___|
l. Other state funding sources *(Please specify)* _____	|___|
m. Other local funding sources *(Please specify)* _____	|___|

P2. For school-age children with IEPs, which of the following activities does your state agency's policy allow to be reimbursed by Medicaid?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Disability screening and diagnosis
2 ☐ Case management and referrals to services
3 ☐ Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid
4 ☐ Equipment and assistive technologies
5 ☐ Transportation costs
6 ☐ Mental and behavioral health services
7 ☐ Occupational therapy
8 ☐ Physical therapy
9 ☐ Speech or language therapy
10 ☐ Personal aide services
11 ☐ Professional development for staff supporting school-age children with IEPs
12 ❍ Our state does not file for Medicaid reimbursement

P3. Which of the following methods are used to determine how special education funding (including federal and state) is allocated for services for school-age children in your state?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ A fixed amount based on all students enrolled in a school district
2 ☐ A fixed amount per student with disabilities enrolled in a school district
3 ☐ Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in a school district, depending on disability category
4 ☐ Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in a school district, depending on specific services required
5 ☐ Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on type of student placement
6 ☐ Predetermined amounts per teacher, supportive services staff position, or other resource required given the number of students with disabilities
7 ☐ A formula based on the amount of specific allowable special education expenses actually incurred (for example, full reimbursement or percentage reimbursement)
8 ☐ A formula based on a measure of local poverty
9 ☐ A formula based on funding allocations in a base year or a previous year
10 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
11 ❍ None of the above, funding to support special education is not separated out from the general education funding formula

P4. For school-age children, does your state allocate a portion of the state special education funding to another state agency or agencies who have responsibility for serving this population?

Do not include high-cost funding.

***High Cost Funds (HCF)** help offset the financial impact on Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities.*

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO P4 = 1, THEN COMPLETE P5

P5. Which other state agencies do you allocate funds to?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Postsecondary education and training

2 ☐ Independent living agencies

3 ☐ Employment or workforce

4 ☐ Health care agencies

5 ☐ Mental health agencies

6 ☐ Social services agencies

7 ☐ Vocational rehabilitation services

8 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

P6. How are state set-aside funds from Federal Part B IDEA grants for school-age children with disabilities being used?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ To finance a high-cost fund to support districts serving high-cost school-age children with disabilities

2 ☐ To support districts in meeting personnel shortages

3 ☐ To support districts in identifying and implementing evidence-based practices (for example, Multi-tiered Systems of Support, Universal Design for Learning)

4 ☐ To provide districts and district staff with capacity building, technical assistance, professional development, and training

5 ☐ To support, expand, or improve the use of technology

6 ☐ To provide programming for children with disabilities who have been expelled from school, live in correctional facilities, or are enrolled in state-operated or state-supported schools

7 ☐ To provide programming for children with disabilities who are enrolled in charter schools

8 ☐ To support development and implementation of transition programs, including coordination of services with agencies involved in supporting the transition of children with disabilities to postsecondary activities

9 ☐ To support state-level monitoring, compliance, and other administrative expenditures for the IDEA Part B grant for preschool-age and school-age children

10 ☐ To support state-level monitoring, compliance, and other administrative expenditures for the IDEA Part C grant for early intervention services

P7. Does the state maintain a high-cost fund?

High Cost Funds (HCFs) *help offset the financial impact on Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities.*

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO P7 = 1, THEN COMPLETE P8

P8. Which of the following *high-cost fund mechanisms* does the state use to provide funding to districts with high-cost school-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ The state allocates IDEA Part B funds to a high-cost fund to assist districts with high-cost students

2 ☐ The state allocates additional state funds, not part of IDEA, to a high-cost fund to assist districts with high-cost students

3 ☐ The state requires districts to pay into a high-cost fund to assist districts with high-cost students

4 ❍ None of the above, funding to support districts with high-cost students is not separated out from the broader special education funding formula

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

Q. ACTIVITIES FUNDS

The next questions are about the use of state-level activities funds.

Section 300.704 of IDEA allows the State Education Agency to reserve a portion of the total funding it receives for state set-aside: state-level administration and other state-level activities.

Q1. During the last school year (2018–2019), what were IDEA *state-level administration funds* spent on?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Administration of school-age special education and related services

2 ☐ Administration of preschool-age special education and related services

3 ☐ Administration of early intervention services

4 ☐ Coordination of activities under Part B with other programs that provide services to children with disabilities

5 ☐ Provision of technical assistance to other programs that provide services to children with disabilities

Q2. During the last school year (2018–2019), what were IDEA *other state-level activities funds* spent on?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Providing professional development, including pre-service training

2 ☐ Implementing paperwork reduction activities, including expanding use of technology in the IEP process

3 ☐ Assisting districts in providing positive behavioral interventions and supports and mental health services

4 ☐ Supporting use of technology to enhance learning, including technology with universal design principles and technology with assistive technology

5 ☐ Developing and/or implementing transition programs, including coordination of services with agencies involved in supporting the transition of students with disabilities to postsecondary activities

6 ☐ Assisting districts in meeting personnel shortages

7 ☐ Supporting capacity-building activities to improve results for children with disabilities

8 ☐ Supporting improvement of delivery services by districts to improve results for children with disabilities

9 ☐ Supporting programming for children with disabilities who have been expelled from school, live in correctional facilities, or are enrolled in state-operated or state-supported schools

10 ☐ Supporting programming for children with disabilities who are enrolled in charter schools

11 ☐ Developing and/or providing appropriate accommodations for children with disabilities

12 ☐ Developing and/or providing alternate assessments that are valid and reliable for assessing the performance of children with disabilities

13 ☐ Providing technical assistance to schools and districts implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities

14 ☐ Providing technical assistance to schools and districts implementing targeted support and improvement activities under Section 1111(d) of the ESSA

15 ☐ Providing professional development in the use of Universal Design for Learning (UDL)

Q3. During the last school year (2018–2019), did your state use Other State-level Activities funds to support activities aligned with your State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO Q3 = 1, THEN COMPLETE Q4

Q4. During the last school year (2018–2019), how did your state use other state-level activities funds to support activities aligned with your State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ To help districts provide professional development
3 ☐ To help districts support infrastructure, for example data systems
4 ☐ To help districts implement evidence-based practices
5 ☐ To help improve staff-to-student ratios
6 ☐ To help institutes of higher education or national experts provide professional development
7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

Q5. How does the state agency determine how it will spend IDEA state-level activities funds (both administration funds and other state-level activities funds)?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Based on requests from Local Education Agencies (LEAs)
2 ☐ Based on an analysis of state or local data
3 ☐ Based on a review of state progress toward goals
4 ☐ Based on state priority areas

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

R. EVIDENCE FROM RESEARCH

The next questions focus on the use of evidence from research.

R1. How often does your state agency draw on the following sources of information when selecting special education policies and practices?

Select one only per row

	Never or not applicable	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Don't know
a. Information provided by the intervention's developer or vendor	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
b. Recommendations from colleagues in other state education departments	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
c. Information from a federal-funded technical assistance center	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
d. Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
e. Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory (REL)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
f. Information from the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
g. Information from the state's research/evaluation office	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
h. Information from professional associations	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
i. Information from a college/university researcher	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
j. Information from a research journal	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
k. Social media (Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, other)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
l. Other (*Please specify)*	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍

_____

R2. What level of evidence, as specified in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), does your state agency require for evidence-based special education policies, procedures, and practices to be used by school districts in your state?

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence: *supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented randomized control experimental studies.*

Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence: *supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental studies.*

Tier 3 – Promising Evidence: *supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented correlational studies (with statistical controls for selection bias).*

Tier 4 – Demonstrates a Rationale: *practices that have a well-defined logic model or theory of action, are supported by research, and have some effort underway by an SEA, LEA, or outside research organization to determine their effectiveness.*

1 ❍ Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

2 ❍ Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

3 ❍ Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

4 ❍ Tier 4 – Demonstrates a Rationale

5 ❍ Not applicable (for example, the state agency requires different levels of evidence for different activities related to special education)

R3. Does your state agency do any of the following to support or ensure that school districts use evidence-based special education policies, procedures, and practices?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Share an approved list of evidence-based programs, interventions, and practices with districts

2 ☐ Provide training and technical assistance to districts on implementing evidence-based practices

3 ☐ Use a checklist to observe districts to assess the use of a particular required evidence-based practice, or to review videos submitted to state

4 ☐ Provide a checklist to districts to support their assessment of the use of a particular required evidence-based practice

5 ☐ Conduct focus groups or surveys with parents/guardians to assess the extent to which evidence-based practices are being used

6 ☐ Conduct focus groups or surveys with district staff to assess the extent to which evidence-based practices are being used

7 ☐ Develop online modules or other materials to assist districts in identifying and selecting evidence-based programs, interventions, and/or practices

8 ☐ Use existing online modules or other materials to assist districts in identifying and selecting evidence-based programs, interventions, and/or practices

9 ☐ Have districts complete self-assessments on practices

10 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

11 ❍ The state agency does not take particular steps to ensure that districts use evidence-based policies, procedures and practices

R4. Does your state agency currently use any of the following strategies to implement or scale up the evidence-based practices identified in your State Systemic Improvement Plans (SSIPs) for Part B 611?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide online training (including single or modular courses) to support local implementations

2 ☐ Encourage district and local staff participation in federal model programs (for example, the Pyramid Model)

3 ☐ Support district and local staff participation in federal model programs (for example, the Pyramid Model)

4 ☐ Pilot implementation of the practice(s) in select districts in order to prepare for more widespread implementation

5 ☐ Disseminate written materials to practitioners to provide training or information to support local implementation

6 ☐ Disseminate written materials that provide training or information to support local implementation

7 ☐ Host informational webinars to support local implementation

8 ☐ Provide coaches to support local implementation

9 ☐ Support communities of practice

10 ☐ Some other strategy *(Please specify)* _____

R5. Which of the following statements best describes the current status of your state agency's efforts in implementing or scaling up the evidence-based practices identified in your SSIPs for Part B?

Select one only

1 ❍ We are in the early planning stages

2 ❍ We are developing materials but have not put any practices into place yet

3 ❍ We have begun implementation but at a small scale

4 ❍ We have expanded beyond an initial phase to reach more districts

5 ❍ We have scaled up or implemented state-wide

6 ❍ Different practices are in different stages of implementation

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

State education agency survey on IDEA implementation for preschool-age children

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) State and Local Implementation Study 2019

STATE PART B 619

November 2019

NOTE: The hardcopy version of this survey is for reference purposes only. All instructions and FAQs pertain to the online version of the survey. To access the survey online, please use the link below. Enter the username and password provided to you in the letter included in the mailing packet.

Survey Link: IDEA-Survey.com/State619

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995
According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1850-0949. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 60 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (Education Department General Administrative Regulations Section, 34 C.F.R. § 76.591). If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this survey, please contact the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20202-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov directly. [Note: Please do not return the completed survey to this address.]

Notice of Confidentiality
Responses to this data collection will be used only for statistical purposes. All information that would permit identification of the state or individual respondent will be kept confidential (per The Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002), will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey, and will not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose except as required by law. Study reports may present information by state.

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) State and Local Implementation Study 2019, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), is an important study that will develop a national picture of state, district, and school implementation of IDEA. It will provide (1) the Department of Education, Congress, and other stakeholders with knowledge that can inform how services are provided to children, and (2) states, districts, and schools with an understanding of how others are implementing IDEA.

The IDEA Implementation Study is not a compliance study, nor a study of the results of effectiveness of IDEA.

We are requesting you complete this questionnaire because you and your staff have the most knowledge about special education policies and practices for children ages 3 through 5 with disabilities in your state. If there are questions you are not able to answer, please feel free to draw on the expertise and knowledge of others within your department. As grantees under IDEA, state education agencies are expected to participate in this data collection (34 C.F.R. § 76.591). With your contribution, ED and Congress will gain a more accurate and complete understanding of how IDEA is being implemented for preschool-age children at the state level.

Please note that data on state policies and resources/supports may be reported by state. Thus, while personally identifiable information about individual respondents will not be released, data displayed by state could be attributed to the state agency or possibly to an individual respondent.

Thank you for joining us in our effort to understand the implementation of IDEA.
We appreciate your time and cooperation.

Please see the next pages for instructions for completing this survey, as well as a set of key definitions and frequently asked questions.

If you have any questions, contact:
Lisbeth Goble, 833-238-7224
email: IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com

Before you answer the questions, please carefully read the instructions, key definitions, and frequently asked questions. You can refer back to these as you complete the survey by clicking on the Instructions, Key Definitions, and FAQs link on the upper right-hand side of the screen.

INSTRUCTIONS

- All items request information pertaining to the 2019–2020 school year unless otherwise specified.
- The primary respondent for this survey is intended to be the person most knowledgeable about preschool special education policies and practices in your state. In most cases, the primary respondent will be the Part B 619 state director of special education.
- Certain questions may require the help of other staff, such as other staff in your state education or early childhood agency. If you need input from other staff, you may share your unique survey hyperlink, which will give them full access to the survey, or you can print off specific questions for them to answer on paper and then fill in the online responses yourself.
- There may be questions where districts, schools or local providers are also doing work in a given area. Unless otherwise specified, please indicate **only** the activities the state agency initiates or engages in.
- Throughout the survey, you'll see some terms in blue. You can click on those to see a definition of the term.
- Items on this survey cover the following topics: Agency Role; Identification for Special Education and Related Services; IEP Development and Quality; Access to General Education Programs and Supports; Collection and Use of Outcome Data; Support for Transitions; Discipline and Safety; Coordination and Collaboration; Addressing Linguistic and Cultural Diversity; Family Engagement; Special Educator Credentials; Staffing; Funding Allocation; Activities Funds; and Evidence from Research.

KEY DEFINITIONS

Children with disabilities is used to reflect children ages 3 through 5 with intellectual disabilities; hearing impairments, including deafness; speech or language impairments; visual impairments, including blindness; serious emotional disturbance (hereafter referred to as emotional disturbance); orthopedic impairments; autism; traumatic brain injuries; developmental delays; other health impairments; specific learning disabilities; deaf-blindness; or multiple disabilities, and who, by reason thereof, receive special education and related services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) according to an Individualized Education Program (IEP) or an Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP).

Preschool special education services is used to reflect publicly funded services provided through an IEP or IFSP to children ages 3 through 5 who are not yet attending kindergarten. These are services funded under Part B of IDEA for which the state education agency has oversight responsibility.

Special education teachers are teachers employed and contracted to work with children with disabilities. For this survey, we would like you to consider teachers who work with children with disabilities who are ages 3 through 5 who are not yet attending kindergarten.

Professional development includes a range of learning and support activities designed to prepare individuals to work with, and on behalf of, children and their families, as well as ongoing experiences to enhance this work. Professional development encompasses education, training, and technical assistance.

Training is a learning experience, or series of experiences, specific to an area of inquiry and related set of skills, delivered by a professional(s) with subject matter and adult learning knowledge and skills. This could include seminars, workshops, or courses about specific topics or key concepts.

Technical assistance (TA) is the provision of targeted and customized supports by a professional(s) with subject matter and adult learning knowledge and skills with the goal of developing or strengthening processes, knowledge application, or implementation of services by recipients. This could include coaching, consulting, or other ongoing support.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

How do I navigate the survey? You can access the survey by clicking on the unique hyperlink we provided to you via email. Once you have started the survey, you can navigate through it by answering each question and clicking the NEXT button at the bottom of the page. To navigate between survey sections, click on the [Survey Menu] button at the top right of your screen. This will allow you go to select the section you wish to complete. To go back to a previous page, click the BACK button. Do not use your internet browser back/forward buttons to move through the survey.

Do I have to complete the survey all at one time? No. You can revisit the website as many times as needed to complete the survey. However, if you need to stop before finishing the survey, **please be sure to click on the NEXT button before closing out so that your response(s) on that page are saved**. You will resume at the next unanswered question when you return to the survey. Once you have finished and submitted your survey, you will no longer have access to it. **Please note that each session will time out after 30 minutes of inactivity**.

Can I complete the survey on my tablet or smartphone? Yes. The survey has been optimized to run on desktop computers, tablets, or smartphones. The survey is best viewed in the latest versions of Chrome, Safari, Firefox, or Internet Explorer (IE 11 or Edge).

How long does the survey take? About 60 minutes. You can preview the questions and are not required to complete the survey all at once. The data you provide each time you log in will be securely stored and available when you return to complete the survey.

Do I have to answer all the questions? Please try to answer all questions that are relevant for your state, so the U.S. Department of Education can gain a more accurate and complete understanding of how IDEA is being implemented. You will automatically be skipped past some questions that do not apply to your situation, depending on your answer to an earlier question. You may choose to skip any question in the survey that you cannot or do not wish to answer. To skip a question, leave the question blank and then click the NEXT button to proceed.

Can I have my staff complete some of the questions instead of me? Yes. Certain questions may require the help of other staff. You may share your unique survey hyperlink with these individuals, which will give them full access to the survey, or you can print off specific questions and fill in the responses yourself at a later time.

Can multiple people work on completing the survey at the same time? No. If multiple people are logged into the same survey at the same time, responses may not be recorded correctly. Only one person on one computer should be completing the survey at any given time.

Can I print individual questions? Yes. You may print an individual page at any time by using your computer's usual method of printing.

Can I print a copy of the questionnaire when I am finished? If you would like a copy of your responses once you complete the survey, please email IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com and we will send you a copy of the survey with your responses.

Can I obtain a paper version of the questionnaire? Yes. If you would like to see a paper version for reference purposes, please email IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com and we will send you a copy.

Will my answers be kept confidential? Yes. All information that would permit identification of the district, school, or individual respondent will be held in strict confidence, will be used only by persons engaged in the survey and only for the purposes of the survey, and will not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose except as required by law. Study reports may present information by state.

Whom should I contact if I have a question? If you have any questions, please contact Lisbeth Goble at 833-238-7224 or at IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com. When sending emails, in addition to the question, please be sure to include your name and a phone number where you can be reached.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Please enter the contact information of the primary respondent below in case we need to contact your agency to clarify responses to any questions.

First Name:_____

Last Name: _____

Title/Position:_____

Phone: |__|__|__| - |__|__|__| - |__|__|__|__|

Email Address: _____

State Name: _____

Best days and times to reach you (in case of questions): _____

A. AGENCY ROLE

The first question is about your role in your state agency.

A1. As the designated state special education director, which of the following describes the population(s) of students for which you have responsibility?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Preschool-age children with disabilities

2 ☐ School-age children with disabilities

3 ☐ Children, birth through age 2, with disabilities

4 ☐ Preschool-age children *without* disabilities

5 ☐ School-age children *without* disabilities

6 ☐ Children, birth through age 2, *without* disabilities

7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

B. IDENTIFICATION FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND RELATED SERVICES

The next questions focus on eligibility criteria and the identification of preschool-age children for special education.

B1. Please enter the web address where we may view your state's current eligibility criteria for the preschool-age special education program and related services.

If this information is not available on a website, please select the response below and scan and email a hard copy to IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com

1 ❍ Information available on a website

_____

0 ❍ Information not available on a website

B2. Which activities does your agency conduct to support the identification of preschool-age children in need of special education services?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Child Find screenings

2 ☐ Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to pediatricians and other health care providers

3 ☐ Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities

4 ☐ Workshops for pediatricians and other health care providers

5 ☐ Workshops for staff from child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities

6 ☐ Outreach to referral sources

7 ☐ Web-based information and other electronic materials

8 ☐ Outreach through radio, TV, newspapers, and other print media to promote awareness of disabilities and services for young children

9 ☐ Outreach through community events, such as health fairs

10 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

11 ❍ None of the above

B3. How does your state agency coordinate identification and determine eligibility of preschool-age children suspected of having a disability with each of the following state or local agencies?

Select all that apply

	Home visiting agencies	Head Start	Pre-K schools	Social service agencies	Public health agencies	N/A
a. Have occasional or regular conversations about identification and screening	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
b. Jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
c. Hold joint professional development for personnel	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
d. Share identification and screening data	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
e. Establish interagency agreements	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
f. Other (*Please specify)* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍

B4. For infants and toddlers who received early intervention services who are *not* determined eligible for preschool special education services, does your state agency provide any of the following to parents/guardians?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Information about preschool programs in the local area
2 ☐ Information about other agencies in the local area
3 ☐ Referrals to other agencies and programs
4 ☐ Referrals to specialists who can assess the child's developmental and learning needs
5 ☐ The opportunity to continue current services, paid for by parents/guardians
6 ☐ Other *(Please specify).*

_____

7 ❍ None of the above

B5. During the eligibility determination period, is there anything your state agency does to help districts apply exclusionary criteria?

The purpose of this exclusionary clause is to help prevent the improper determination of eligibility of children for special education services, especially those from distinct cultures who have acquired learning styles, language, or behaviors that are not compatible with academic requirements of schools in the dominant culture.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Develop procedures for application of exclusionary criteria

2 ☐ Provide professional development for school staff

3 ☐ Provide written materials to school staff

4 ☐ Provide guidelines for staff to follow before screening children who are English Learners

5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

B6. How does your state agency work with other agencies and programs (such as home visiting, Head Start, public health, substance abuse treatment, mental health, social services) to identify and determine eligibility of preschool-age children who have experienced the following emerging health concerns?

Select all that apply

	Have occasional or regular conversations	Jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	Hold joint professional development for personnel	Share identification and screening data	Establish interagency agreements	Don't work with other agencies/ programs on this condition
a. Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs)	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
b. Fetal alcohol spectrum disorders	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
c. Lead or other heavy metal poisoning	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
d. Neonatal abstinence syndrome	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
e. Opioid addiction	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
f. Prenatal substance use	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
g. Zika virus	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

C. MULTI-TIERED SYSTEMS OF SUPPORT

The next questions focus on Multi-tiered Systems of Support

C1. Which of the following describes state-level activities related to Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), including Response to Intervention (RtI)?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ The state has a state-level MTSS task force, commission, or internal working group

2 ☐ The state agency has a dedicated full-time position related to MTSS

3 ☐ The state agency has an outside advisory group related to MTSS

4 ☐ The state agency has provided resources to school districts (for example, issued grants or RFPs) to explore the use of MTSS (for example, to identify or try model MTSS programs; to plan or begin implementation)

5 ☐ The state agency has issued guidelines on MTSS

6 ☐ The state agency has organized trainings on MTSS that were conducted by consultants or contractors

7 ☐ State agency staff conduct trainings on MTSS

8 ☐ State agency staff provide technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) to LEAs and schools that are investigating or implementing MTSS

9 ☐ The state agency arranges technical assistance from consultants or contractors for districts and schools that are investigating or implementing MTSS

10 ☐ MTSS information is available on the state agency's website

11 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

12 ❍ None of the above

C2. Please describe any current state agency initiatives related to MTSS, including RtI, in *reading*.

Select one only

1 ❍ The state agency has no current initiatives related to implementation of MTSS

2 ❍ The state agency has a pilot initiative to implement MTSS in a limited number of districts or schools

3 ❍ The state agency has an initiative to expand the use of MTSS more broadly within the state

4 ❍ The state agency has an initiative to implement MTSS statewide

C2a. Please describe any current state agency initiatives related to MTSS, including RtI, in *math*.

Select one only

1 ❍ The state agency has no current initiatives related to implementation of MTSS

2 ❍ The state agency has a pilot initiative to implement MTSS in a limited number of districts or schools

3 ❍ The state agency has an initiative to expand the use of MTSS more broadly within the state

4 ❍ The state agency has an initiative to implement MTSS statewide

C2b. Please describe any current state agency initiatives related to MTSS, including RtI, in *behavior*.

Select one only

1 ❍ The state agency has no current initiatives related to implementation of MTSS

2 ❍ The state agency has a pilot initiative to implement MTSS in a limited number of districts or schools

3 ❍ The state agency has an initiative to expand the use of MTSS more broadly within the state

4 ❍ The state agency has an initiative to implement MTSS statewide

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C2 OR C2A OR C2B = 2, 3, OR 4, THEN COMPLETE C3

C3. If your state has either a pilot or statewide initiative that promotes MTSS, including RtI in preschools, at what level are decisions made about each of the aspects of MTSS implementation described below?

Select all that apply

		State agency staff decide	District staff decide	School staff decide	Not done	Don't know
a.	The research-based curricula to use in general education	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍	d ❍
b.	The cut scores for determining risk status	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍	d ❍
c.	The criteria for determining a student's responsiveness to intervention	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍	d ❍
d.	The frequency and duration of progress monitoring	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍	d ❍
e.	The choice of interventions to use for students determined to be at risk	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍	d ❍
f.	The number of intervention sessions required prior to referral for special education	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍	d ❍
g.	The decision rules for a referral for a special education evaluation	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍	d ❍
h.	How to document intervention fidelity	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍	d ❍

C4. In determination of eligibility for special education under Specific Learning Disability (SLD), which best describes your state's policy with respect to MTSS, including RtI?

Select one only

1 ❍ The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility

2 ❍ The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) is used to determine eligibility

3 ❍ The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility

4 ❍ The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data may be used in determining eligibility

5 ❍ The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) may be used to determine eligibility

6 ❍ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

7 ❍ None of the above

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C4 = 3, 4, 5, 6 OR 7, THEN COMPLETE C5

C5. If your state permits the use of a discrepancy method in determining SLD, which best characterizes your state policy?

1 ❍ The state agency has operationalized discrepancy criteria and any district using a discrepancy method must adhere to these criteria

2 ❍ Districts have discretion to choose the specific discrepancy criteria used

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C4 = 3, 4, 5, 6 OR 7, THEN COMPLETE C6

C6. Does your state have a plan to eliminate the use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model as a determination of eligibility for special education under SLD by the 2020–2021 school year?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

C7. Does your state allow an approach other than MTSS or IQ-achievement discrepancy to determine the presence of SLD?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C7 = 1, THEN COMPLETE C8

C8. What other approach(es) does your state allow?

_____

(Please specify)

_____

(Please specify)

C9. Does your state policies and practices for the identification of students with SLD *differ by grade level*?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

D. IEP DEVELOPMENT AND QUALITY

The next questions focus on early learning standards and development of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs).

Early learning standards *describe expectations for children's learning and development prior to kindergarten.*

Standards-based IEPs *are those that align goals for children with disabilities with the early learning standards that form the basis of each state's preschool program and curriculum.*

D1. Does your state's early learning standards for preschool-age children align with early learning guidelines or K-12 standards?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Yes, with early learning guidelines (birth through age 2)

2 ☐ Yes, with K-12 standards

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO D1 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE D2

D2. Which domains are covered by the early learning standards for preschool-age children?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Physical/health

2 ☐ Cognitive

3 ☐ Approaches to learning

4 ☐ Social/emotional

5 ☐ Communication/language

6 ☐ Adaptive behavior

7 ☐ Motor development

8 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

9 ❍ None of the above

D3. For the 2019–2020 school year, does your state have formal written policies in place regarding development and use of standards-based IEPs for preschool-age children with disabilities?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO D1 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE D4

D4. During the 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 school years, what proportion of your state staff who work with preschool-age children participated in professional development on the development of standards-based IEPs for preschool-age children with disabilities?

Your best estimate is fine.

1 ❍ 0 to 20 percent
2 ❍ 21 to 40 percent
3 ❍ 41 to 60 percent
4 ❍ 61 to 80 percent
5 ❍ 81 to 100 percent

D5. Does your state agency provide any *professional development* on any of the following topics to help promote the quality of the IEP process for preschool-age children with disabilities?

If your state has elected the Extended Part C option to use Part C funding to provide services for children until they enter kindergarten, please consider both IFSPs and IEPs in your response.

Professional development can occur either in person or online.

***A quality IEP** is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student.*

***Standards-based IEPs** are those that align goals for students with disabilities with the content and academic achievement standards that form the basis of each state's general education curriculum.*

***Appropriately ambitious goals** are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of their circumstances.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Developing standards-based IEP goals
2 ☐ Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals
3 ☐ Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals
4 ☐ Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process
5 ☐ Engaging staff from state or local community agencies or programs (for example, Head Start and child care staff) in the IEP process
6 ☐ Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data
7 ☐ Other professional development *(Please specify)*

_____

8 ❍ None of the above

D6. Does your state agency provide *written policy or guidelines* on any of the following topics to help promote the quality of the IEP process for preschool-age children with disabilities?

Appropriately ambitious goals *are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of their circumstances.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals

2 ☐ Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals

3 ☐ Engaging parent/guardians in the IEP process

4 ☐ Engaging staff from local community agencies or programs (for example, Head Start and child care staff) in the IEP process

5 ☐ Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data

6 ☐ Other topics *(Please specify)*

_____

7 ❍ None of the above

D7. Does your state agency provide any of the following *resources* to help promote the quality of the IEP process for preschool-age children with disabilities?

Appropriately ambitious goals *are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of their circumstances.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ A *mandated* standards-based IEP form or template

2 ☐ A *suggested* standards-based IEP form or template

3 ☐ A rubric or other resource describing features of quality IEPs, including appropriately ambitious IEP goals

4 ☐ A coach, mentor, or IEP facilitator to assist with writing the IEP

5 ☐ Other resources to promote the quality of IEPs *(Please specify)*

_____

6 ❍ None of the above

D8. How does your state agency monitor local programs to ensure IEP teams identify appropriate IEP goals?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Review data from state data system (for example, data on planned and delivered IEP services)

2 ☐ Conducts on-site monitoring visits of school districts and preschool programs

3 ☐ Reviews a selection of IEPs from school districts

4 ☐ Surveys parents/guardians about IEP goals or services

5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

6 ❍ None of the above

D9. How does your state agency monitor local programs to ensure appropriate *service decisions* are delivered in accordance with the IEP?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Review data from state data system (for example, data on planned and delivered IEP services)

2 ☐ Conducts on-site monitoring visits at school districts (for example, stakeholder interviews or observation of IEP meetings)

3 ☐ Reviews a selection of IEPs from school districts

4 ☐ Surveys parents/guardians about IEP goals and services

5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

6 ❍ None of the above

The next questions will focus on charter schools

D10. Does your state have public charter preschools?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Yes, we have charter preschools that are part of traditional school districts

2 ☐ Yes, we have charter preschools that are their own school district

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO D10 = 1, THEN COMPLETE D11

D11. Which agency or entities are responsible for ensuring that the IEPs of preschool-age children with disabilities enrolled in *public charter schools that are part of a traditional school district* are developed and implemented appropriately?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ The charter school's authorizer

2 ☐ The charter school's district

3 ☐ The charter school

4 ☐ The student's local school district

5 ☐ The state

6 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO D10 = 2, THEN COMPLETE D12

D12. Which agency or entities are responsible for ensuring that the IEPs of preschool-age children with disabilities enrolled in *public charter schools that are their own school district* are developed and implemented appropriately?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ The charter school's authorizer

2 ☐ The charter school's district

3 ☐ The charter school

4 ☐ The student's local school district

5 ☐ The state

6 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

E. ACCESS TO GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND SUPPORTS

The next questions focus on access to general education curriculum and standards for preschool-age children with disabilities.

E1. During the 2019–2020 school year, does your state operate a state-funded universal preschool program?

Universal preschool *refers to preschool access for all preschool-age children similar to kindergarten availability through public schools. In some states, universal preschool is available without cost to only certain student groups, such as low-income children, children from working families, or children identified "at risk" of school failure. Please respond to the following question if your state's program fits this general description, even if it is not called universal preschool.*

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, all districts offer a state-funded universal preschool program

2 ❍ Yes, state provides funding to districts that choose to implement a universal preschool program

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO E1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE E2, E2A, AND E2B

E2. For each age group, which children are eligible for your state-funded universal preschool program?

1 ☐ *Check here if this is decided by the local district*

3-year-olds:

1 ❍ All children in this age group

2 ❍ Not all children in this age group

3 ❍ No children in this age group

E2a. 4-year-olds:

1 ❍ All children in this age group

2 ❍ Not all children in this age group

3 ❍ No children in this age group

E2b. 5-year-olds:

1 ❍ All children in this age group

2 ❍ Not all children in this age group

3 ❍ No children in this age group

IF YOUR ANSWERS ON E2 = 2 OR E2A = 2 OR E2B = 2, THEN COMPLETE E3

E3. If not all children in an age group are eligible for your state-funded universal preschool program, please indicate which of the following groups are eligible.

☐ *Check here if this is decided by the local district*

Select all that apply

		3-year-olds	4-year-olds	5-year-olds	Not applicable
a.	Children from low-income families	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
b.	Children with disabilities	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
c.	Children with other specific risk factors *(Please specify)* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
d.	Children with other specific risk factors *(Please specify)* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
e.	Children with other specific risk factors *(Please specify)* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍

E4. Does your state agency recommend the use of any programs, practices, or curricula to support the positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns of preschool-age children with disabilities?

1 ❍ Yes, my state recommends *one specific* program, practice, or curriculum

2 ❍ Yes, my state recommends *several* programs, practices, or curricula

0 ❍ No

E5. Does your state agency offer any of the following to districts or providers to promote the provision of services in least restrictive environments?

Consider only services that aim to enable participation in daily routines and activities and allow the child to make progress in developmental areas. Select all that apply

1 ☐ Technical assistance

2 ☐ Written guidelines

3 ☐ Workshops

4 ☐ Mentors or coaches

5 ☐ Virtual opportunities including webinars or communities of practice

6 ☐ Additional funding

7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

8 ❍ None of the above

E6. Does your state agency do any of the following to help support districts and schools in the use of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) for preschool-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Technical assistance

2 ☐ Written guidelines

3 ☐ Workshops

4 ☐ Mentors or coaches

5 ☐ Virtual opportunities including webinars or communities of practice

6 ☐ Additional funding

7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

8 ❍ None of the above

E7. How does your state agency support local agencies' or programs' use of individualized assistive technology (AT) for serving preschool-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Offer information about AT to families, such as through AT fairs

2 ☐ Provide designated funding to support AT devices and use

3 ☐ Provide lists of AT devices to districts or providers for consideration

4 ☐ Provide guidelines for how to assess AT needs as part of IEP development

5 ☐ Provide specific guidelines for AT use

6 ☐ Provide professional development to *general education teachers* on use of AT

7 ☐ Provide professional development to *special education teacher* on use of AT

8 ☐ Provide professional development to *Specialized Instructional Support Staff (SISP)* on use of AT

9 ☐ Review or monitor IEPs to determine extent of AT use

10 ☐ Provide or lend AT devices or software to districts

11 ☐ Monitor use of AT to ensure effective implementation

12 ☐ Hire or contract with AT experts to promote effective implementation strategies

13 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

F. COLLECTION AND USE OF OUTCOME DATA

The next questions focus on the data your state collects and uses to measure child outcomes.

F1. What types of outcome data does your state agency examine for all preschool-age children *with disabilities*?

Adaptive behavior *refers to behavior that enables a person to get along in his or her environment with greatest success and least conflict with others.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Attendance

2 ☐ Discipline

3 ☐ Functional performance or adaptive behaviors

4 ☐ Measures of language development

5 ☐ Measures of self-regulation or behavior

6 ☐ Measures of social-emotional development

7 ☐ Measures of performance in academic areas such as reading, math, and science

8 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

F2. Does your state agency examine outcomes for preschool-age children with disabilities separately based on whether they are taught primarily in inclusive classrooms versus separate classrooms?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

d ❍ Don't know

F3. Which of the following has your state agency done in response to your examination of outcome data for preschool-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provided data analysis (for example, reports) for local use

2 ☐ Provided training and support to local programs on how to analyze and use their data

3 ☐ Provided individualized training and support to local programs based on their data

4 ☐ Developed written procedures and guidance in response to findings from the data

5 ☐ Coordinated with State Part C colleagues to review findings and discuss an appropriate course of action

6 ☐ Coordinated with State Part B colleagues to review findings and discuss an appropriate course of action

7 ☐ Provided parents/guardians with materials, training, or other resources

8 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

9 ❍ Not applicable

F4. Are prekindergarten assessment data included in your state's K-12 data system?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

F5. How are data shared with and received from other programs or entities, such as Part B 611, Head Start, or social services?

If data are shared using more than one method, please select the method by which most data are shared.

1 ❍ There is an integrated, longitudinal data system for storing data

2 ❍ Separate data systems are linked as needed using a common identifier or other matching process

3 ❍ Individual-level data from separate data systems are shared but cannot be linked

4 ❍ Aggregate data from separate data systems are shared

5 ❍ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F5 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE F6

F6. For which systems are you able to link data? For example, child welfare, Head Start, or K-12.

_____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

G. SUPPORTS FOR TRANSITIONS

The next questions ask about the supports provided to preschool-age children with disabilities into and out of special education for preschool-age children.

G1. For the 2019–2020 school year, in what ways is your state agency supporting the transition of preschool-age children with disabilities from *early intervention services to preschool*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Part B preschool funds can be used to provide FAPE (free appropriate public education) to children *before* their third birthday

2 ☐ Part C funds can be used to provide FAPE (free appropriate public education) for children *past* their third birthday

3 ☐ Developed or maintained *agreements* on transition between early intervention services and preschool special education

4 ☐ Developed or maintained *policies* on transition from early intervention services to preschool special education

5 ☐ Provided training to local providers on transition

6 ☐ Provided technical assistance to local providers on transition

7 ☐ Developed or disseminated materials for parents/guardians on transition from early intervention services to preschool special education

8 ☐ Provided meetings or workshops for parents/guardians

9 ☐ Developed or maintained an electronic database of individual child records to allow children to be followed from early intervention services to preschool special education

10 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

11 ❍ None of the above

G2. For the 2019–2020 school year, in what ways is your state agency supporting the transition of preschool-age children with disabilities from *preschool to kindergarten/elementary school*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Developed or maintained *agreements* on transition between agencies providing preschool services and elementary schools

2 ☐ Developed or maintained *policies* on transition from preschool to elementary school

3 ☐ Provided training to local providers on transition

4 ☐ Provided technical assistance to local providers on transition

5 ☐ Developed or disseminated materials for parents/guardians on preschool to elementary school transition

6 ☐ Provided meetings or workshops for parents/guardians

7 ☐ Developed or maintained an electronic database of individual child records to allow children to be followed from preschool programs to elementary school

8 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

9 ❍ None of the above

G3. Does your state agency require that IEPs include a transition component for children with disabilities entering elementary school?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

H. DISCIPLINE

The next questions ask about your state's discipline policies.

When answering these questions, please assume manifestation determination review has taken place and it has been determined that the infraction is not due to the child's disability or the district's inability to implement the IEP.

H1. Does your state agency provide districts with requirements or recommended guidelines around discipline?

1 ❍ Yes, the state provides districts with requirements

2 ❍ Yes, the state provides districts with recommended guidelines

0 ❍ No GO TO SECTION I

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H1 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE H2

H2. Please enter the web address where we may view your state's current discipline policy.

If this information is not available on a website, please select the response below and scan and email a hard copy to IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com.

1 ❍ Information available on a website

_____

0 ❍ Information not available on a website

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H1 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE H3

H3. Does your state have a policy pertaining to *suspensions (both in-school and out-of-school) and expulsions* for preschool-age children?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H3 = 1, THEN COMPLETE H4

H4. Does your state's policy pertaining to *in-school suspensions* for preschool-age children differ *based on whether a child has a disability*?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, it always differs for students with and without disabilities

2 ❍ Sometimes, it depends on the infraction

0 ❍ No, the policy is the same for all students

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H3 = 1, THEN COMPLETE H5

H5. Does your state's policy pertaining to *out-of-school suspensions* for preschool-age children differ based on whether a child has a disability?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, it always differs for students with and without disabilities
2 ❍ Sometimes, it depends on the infraction
0 ❍ No, the policy is the same for all students

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H3 = 1, THEN COMPLETE H6

H6. Does your state's policy pertaining to *expulsions* for preschool-age children *differ based on* whether a child has a disability?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, it always differs for students with and without disabilities
2 ❍ Sometimes, it depends on the infraction
0 ❍ No, the policy is the same for all students

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H1 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE H7

H7. Does your state have a policy restricting the use of *restraints and seclusion* for preschool-age children in schools?

1 ❍ Yes
0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H7 = 1, THEN COMPLETE H8

H8. Does your state's policy restricting the use of *restraints and seclusion* for preschool-age children in schools differ based on whether a child has a disability?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, it always differs for students with and without disabilities
2 ❍ Sometimes, it depends on the infraction
0 ❍ No, the policy is the same for all students

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H1 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE H9

H9. Does your state agency collaborate with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities?

1 ❍ Yes
0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H9 = 1, THEN COMPLETE H10

H10. Which of the following agencies or organizations does your state agency work with to develop or support the implementation of behavioral supports to address disciplinary issues among preschool-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Behavioral/mental health agency
2 ☐ Developmental disabilities agency
3 ☐ Early Intervention Part C
4 ☐ Head Start
5 ☐ Health agency
6 ☐ Local or state disability advocacy groups
7 ☐ Private therapists or therapy organizations (for example, trauma-informed therapists, applied behavior analysis providers)
8 ☐ Social services
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H1 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE H11

H11. Which of the following strategies, programs, or curricula does your state agency recommend to *manage behavioral issues* for preschool-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Early childhood mental health consultation
2 ☐ Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA)
3 ☐ Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)
4 ☐ Teacher training focused on managing student behavior
6 ☐ Technical assistance focused on managing student behavior
7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

8 ❍ Not applicable, my state does not use any strategies or programs to manage the behavior of preschool-age children with disabilities

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

I. COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION

The next questions focus on how your state agency collaborates and coordinates with other agencies and programs in addressing the needs of preschool-age children with disabilities.

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A1 = 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, OR 7, THEN COMPLETE I1

I1. How closely do you work with staff from the *Part C state lead agency*?

Select one only

1 ❍ Rarely have contact with them (once or twice a year)

2 ❍ Sometimes have contact with them (between three and six times per year)

3 ❍ Moderate amount of contact with them (between seven and eleven times per year)

4 ❍ Work closely with them (at least monthly)

IF YOUR ANSWER TO I1 = 2, 3, OR 4, THEN COMPLETE I2

I2. What topics do you regularly address when working with the *state Part C coordinator*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Child Find

2 ☐ Transitions

3 ☐ Professional development

4 ☐ Data sharing

5 ☐ Disputes

6 ☐ State Performance Plans/Annual Performance Reports required under IDEA

7 ☐ State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

8 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

9 ❍ None of the above

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A1 = 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, OR 7, THEN COMPLETE I3

I3. How closely do you work with staff from the *school-age special education program*?

Select one only

1 ❍ Rarely have contact with them (once or twice a year)

2 ❍ Sometimes have contact with them (between three and six times per year)

3 ❍ Moderate amount of contact with them (between seven and eleven times per year)

4 ❍ Work closely with them (at least monthly)

IF YOUR ANSWER TO I3 = 2, 3, OR 4, THEN COMPLETE I4

I4. What topics do you regularly address when working with the *state special education director*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Child Find
2 ☐ Transitions
3 ☐ Professional development
4 ☐ Data sharing
5 ☐ Disputes
6 ☐ State Performance Plans/Annual Performance Reports required under IDEA
7 ☐ State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
8 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

9 ❍ None of the above

I5. Does your state agency coordinate with any of the following state agencies or programs to engage parents/guardians of preschool-age children with disabilities in the *development of IEPs*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Child care agency (for example, the Office of Child Care, or the Child Care Development Fund coordinator)
2 ☐ Early learning agency
3 ☐ Head Start association or collaboration office
4 ☐ Health agency
5 ☐ Home visiting program
6 ☐ Mental health agency
7 ☐ Part C lead agency
8 ☐ Social services agency
9 ☐ Department of developmental disabilities/services
10 ☐ Other state agencies or programs *(Please specify)*

_____

I6. Has your state agency developed formal agreements with other agencies or entities to *provide mental health and social-emotional supports* to preschool-age children with disabilities?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes
0 ❍ No
3 ❍ Not applicable, this is done at the district level

IF YOUR ANSWER TO I6 = 1, THEN COMPLETE I7

I7. Which agencies or entities has your state agency developed formal agreements with to provide *direct mental health and/or social-emotional supports* to preschool-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Behavioral/mental health agency
2 ☐ Developmental disabilities agency
3 ☐ Early Intervention Part C
4 ☐ Head Start
5 ☐ Health agency
6 ☐ Local or state disability advocacy groups
7 ☐ Private therapists or therapy organizations (for example, trauma-informed therapists, applied behavior analysis providers)
8 ☐ Social services
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

I8. For preschool-age children with disabilities, what does your state agency share or coordinate with the following programs or entities to support the transition from preschool to kindergarten/elementary school?

Select all that apply

	Share data	Share funding	Share personnel	Coordinate service provision	Share other information (such as IEPs)	No sharing or coordination occurs
a. Child care agencies	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
b. Early learning agencies	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
c. Part B 611 program	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
d. Health care agencies	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
e. Mental health agencies	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
f. Social service agencies (for example, Department of Developmental Services)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

J. ADDRESSING LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY

The next questions focus on efforts made to address the linguistic and cultural diversity among families and preschool-age children with disabilities.

J1. Does your state agency do any of the following to ensure *non-English-speaking parents/guardians* understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes for preschool-age children?

*Please select anything the state does **or** requires local school districts or providers to do.*

***Do not** include activities that are initiated at the district or school level.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Parents/guardians are asked to state their primary language as part of standard procedure at intake

2 ☐ An interpreter is provided for parents/guardians as needed

3 ☐ Parents/guardians are encouraged to bring someone who can interpret for them

4 ☐ Parents/guardians are provided with translated written resources

5 ☐ A toll-free phone number staffed by early intervention multilingual staff is provided for non-English-speaking parents/guardians

6 ☐ A toll-free vendor interpreter service is used as needed

7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

J2. Does your state agency do any of the following to help ensure that *referrals and evaluations* are linguistically and culturally competent?

Linguistically and culturally competent practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide professional development on culturally competent practices

2 ☐ Include parents/guardians on state advisory committees, task forces, or work groups representing diverse populations

3 ☐ Solicit periodic feedback from stakeholders and families representing diverse populations

4 ☐ Monitor how interpreters and translators are used

5 ☐ Monitor the use of culturally competent practices

6 ☐ Provide guidance specifically designed to support the use of linguistically and culturally competent practices (for example, written guidance or webinars)

7 ☐ Work with the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate

J3. What challenges has your state agency experienced in ensuring that *referrals and evaluations* are linguistically and culturally competent?

***Linguistically and culturally competent** practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Addressing family reluctance to engage with preschools around special education

2 ☐ Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status

3 ☐ Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals

4 ☐ Having an insufficient number of interpreters

5 ☐ Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes

6 ☐ Having assessments for evaluation that are not normed for other languages

7 ☐ Difficulty determining if eligibility for services is due to lack of skills in native language, rather than a disability

8 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

9 ❍ None of the above

J4. Does your state agency do any of the following to help ensure that *services* are linguistically and culturally competent?

Linguistically and culturally competent *practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide professional development on culturally competent practices

2 ☐ Include parents/guardians on state advisory committees, task forces, or work groups representing diverse populations

3 ☐ Solicit periodic feedback from stakeholders and families representing diverse populations

4 ☐ Monitor how interpreters and translators are used

5 ☐ Monitor the use of culturally competent practices

6 ☐ Provide guidance specifically designed to support the use of linguistically and culturally competent practices (for example, written guidance or webinars)

7 ☐ Work with the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate

J5. What challenges has your state agency experienced in ensuring that *services* are linguistically and culturally competent?

Linguistically and culturally competent *practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Addressing family reluctance to engage with preschools around special education

2 ☐ Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status

3 ☐ Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals

4 ☐ Having an insufficient number of interpreters

5 ☐ Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes

6 ☐ Other *(Please specify*

_____

7 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

K. FAMILY ENGAGEMENT

The next questions focus on engaging families of preschool-age children with disabilities in the Part B system.

K1. Does your state require that districts or schools provide parents/guardians with information about the Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center when a referral is made?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

K2. For the 2019–2020 school year, is your state agency offering any of the following to preschool providers to promote the involvement of parents/guardians of children with IEPs?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Funds to districts to help parents/guardians participate in IEP meetings (for example, funds for transportation, child care, translators)

2 ☐ Training on increasing parent/guardian involvement

3 ☐ Technical assistance related to promoting parent/guardian involvement

4 ☐ Written guidelines related to parent/guardian involvement

5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

6 ❍ None of the above

K3. For the 2019–2020 school year, in what ways is state agency staff collaborating with the Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Development or delivery of trainings

2 ☐ Delivery of technical assistance

3 ☐ Dissemination of information regarding each other's services

4 ☐ Development of training/guidance materials

5 ☐ Family outreach efforts (for example, parents/guardians and siblings)

6 ☐ Promotion of alternative dispute resolution models

7 ☐ Involvement in the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

8 ☐ Implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

9 ☐ Assisting with conducting the required parent survey (Indicator C4 in the SPP/APR)

10 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

11 ❍ None of the above

K4. For the 2019–2020 school year, in what ways is the state agency *supporting* the PTI?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Staff from the state agency meet with PTI staff on a regular basis

2 ☐ State agency and PTI have joint planning sessions to coordinate services provided

3 ☐ State agency and PTI offer joint professional development

4 ☐ State agency provides financial support for events or services

5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

6 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

L. SPECIAL EDUCATOR CREDENTIALS

The next questions focus on the qualification and credentialing criteria for special educators.

L1. Which state agency is responsible for licensing and certification of preschool special education teachers?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ State Education Agency (SEA)
2 ☐ State licensing and certification agency that is not part of the SEA
3 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

L2. Whatcredential is required for preschool special educators in your state?

Select one only

1 ❍ No certification, licensure, or other credential is required
2 ❍ General early childhood certification or credential (no special education requirements)
3 ❍ General early childhood certification or credential (including special education requirements)
4 ❍ General early childhood certification/credential plus preschool special education add-on or endorsement
5 ❍ Blended early childhood/early childhood special education certification or credential
6 ❍ Early childhood special education certification or credential
7 ❍ Special education certification or credential
8 ❍ Special education certification/credential plus preschool special education add-on or endorsement
9 ❍ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

L3. In what ways can preschool special education classroom teachers qualify for *traditional certification*?

Please do not include emergency certifications.

Select one only per row

	Required	Optional	Not applicable
a. Portfolio	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
b. Exam/proficiency test	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
c. Undergraduate or graduate degree program	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
d. Coursework (not leading to a degree)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
e. Other (*Please specify*) _____	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍

L4. In what ways can preschool special education classroom teachers qualify for *certification through alternative routes*?

Please do not include emergency certifications.

Select one only per row

		Required	Optional	Not applicable
a.	Portfolio	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
b.	Exam/proficiency test	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
c.	Undergraduate or graduate degree program	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
d.	Coursework (not leading to a degree)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
e.	Other (*Please specify)* _____	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍

L5. Does your state allow for preschool special education classroom teachers to transfer certification from a reciprocating state?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

M. STAFFING

The next questions focus on the availability of staff to provide services to preschool-age children with disabilities.

M1. During the current (2019–2020) and preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019), what strategies has your state agency used to *increase the number of effective preschool special education teachers*?

Please do not include strategies initiated at the district or school level.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Collaborated with universities to develop programs and curricula to prepare providers in specific shortage areas

2 ☐ Paid fees for tests/licensure exams

3 ☐ Paid for tutoring to prepare teachers for certification tests/licensure exams

4 ☐ Provided time or funding for teachers to participate in professional development opportunities (for example, institute of higher education tuition, workshop fees)

5 ☐ Provided alternative routes to certification in preschool special education for *any person with a bachelor's degree*

6 ☐ Provided alternative routes to certification in preschool special education for *persons with a special education degree*

7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

8 ❍ None of the above

M2. During the current (2019–2020) and preceding two (2017–2018 and 2018–2019) school years, what initiatives or incentives has your state agency used to *retain* effective preschool special education teachers?

Please do not include initiatives or incentives initiated at the district or school level.

Tuition "pay back": *For every year of tuition, teachers owe the district a year of service.*

Select all that apply

0 ❍ Our state has not had problems with retention
1 ☐ Cover continuing education costs to attain a higher degree
2 ☐ Cover continuing education costs to maintain certification
3 ☐ Provide mentoring or induction programs
4 ☐ Offer full-time teaching positions
5 ☐ Offer part-time teaching positions
6 ☐ Offer same salary levels as K-12 educators
7 ☐ Provide additional planning or release time
8 ☐ Provide smaller caseloads
9 ☐ Provide smaller class sizes
10 ☐ Offer student loan forgiveness
11 ☐ Offer tuition "pay back" or partial reimbursement
12 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

N. FUNDING ALLOCATION

The next questions focus on funding for Part B services for preschool-age children with disabilities.

N1. What funding sources support services for preschool-age children with disabilities, as required by their IEPs?

*Please select **any funding sources** that support preschool-age children with disabilities.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ IDEA, Part B

2 ☐ State education funds

3 ☐ Local municipality or county funds

4 ☐ Head Start

5 ☐ Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V

6 ☐ Medicaid/Title XIX

7 ☐ Private insurance

8 ☐ State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)

9 ☐ Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)

10 ☐ Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

11 ☐ TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)

12 ☐ Other federal funding sources *(Please specify)*

_____

13 ☐ Other state funding sources *(Please specify)*

_____

14 ☐ Other local funding sources *(Please specify)*

_____

N1a. IF YOU SELECTED **THREE OR MORE** ITEMS IN N1:

Please write a "1" for the source that provides the largest share of funding, a "2" for the source that provides the next largest share of funding, and a "3" for the third largest funding source, based on the responses provided in N1.

IF YOU SELECTED **TWO** ITEMS IN N1**:**

Please write a "1" for the source listed below that provides the largest share of funding, and a "2" for the source that provides the next largest share of funding, based on the responses provided in N1.

IF YOU SELECTED **ONE** ITEM IN N1:

Please write a "1" next to the source selected in N1, and continue to the next survey item.

		Rank 1, 2, and 3 by share of funding. Use each number only once.
a.	IDEA, Part B	|__|
b.	State education funds	|__|
c.	Local municipality or county funds	|__|
d.	Head Start	|__|
e.	Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	|__|
f.	Medicaid/Title XIX	|__|
g.	Private insurance	|__|
h.	State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)	|__|
i.	Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)	|__|
j.	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	|__|
k.	TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	|__|
l.	Other federal funding sources *(Please specify)* _____	|__|
m.	Other state funding sources *(Please specify)* _____	|__|
n.	Other local funding sources *(Please specify)* _____	|__|

N2. Which of the following methods are used to determine how special education funding (including federal and state) is allocated for services for preschool-age children in your state?

Do not include high-cost funding.

***High Cost Funds (HCF)** help offset the financial impact on Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ A fixed amount based on all children enrolled in preschool in a school district

2 ☐ A fixed amount per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in a school district

3 ☐ Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in a school district, depending on disability category

4 ☐ Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in a school district, depending on specific services required

5 ☐ Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in a school district, depending on type of student placement

6 ☐ Predetermined amounts per teacher, supportive services staff position, or other resource required given the number of students with disabilities

7 ☐ A formula based on the amount of specific allowable special education expenses actually incurred (for example, full reimbursement or percentage reimbursement)

8 ☐ A formula based on a measure of local poverty

9 ☐ A formula based on funding allocations in a base year or a previous year

10 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

11 ❍ None of the above, funding to support special education is not separated out from the general preschool funding formula

N3. For preschool-age children, does your state allocate a portion of the state special education funding to another state agency or agencies who have responsibility for serving this population?

Do not include high-cost funding.

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO N3 = 1, THEN COMPLETE N4

N4. Which other state agencies do you allocate funds to?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Health care agencies
2 ☐ Mental health agencies
3 ☐ Social services agencies
4 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

N5. How are state set-aside funds from Federal Part B IDEA grants for preschool-age children with disabilities being used?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ To coordinate activities under Part B with, and provide technical assistance to, other programs that provide services to preschool-age children with disabilities
2 ☐ To provide service coordination or IEP case management for families
3 ☐ To provide activities at the state and local levels to meet the state performance goals
4 ☐ To provide direct services for preschool-age children with disabilities
5 ☐ To provide early intervention services (such as speech and language services, occupational therapy or psychological services)
6 ☐ To supplement other funds used to develop and implement a statewide coordinated services system
7 ☐ To support administration for the IDEA Part C grant for early intervention services
8 ☐ To support administration for the IDEA Part B grant for preschool-age children
9 ☐ For support services, including establishing and implementing the mediation process

N6. Doesthe state maintain a high-cost fund?

High Cost Funds (HCF) *help offset the financial impact on Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities.*

1 ❍ Yes
0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO N6 = 1, THEN COMPLETE N7

N7. Which of the following *high-cost fund mechanisms* does your state use to provide funding to districts with high-cost preschool-age children with disabilities?

High Cost Funds (HCF) *help offset the financial impact on Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ The state allocates IDEA Part B funds to a high-cost fund to assist districts with high-cost students

2 ☐ The state allocates additional state funds, not part of IDEA, to a high-cost fund to assist districts with high-cost students

3 ☐ The state requires districts to pay into a high-cost fund to assist districts with high-cost students

4 ❍ None of the above, funding to support districts with high-cost students is not separated out from the broader special education funding formula

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

O. ACTIVITIES FUNDS

The next questions are related to the use of state-level activities funds.

Section 300.704 of IDEA allows the State Education Agency to reserve a portion of the total funding it receives for state set-asides: state-level administration and other state-level activities.

O1. During the last school year (2018–2019), what were IDEA *state-level administration funds* spent on?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Administration of school-age special education and related services

2 ☐ Administration of preschool-age special education and related services

3 ☐ Administration of early intervention services

4 ☐ Coordination of activities under Part B with other programs that provide services to children with disabilities

5 ☐ Provision of technical assistance to other programs that provide services to children with disabilities

O2. During the last school year (2018–2019), what were IDEA *other state-level activities funds* spent on?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Providing professional development, including pre-service training

2 ☐ Implementing paperwork reduction activities, including expanding use of technology in the IEP process

3 ☐ Assisting districts in providing positive behavioral interventions and supports and mental health services

4 ☐ Supporting use of technology to enhance learning, including technology with universal design principles and technology with assistive technology

5 ☐ Developing and/or implementing transition programs, including coordination of services with agencies involved in supporting the transition of students with disabilities to postsecondary activities

6 ☐ Assisting districts in meeting personnel shortages

7 ☐ Supporting capacity-building activities to improve results for children with disabilities

8 ☐ Supporting improvement of delivery services by districts to improve results for children with disabilities

9 ☐ Supporting programming for children with disabilities who have been expelled from school, live in correctional facilities, or are enrolled in state-operated or state-supported schools

10 ☐ Supporting programming for children with disabilities who are enrolled in charter schools

11 ☐ Developing and/or providing appropriate accommodations for children with disabilities

12 ☐ Developing and/or providing alternate assessments that are valid and reliable for assessing the performance of children with disabilities

13 ☐ Providing technical assistance to schools and districts implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities

14 ☐ Providing technical assistance to schools and districts implementing targeted support and improvement activities under Section 1111(d) of the ESSA

15 ☐ Providing professional development in the use of Universal Design for Learning (UDL)

O3. During the last school year (2018–2019), did your state use other state-level activities funds to support activities aligned with your State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO O3 = 1, THEN COMPLETE O4

O4. During the last school year (2018–2019), how did your state use other state-level activities funds to support activities aligned with your State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ To help districts provide professional development

2 ☐ To help districts support infrastructure, for example data systems

3 ☐ To help districts implement evidence-based practices

4 ☐ To help improve staff-to-student ratios

5 ☐ To help institutes of higher education or national experts provide professional development

6 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

O5. Howdoes the state agency determine how it will spend IDEA state-level activities funds (both administration funds and other state-level activities funds)?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Based on requests from Local Education Agencies (LEAs)

2 ☐ Based on an analysis of state or local data

3 ☐ Based on a review of state progress toward goals

4 ☐ Based on state priority areas

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

P. EVIDENCE FROM RESEARCH

The next questions focus on the use of evidence from research.

P1. How often does your state agency draw on the following sources of information when selecting special education policies and practices?

Select one only per row

	Never or not applicable	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Don't know
a. Information provided by the intervention's developer or vendor	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
b. Recommendations from colleagues in other state education departments	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
c. Information from a federally funded technical assistance center	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
d. Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
e. Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory (REL)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
f. Information from the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
g. Information from the state's research/evaluation office	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
h. Information from professional associations	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
i. Information from a college/university researcher	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
j. Information from a research journal	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
k. Social media (Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, other)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
l. Other (*Please specify*)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍

_____

P2. What level of evidence, as specified in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), does your state agency require for evidence-based special education policies, procedures, and practices to be used by school districts in your state?

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence: *supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented randomized control experimental studies.*

Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence: *supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental studies.*

Tier 3 – Promising Evidence: *supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented correlational studies (with statistical controls for selection bias).*

Tier 4 – Demonstrates a Rationale: *practices that have a well-defined logic model or theory of action, are supported by research, and have some effort underway by a state, district, or outside research organization to determine their effectiveness*

Select one only

1 ❍ Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

2 ❍ Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

3 ❍ Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

4 ❍ Tier 4 – Demonstrates a Rationale

5 ❍ Not applicable (for example, the state agency requires different levels of evidence for different activities related to special education)

P3. Does your state agency do any of the following to support or ensure that school districts use evidence-based special education policies, procedures, and practices?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Share an approved list of evidence-based programs, interventions, and practices with districts

2 ☐ Provide training and technical assistance to districts on implementing evidence-based practices

3 ☐ Use a checklist to observe districts to assess the use of a particular required evidence-based practice, or to review videos submitted to state

4 ☐ Provide a checklist to districts to support their assessment of the use of a particular required evidence-based practice

5 ☐ Conduct focus groups or surveys with parents/guardians to assess the extent to which evidence-based practices are being used

6 ☐ Conduct focus groups or surveys with district staff to assess the extent to which evidence-based practices are being used

7 ☐ Develop online modules or other materials to assist districts in identifying and selecting evidence-based programs, interventions, and/or practices

8 ☐ Use existing online modules or other materials to assist districts in identifying and selecting evidence-based programs, interventions, and/or practices

9 ☐ Have districts complete self-assessments on practices

10 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

11 ❍ The state agency does not take particular steps to ensure that districts use evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices

P4. Does your state agency currently use any of the following to implement or scale up the evidence-based practices identified in your State Systemic Improvement Plans (SSIPs) for the Part B 619 preschool-age special education program?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide online training (including single or modular courses) to support local implementation

2 ☐ Encourage district and local staff participation in federal model programs (for example, the Pyramid Model)

3 ☐ Support district and local staff participation in federal model programs (for example, the Pyramid Model)

4 ☐ Pilot implementation of the practice(s) in select districts in order to prepare for more widespread implementation

5 ☐ Disseminate information to parents/guardians to inform them of the scale-up plans

6 ☐ Disseminate written materials that provide training or information to support local implementation

7 ☐ Host informational webinars to support local implementation

8 ☐ Provide coaches to support local implementation

9 ☐ Support communities of practice

10 ☐ Some other strategy *(Please specify)*

_____

P5. Which of the following statements best describes the current status of your state agency's efforts in implementing or scaling up the evidence-based practices identified in your SSIPs for Part B?

Select one only

1 ❍ We are in the early planning stages

2 ❍ We are developing materials but have not put any practices into place yet

3 ❍ We have begun implementation but at a small scale

4 ❍ We have expanded beyond an initial phase to reach more districts

5 ❍ We have scaled up or implemented statewide

6 ❍ Different practices are in different stages of implementation

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IDEA Implementation Study

Mathematica

State education agency survey on IDEA implementation for infants and toddlers

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) State and Local Implementation Study 2019

STATE PART C

November 2019

NOTE: The hardcopy version of this survey is for reference purposes only. All instructions and FAQs pertain to the online version of the survey. To access the survey online, please use the link below. Enter the username and password provided to you in the letter included in the mailing packet.

Survey Link: IDEA-Survey.com/StateC

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995
According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1850-0949. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 60 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (Education Department General Administrative Regulations Section, 34 C.F.R. § 76.591). If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this survey, please contact the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20202-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov directly. [Note: Please do not return the completed survey to this address.]

Notice of Confidentiality
Responses to this data collection will be used only for statistical purposes. All information that would permit identification of the state or individual respondent will be kept confidential (per The Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002), will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey, and will not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose except as required by law. Study reports may present information by state.

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) State and Local Implementation Study 2019, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), is an important study that will develop a national picture of state, district, and school implementation of IDEA. It will provide (1) the Department of Education, Congress, and other stakeholders with knowledge that can inform how early intervention services are provided to children, and (2) states, districts, and schools with an understanding of how others are implementing IDEA.

The IDEA State and Local Implementation Study is not a compliance study, nor a study of the results of effectiveness of IDEA.

We are requesting you complete this questionnaire because you and your staff have the most knowledge about early intervention policies and practices for infants and toddlers identified for services in your state and their families. If there are questions you are not able to answer, please feel free to draw on the expertise and knowledge of others within your department. As grantees under IDEA, state agencies are expected to participate in this data collection (34 C.F.R. § 76.591). With your contribution, ED and Congress will gain a more accurate and complete understanding of how IDEA is being implemented for young children and their families at the state level.

Please note that data may be reported by state. Thus, while personally identifiable information about individual respondents will not be released, data displayed by state could be attributed to the state agency or possibly to an individual respondent.

Thank you for joining us in our effort to understand the current implementation of IDEA.

We appreciate your time and cooperation.

Please see the next pages for instructions for completing this survey, as well as a set of key definitions and frequently asked questions.

If you have any questions, contact:

Lisbeth Goble, 833-238-7224

email: IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

Before you answer the questions, please carefully read the instructions, key definitions, and frequently asked questions. You can refer back to these as you complete the survey by clicking on the Instructions, Key Definitions, and FAQs link on the upper right-hand side of the screen.

INSTRUCTIONS

- All items request information pertaining to the 2020 fiscal year unless otherwise specified.
- The primary respondent for this survey is intended to be the person most knowledgeable about early intervention policies and practices in your state. In most cases, the primary respondent will be the Part C Coordinator.
- Certain questions may require the help of other staff, such as other staff in the Part C lead agency or any partner agencies. If you need input from other staff, you may share your unique survey hyperlink, which will give them full access to the survey, or you can print off specific questions for them to answer on paper and then fill in the online responses yourself.
- There may be questions where the local providers are also doing work in a given area. Unless otherwise specified, please indicate **only** the activities the lead agency initiates or engages in.
- Throughout the survey, you'll see some terms in blue. You can click on those to see a definition of the term.
- Items on this survey cover the following topics: Lead Agency; Identification for Early Intervention Services; IFSP Development and Quality; Early Intervention Services; Addressing Linguistic and Cultural Diversity; Collection and Use of Outcome Data; Collaboration and Coordination; Support for Transitions; Family Engagement; Special Educator Credentials; Staffing; Funding Allocation; and Evidence from Research.

KEY DEFINITIONS

Children with disabilities is used to reflect infants and toddlers (birth through age 2) with an Individualized Family Services Plan (IFSP).

Early intervention refers specifically to the services being provided to children with IFSPs and their families under Part C of IDEA.

Fiscal year refers to the definition of fiscal year used by your state, not to the federal fiscal year.

Early intervention service provider refers to one of the types of qualified personnel who provide early intervention services as referenced in IDEA, Part C (Sec. 632(4)(F)(i)).

Local early intervention program refers to the local provider of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities (birth through age 2) and their families.

Professional development includes a range of learning and support activities designed to prepare individuals to work with, and on behalf of, children and their families, as well as ongoing experiences to enhance this work. Professional development encompasses education, training, and technical assistance.

Training is a learning experience, or series of experiences, specific to an area of inquiry and related set of skills, delivered by a professional(s) with subject matter and adult learning knowledge and skills. This could include seminars, workshops, or courses about specific topics or key concepts.

Technical assistance (TA) is the provision of targeted and customized supports by a professional(s) with subject matter and adult learning knowledge and skills with the goal of developing or strengthening processes, knowledge application, or implementation of services by recipients. This could include coaching, consulting, or other ongoing support.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

How do I navigate the survey? You can access the survey by clicking on the unique hyperlink we provided to you via email. Once you have started the survey, you can navigate through it by answering each question and clicking the NEXT button at the bottom of the page. To navigate between survey sections, click on the [Survey Menu] button at the top right of your screen. This will allow you go to select the section you wish to complete. To go back to a previous page, click the BACK button. Do not use your internet browser back/forward buttons to move through the survey.

Do I have to complete the survey all at one time? No. You can revisit the website as many times as needed to complete the survey. However, if you need to stop before finishing the survey, **please be sure to click on the NEXT button before closing out so that your response(s) on that page are saved**. You will resume at the next unanswered question when you return to the survey. Once you have finished and submitted your survey, you will no longer have access to it. **Please note that each session will time out after 30 minutes of inactivity**.

Can I complete the survey on my tablet or smartphone? Yes. The survey has been optimized to run on desktop computers, tablets, or smartphones. The survey is best viewed in the latest versions of Chrome, Safari, Firefox, or Internet Explorer (IE 11 or Edge).

How long does the survey take? About 60 minutes. You can preview the questions and are not required to complete the survey all at once. The data you provide each time you log in will be securely stored and available when you return to complete the survey.

Do I have to answer all the questions? Please try to answer all questions that are relevant for your state, so the U.S. Department of Education can gain a more accurate and complete understanding of how IDEA is being implemented. You will automatically be skipped past some questions that do not apply to your situation, depending on your answer to an earlier question. You may choose to skip any question in the survey that you cannot or do not wish to answer. To skip a question, leave the question blank and then click the NEXT button to proceed.

Can I have my staff complete some of the questions instead of me? Yes. Certain questions may require the help of other staff. You may share your unique survey hyperlink with these individuals, which will give them full access to the survey, or you can print off specific questions and fill in the responses yourself at a later time.

Can multiple people work on completing the survey at the same time? No. If multiple people are logged into the same survey at the same time, responses may not be recorded correctly. Only one person on one computer should be completing the survey at any given time.

Can I print individual questions? Yes. You may print an individual page at any time by using your computer's usual method of printing.

Can I print a copy of the questionnaire when I am finished? If you would like a copy of your responses once you complete the survey, please email IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com and we will send you a copy of the survey with your responses.

Can I obtain a paper version of the questionnaire? Yes. If you would like to see a paper version for reference purposes, please email IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com and we will send you a copy.

Will my answers be kept confidential? Yes. All information that would permit identification of the district, school, or individual respondent will be held in strict confidence, will be used only by persons engaged in the survey and only for the purposes of the survey, and will not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose except as required by law. Study reports may present information by state.

Whom should I contact if I have a question? If you have any questions, please contact Lisbeth Goble at 833-238-7224 or at IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com. When sending emails, in addition to the question, please be sure to include your name and a phone number where you can be reached.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Please enter the contact information of the primary respondent below in case we need to contact your agency to clarify responses to any questions.

First Name: _____

Last Name: _____

Title/Position: _____

Lead Agency Name: _____

Phone: |___|___|___| - |___|___|___| - |___|___|___|___|

Email Address:_____

State Name:_____

Best days and times to reach you (in case of questions): _____

A. LEAD AGENCY

The first two questions are about your role in your state agency.

A1. For the current fiscal year, which state agency is designated as the lead agency for early intervention under IDEA, Part C (for example, State Department of Health)?

Please indicate more than one agency if there are co-leads in your state.

_____

A2. As the designated early intervention coordinator, which of the following describes the population(s) for which you have responsibility?

Please indicate any other responsibilities or obligations in the 'other' response options

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Children, birth through age 2, with disabilities
2 ☐ Preschool-age children with disabilities
3 ☐ School-age children with disabilities
4 ☐ Children, birth through age 2, without disabilities
5 ☐ Preschool-age children without disabilities
6 ☐ School-age children without disabilities
7 ☐ Other responsibilities or obligations *(please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

B. IDENTIFICATION FOR EARLY INTERVENTION SERVICES

The next questions focus on eligibility criteria and the identification of infants and toddlers for Part C early intervention services.

B1. Please enter the web address where we may view your state's current eligibility criteria for Part C early intervention services.

If this information is not available on a website, please select the response below and scan and email a hard copy to IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com.

1 ❍ Information available on a website

_____

0 ❍ Information not available on a website

B2. How does your lead agency coordinate identification and determine eligibility of infants and toddlers suspected of having a disability with each of the following state or local agencies?

Select all that apply

	Home visiting agencies	Child care providers	Early Head Start	Pre-K schools	Social service agencies	Public health agencies	N/A
a. Have occasional or regular conversations about identification and screening	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ☐	7 ❍
b. Jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ☐	7 ❍
c. Hold joint professional development for personnel	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ☐	7 ❍
d. Share identification and screening data	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ☐	7 ❍
e. Establish interagency agreements	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ☐	7 ❍
f. Other (*please specify*)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ☐	7 ❍

_____

The next set of questions focuses on the Part C Screening Procedures Option.

B3. Which of the following best describes the status of your state's adoption of the screening procedures option made available in the 2011 Part C regulations?

The screening procedures option refers to § 303.320 of the 2011 IDEA Part C Rules and Regulations and specifies that lead agencies may adopt procedures to screen children under age 3 who have been referred to the Part C program to determine whether they are suspected of having a disability.

Select one only

We adopted the screening procedures option and:

1 ❍ Require ALL local early intervention programs to screen ALL children referred

2 ❍ Require ALL local early intervention programs to screen, but ONLY for certain referral sources or populations of children

3 ❍ Give local early intervention programs discretion around BOTH whether to use the option AND which referral sources or populations of children are screened

4 ❍ Give local early intervention programs discretion ONLY as to whether they use the option or not

5 ❍ Give local early intervention programs discretion ONLY as to which referral sources or populations of children are screened

6 ❍ Not applicable; we did not adopt the screening policy option

IF YOUR ANSWER TO B3 = 1-5, THEN COMPLETE B4

B4. Which of the following statements describe your experiences in using the screening procedures option?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Our data suggest that using the screening policy is cost-effective

2 ☐ Our data suggest that using the screening policy is appropriate for children

3 ☐ Our state has experienced challenges with identifying appropriate screening tools

4 ☐ Our state has experienced challenges with having enough personnel qualified in the use of appropriate screening tools

5 ☐ Our state has found many parents/guardians want an evaluation conducted even when screening results suggest it is not necessary

6 ☐ Based on the state's experiences, we are considering eliminating this policy

8 ☐ ..... Other *(please specify)* ____

7 ❍ Our state has not yet evaluated the impact of this policy

IF YOUR ANSWER TO B3 = 6, THEN COMPLETE B5

B5. Which of the following statements best describes your *primary* reason for NOT adopting the screening procedures option?

Select one only

1 ❍ Concern with being able to meet the 45-day timeline requirement if screening is added
2 ❍ Limited usefulness because evaluation is required if requested by the parent/guardian
3 ❍ Limited resources and capacity for establishing screening tools
4 ❍ Limited resources and capacity for having qualified staff to conduct screenings
5 ❍ Limited usefulness because all infants and toddlers who are referred should receive a comprehensive evaluation
6 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

B6. Which activities does your lead agency conduct to support the identification of infants and toddlers in need of early intervention services?

Please do not include activities initiated at the local level.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Child Find screenings
2 ☐ Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to pediatricians and other health care providers
3 ☐ Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities
4 ☐ Workshops for pediatricians and other health care providers
5 ☐ Workshops for staff from child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities
6 ☐ Outreach to referral sources
7 ☐ Web-based information and other electronic materials
8 ☐ Outreach through radio, TV, newspapers, and other print media to promote awareness of disabilities and services for young children
9 ☐ Outreach through community events, such as health fairs
10 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
11 ❍ None of the above

B7. What are the top three *referral sources* for Part C early intervention services?

Please write in the space provided a "1" for the source providing the most referrals, a "2" for the source that provides the next largest number of referrals, and a "3" for the source providing the third largest number of referrals.

		Rank referral sources 1, 2, and 3. Use each number only once.
a.	Local school district	|___|
b.	Health department	|___|
c.	Social service agencies (for example, child welfare, mental health)	|___|
d.	Parents/guardians	|___|
e.	Health care providers or hospitals	|___|
f.	Child care	|___|
g.	Early Head Start	|___|
h.	Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI) systems	|___|
i.	Other *(please specify)* _____	|___|

B8. How does your lead agency work with other state or local agencies and programs (such as home visiting, Early Head Start, public health, substance abuse treatment, mental health, social services) to identify and determine eligibility of infants and toddlers who have experienced the following emerging health concerns?

Select all that apply

	Have occasional or regular conversations	Jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	Hold joint professional development for personnel	Share identification and screening data	Establish interagency agreements	Don't work with other agencies/ programs on this condition
a. Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs)	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
b. Fetal alcohol spectrum disorders	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
c. Lead or other heavy metal poisoning	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
d. Neonatal abstinence syndrome	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
e. Opioid addiction	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
f. Prenatal substance use	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍
g. Zika virus	1☐	2☐	3☐	4☐	5☐	6❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

C. IFSP DEVELOPMENT AND QUALITY

The next questions focus on early learning guidelines and the development and content of Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs).

C1. Does your state have general early learning guidelines for infants and toddlers birth through age 2?

Early learning guidelines describe expectations for young children's learning and development.

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE C2

C2. Which domains are covered by your state's early learning guidelines?

Early learning guidelines describe expectations for young children's learning and development.

Adaptive behavior refers to behavior that enables a person to get along in his or her environment with greatest success and least conflict with others.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Physical health

2 ☐ Cognitive

3 ☐ Approaches to learning

4 ☐ Social/emotional

5 ☐ Communication/language

6 ☐ Adaptive behavior

7 ☐ Motor development

8 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

9 ❍ None of the above

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE C3

C3. For the current fiscal year (2020), does your state have formal policies in place regarding the alignment of the provision of Part C early intervention services with your early learning guidelines?

Early learning guidelines *describe expectations for young children's learning and development.*

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE C4

C4. During the 2019 and 2020 fiscal years, has your lead agency provided any training or professional development on the alignment of early learning guidelines and the provision of Part C early intervention services?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

C5. Does your lead agency provide *professional development* on any of the following topics to promote the quality of the IFSP process for infants and toddlers with disabilities?

Professional development can occur either in person or online.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Setting developmentally appropriate IFSP outcomes

2 ☐ Setting high quality functional IFSP outcomes

3 ☐ Identifying appropriate early intervention services to meet IFSP outcomes

4 ☐ Engaging families in the IFSP process

5 ☐ Engaging staff from local community agencies or programs (for example, pre-K, Early Head Start, or child care staff) in the IFSP process

6 ☐ Monitoring progress toward achieving IFSP outcomes, including through use of data

7 ☐ Other training or professional development *(please specify)* _____

8 ❍ None of the above

C6. Does your lead agency provide *written policy or guidelines* on any of the following topics to promote the quality of the IFSP process?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Setting developmentally appropriate IFSP outcomes

2 ☐ Setting high quality functional IFSP outcomes

3 ☐ Identifying appropriate early intervention services to meet IFSP outcomes

4 ☐ Engaging families in the IFSP process

5 ☐ Engaging staff from local community agencies or programs (for example, pre-K, Early Head Start, or child care staff) in the IFSP process

6 ☐ Monitoring progress toward achieving IFSP outcomes, including through use of data

7 ☐ Other written policies or guidelines *(please specify)* _____

8 ❍ None of the above

C7. Does your lead agency provide any of the following *resources* to promote the quality of the IFSP process?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ A *mandated* IFSP form or template
2 ☐ A *suggested* IFSP form or template
3 ☐ A rubric or other resource describing features of quality IFSPs
4 ☐ A coach, mentor, or IFSP facilitator to assist with writing the IFSP
5 ☐ Other resources to promote the quality of IFSPs *(please specify)*

_____

6 ❍ None of the above

C8. How does your lead agency monitor local early intervention programs to ensure IFSP teams appropriately identify IFSP outcomes?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Reviews data from state data system (for example, data on planned and delivered IFSP services)
2 ☐ Conducts on-site monitoring visits of local early intervention providers (for example, stakeholder interviews or observation of IFSP meetings)
3 ☐ Reviews a selection of IFSPs from local early intervention providers
4 ☐ Surveys parents/guardians about IFSP outcomes or services
5 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
6 ❍ None of the above

C9. How does your lead agency monitor local early intervention programs to ensure *service decisions* are delivered in accordance with the IFSP?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Reviews data from state data system (for example, data on planned and delivered IFSP services)
2 ☐ Conducts on-site monitoring visits of local early intervention providers (for example, stakeholder interviews or observation of IFSP meetings)
3 ☐ Reviews a selection of IFSPs from local early intervention providers
4 ☐ Surveys parents/guardians about IFSP outcomes or services
5 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
6 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

D. EARLY INTERVENTION SERVICES

The next questions focus on efforts to support infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

D1. For the current fiscal year (2020), is your lead agency offering any of the following to local early intervention programs to promote the provision of services in natural environments?

Consider only services that aim to enable participation in daily routines and activities and allow the child to make progress in developmental areas.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Technical assistance
2 ☐ Written guidelines
3 ☐ Workshops or professional development
4 ☐ Mentors or coaches
5 ☐ Virtual opportunities including webinars or communities of practice
6 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
7 ❍ None of the above

D2. For the current fiscal year (2020), what strategies is your lead agency using to support local programs in developing social-emotional skills and addressing challenging behaviors or mental health concerns for infants and toddlers with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide guidelines for how to assess social-emotional development and address challenging behaviors or mental health concerns as part of IFSP development
2 ☐ Provide professional development or technical assistance on social-emotional development, challenging behaviors, or mental health concerns
3 ☐ Review or monitor decisions of local IFSP teams to ensure appropriate services related to social-emotional development, challenging behaviors, or mental health concerns are included
4 ☐ Provide designated funding to local programs to support social-emotional development and address challenging behaviors or mental health concerns
5 ☐ Provide coaches to local programs to support social-emotional development and address challenging behaviors or mental health concerns
6 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

D3. What strategies does your lead agency use to support local early intervention programs in addressing the needs of infants and toddlers who have experienced *emerging health concerns*?

Examples of emerging health concerns include conditions and experiences such as: Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs), fetal alcohol spectrum disorders, neonatal abstinence syndrome, perinatal substance use, toxic stress due to violence, toxic stress due to poverty, and Zika virus.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Technical assistance
2 ☐ Written guidelines
3 ☐ Workshops or professional development
4 ☐ Mentors or coaches
5 ☐ Virtual opportunities including webinars or communities or practice
6 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
7 ❍ None of the above

D4. How does your lead agency support local early intervention programs' use of individualized assistive technology (AT) for serving infants and toddlers with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Offer information about AT to families, such as through AT fairs
2 ☐ Provide designated funding to support AT devices and use
3 ☐ Provide lists of AT devices to providers for consideration
4 ☐ Provide guidelines for how to assess AT needs as part of IFSP development
5 ☐ Provide specific guidelines for AT use
6 ☐ Provide professional development to early intervention service providers on use of AT
7 ☐ Review or monitor IFSPs to determine extent of AT use
8 ☐ Provide or lend AT devices or software to local providers
9 ☐ Monitor use of AT to ensure effective implementation
10 ☐ Hire or contract with AT experts to promote effective implementation strategies
11 ❍ None of the above

D5. During the current fiscal year (2020), is your state using the Extended Part C Option, approved by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)?

Amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2004 include a provision that provides the option for states to use Part C funding to provide services for children until they enter kindergarten. This is commonly referred to as the "Extended Part C Option."

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO D5 = 0, THEN COMPLETE D6

D6. Which issues are affecting (or have affected) your decision?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Insufficient funding

2 ☐ Insufficient lead agency staff

3 ☐ Part C lead agency is not able to promote school readiness as required

4 ☐ Insufficient interagency coordination at the state level

5 ☐ Insufficient interagency coordination at the local level

6 ☐ Shortages of staff at the local level

7 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

8 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

E. ADDRESSING LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY

The next questions focus on efforts made to address the linguistic and cultural diversity among families and infants and toddlers with disabilities.

E1. Does your lead agency do any of the following to ensure *non-English-speaking parents/guardians* understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes and in early intervention services?

*Please select anything the state does **or** requires local early intervention providers to do.*

***Do not** include activities that are initiated at the local level.*

Select all that apply.

1 ☐ Parents/guardians are asked to state their primary language as part of standard procedure at intake

2 ☐ An interpreter is provided for parents/guardians as needed

3 ☐ Parents/guardians are encouraged to bring someone who can interpret for them

4 ☐ Parents/guardians are provided with translated written resources

5 ☐ A toll-free phone number staffed by early intervention multilingual staff is provided for non-English-speaking parents/guardians

6 ☐ A toll-free vendor interpreter service is used as needed

7 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

E2. Does your lead agency do any of the following to help ensure that *referrals and evaluations* are linguistically and culturally competent?

Linguistically and culturally competent practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide professional development on culturally competent practices

2 ☐ Include parents/guardians on state advisory committees, task forces, or work groups representing diverse populations

3 ☐ Solicit periodic feedback from stakeholders and families representing diverse populations

4 ☐ Monitor how interpreters and translators are used

5 ☐ Monitor the use of culturally competent practices

6 ☐ Provide guidance specifically designed to support the use of linguistically and culturally competent practices (for example, written guidance or webinars)

7 ☐ Work with the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate

E3. What challenges has your state experienced in ensuring that *referrals and evaluations* are linguistically and culturally competent?

Linguistically and culturally competent *practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals around early intervention services

2 ☐ Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status

3 ☐ Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals

4 ☐ Having an insufficient number of interpreters

5 ☐ Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes

6 ☐ Having assessments for evaluation that are not normed for other languages

7 ☐ Difficulty determining if eligibility for services is due to lack of skills in native language, rather than a disability

8 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

9 ❍ None of the above

E4. Does your lead agency do any of the following to help ensure that *services* are linguistically and culturally competent?

Linguistically and culturally competent *practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide professional development on culturally competent practices

2 ☐ Include parents/guardians on state advisory committees, task forces, or work groups representing diverse populations

3 ☐ Solicit periodic feedback from stakeholders and families representing diverse populations

4 ☐ Monitor how interpreters and translators are used

5 ☐ Monitor the use of culturally competent practices

6 ☐ Provide guidance specifically designed to support the use of linguistically and culturally competent practices (for example, written guidance or webinars)

7 ☐ Work with the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate

E5. What challenges has your state experienced in ensuring that *services* are linguistically and culturally competent?

Linguistically and culturally competent *practices include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals around early intervention services

2 ☐ Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status

3 ☐ Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals

4 ☐ Having an insufficient number of interpreters

5 ☐ Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes

6 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

7 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

F. COLLECTION AND USE OF OUTCOME DATA

The next questions focus on the data your state collects and uses to measure child outcomes.

States receiving funds to implement the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) must develop a State Performance Plan (SPP) that describes their efforts to meet the requirements and purposes of IDEA, as well as an Annual Performance Report (APR) that reports on their performance.

Indicator 3 measures the percentage of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved a) positive social-emotional skills, b) acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and c) use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

F1. For the child outcome data collected under State Performance Plans (SPP)/Annual Performance Reports (APR) Part C Indicator 3, does your lead agency examine the data by any of the following?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Demographic characteristics

2 ☐ Setting in which services are provided (for example, home, child care, community setting)

3 ☐ Service provider (for example, particular agency, type of staff)

4 ☐ Services received (for example, speech and language therapy; physical or occupational therapy; psychological services; home visits; medical, nursing, or nutrition services; hearing or vision services; social work services; transportation)

5 ☐ Reason for early intervention services (for example, due to developmental delay or due to a specific health condition that could lead to a delay)

6 ❍ None of the above

F2. Which of thefollowing has your lead agency done in response to your examination of these outcome data for infants and toddlers with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide data analysis (for example, reports) for local use

2 ☐ Provide training and support to local providers on how to analyze and use their data

3 ☐ Provide individualized training and support to local providers based on results of the data analysis

4 ☐ Develop written procedures and guidance in response to findings from the data

5 ☐ Coordinate with state Part B colleagues to review findings and discuss an appropriate course of action

6 ☐ Provide families with materials, training, or other resources

7 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

8 ❍ Not applicable

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

G. COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION

The next questions focus on how your lead agency collaborates and coordinates with other agencies and programs in addressing the needs of infants and toddlers with disabilities.

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, OR 7, THEN COMPLETE G1

G1. How closely do you work with staff from the state Part B 619 preschool agency?

Select one only

1 ❍ Rarely have contact with them (once or twice a year)
2 ❍ Sometimes have contact with them (between three and six times per year)
3 ❍ Moderate amount of contact with them (between seven and eleven times per year)
4 ❍ Work closely with them (at least monthly)
5 ❍ Not applicable – Part C staff also coordinate the Part B 619 preschool program

IF YOUR ANSWER TO G1 = 2, 3, OR 4, THEN COMPLETE G2

G2. What topics do you regularly address when working with the state Part B 619 coordinator?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Child Find
2 ☐ Transitions
3 ☐ Professional development
4 ☐ Data sharing
5 ☐ Disputes
6 ☐ State Performance Plans/Annual Performance Reports required under IDEA
7 ☐ State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
8 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
9 ❍ None of the above

G3. How are early intervention data shared with your state preschool special education program?

If data are shared using more than one method, please select the method by which most data are shared.

Select one only

1 ❍ There is an integrated, longitudinal data system for storing data

2 ❍ Separate data systems are linked as needed using a common identifier or other matching process

3 ❍ Individual-level data from separate data systems are shared but cannot be linked

4 ❍ Aggregate data from separate data systems are shared

5 ❍ The state does not share data but some local providers do

6 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

H. SUPPORTS FOR TRANSITIONS

The next questions focus on issues related to the transition of infants and toddlers with disabilities from Part C early intervention services.

H1. How does your lead agency collaborate with the state preschool special education program to support local programs in the transition of children with disabilities from Part C to Part B?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ We issue joint policies or guidance

2 ☐ We provide joint trainings for personnel from both programs

3 ☐ We work together to provide workshops for families approaching transition

4 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

H2. Howdoes your lead agency ensure the quality of transition plans within Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs)?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Conducts on-site monitoring visits of local early intervention programs (for example, stakeholder interviews or observations of IFSP meetings)

2 ☐ Identifies local early intervention programs needing to improve transition processes

3 ☐ Provides technical assistance to local early intervention programs

4 ☐ Recommends or requires that local early intervention programs needing improvement implement a quality improvement plan

5 ☐ Recommends or requires that local early intervention programs use a transition planning rubric or guidance on best practices for compliance and quality

6 ☐ Recommends or requires that local early intervention programs use a transition procedures manual

7 ☐ Reviews data on student outcomes by local early intervention programs

8 ☐ Reviews a selection of IFSPs from local early intervention programs

9 ☐ Surveys parents/guardians about IFSP transition outcomes or supports

10 ☐ Identifies local early intervention programs that need to improve

11 ❍ None of the above

H3. For the current fiscal year (2020), in what ways is your lead agency supporting the transition of children with disabilities from early intervention services to preschool?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Part B preschool funds can be used to provide FAPE (free appropriate public education) to children before their third birthday

2 ☐ Part C funds can be used to provide FAPE (free appropriate public education) for children past their third birthday

3 ☐ Developed or maintained agreements on transitions from early intervention services to preschool special education

4 ☐ Developed or maintained policies on transition from early intervention services to preschool special education

5 ☐ Provided training to local early intervention providers on transition

6 ☐ Provided technical assistance to local early intervention providers on transition

7 ☐ Developed or disseminated materials for parents/guardians on transition from early intervention services to preschool special education

8 ☐ Developed or maintained an electronic database of individual child records to allow children to be followed from early intervention services to preschool special education

9 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

10 ❍ None of the above

H4. Does your lead agency *examine* data on children with disabilities after their transition from early intervention services?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H4 = 1, THEN COMPLETE H5

H5. What types of data does your lead agency examine on children with disabilities after their transition from early intervention services?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Whether child receives services through the Part B special education program
2 ☐ The setting in which preschool-age special education services are received
3 ☐ Whether the child participates in early learning programs such as Head Start or pre-K
4 ☐ Preschool exit data on child outcomes: positive social-emotional skills
5 ☐ Preschool exit data on child outcomes: acquisition and use of knowledge and skills
6 ☐ Preschool exit data on child outcomes: the use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs
7 ☐ Information on family satisfaction with the transition process
8 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H4 = 1, THEN COMPLETE H6

H6. How does your lead agency obtain data on the result of the transition from early intervention services to preschool-age special education services?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ District-reported data about students in preschool-age special education services
2 ☐ Surveys of families
3 ☐ Surveys of staff at agencies serving children who have transitioned from the Part C early intervention program
4 ☐ State longitudinal data systems
5 ☐ State early intervention data system
6 ☐ Multiple data systems that are linked as needed using a common identifier or other matching process
7 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

H7. During the current (2020) or the preceding two fiscal years (2018 and 2019), what actions has your lead agency taken to change transition policies, procedures, and practices for infants and toddlers with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Revised or developed memorandums of understanding and collaboration agreements with other entities, such as Early Head Start, social service agencies, or public health agencies

2 ☐ Provided targeted professional development, including materials and funds, to local Part C early intervention programs with below-target outcomes

3 ☐ Updated guidance to local early intervention programs on Part C transition procedures for families receiving Part C services

4 ☐ Revised policies or requirements of local early intervention programs related to transition supports offered to families

5 ☐ Increased coordination with state Part B colleagues to assist local programs in improving transition

6 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

7 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

I. FAMILY ENGAGEMENT

The next questions focus on engaging families of infants and toddlers with disabilities in the early intervention system for infants and toddlers.

I1. In what ways and at what level (state, region, or local) are families involved in the Part C system?

Select all that apply

	State	Region	Local	Don't Know
a. Providing training to other families	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	d ❍
b. Providing training to Part C early intervention personnel	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	d ❍
c. Employed as Part C early intervention personnel (for example, service coordinator)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	d ❍
d. Participating on committees/task forces (other than interagency coordinating councils)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	d ❍
e. State monitoring (for example, participate on monitoring teams)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	d ❍
f. Developing policies and procedures	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	d ❍
g. Involved in procedural safeguard system	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	d ❍
h. Other activity (*please specify*) _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	d ❍

I2. Does your state require local early intervention providers to provide families with information about the Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center when a referral is made?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

I3. For the current fiscal year (2020), is your lead agency offering any of the following to local early intervention programs to promote the involvement of families of children with IFSPs?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Funds to provider agencies to help parents/guardians participate in IFSP meetings (for example, funds for transportation, child care, translators)

2 ☐ Training on increasing parent/guardian involvement

3 ☐ Technical assistance related to promoting parent/guardian involvement

4 ☐ Written guidelines related to parent/guardian involvement

5 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

6 ❍ None of the above

I4. For the current fiscal year (2020), in what ways are lead agency staff collaborating with the Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center?

Indicator C4 requires states to collect information on the percentage of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family a) know their rights, b) effectively communicate their children's needs, and c) help their children develop and learn.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Development or delivery of trainings
2 ☐ Delivery of technical assistance
3 ☐ Dissemination of information regarding each other's services
4 ☐ Development of training/guidance materials
5 ☐ Family outreach efforts (for example, parents/guardians and siblings)
6 ☐ Promotion of alternative dispute resolution models
7 ☐ Involvement in the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
8 ☐ Implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
9 ☐ Assisting with conducting the required parent survey (Indicator C4 in the SPP/APR)
10 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
11 ❍ None of the above

I5. For the 2019–2020 fiscal year, in what ways is the lead agency *supporting* the Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Staff from the lead agency meet with PTI staff on a regular basis
2 ☐ Lead agency and PTI have joint planning sessions to coordinate services provided
3 ☐ Lead agency and PTI offer joint professional development
4 ☐ Lead agency provides financial support for PTI events or services
5 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

J. SPECIAL EDUCATOR CREDENTIALS

The next questions focus on the qualification and credentialing criteria for early intervention service providers.

J1. Which state agency is responsible for licensing and certification of early intervention service providers?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Part C early intervention lead agency
2 ☐ State education agency (SEA) (if not lead agency)
3 ☐ State licensing/certification agency that is not part of the SEA or the early intervention lead agency *(please specify)* _____
4 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

J2. How do early intervention service providers qualify for licensing/certification?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Portfolio
2 ☐ Exam/proficiency test
3 ☐ Undergraduate or graduate degree program
4 ☐ Coursework (not leading to a degree)
5 ☐ Background check
6 ☐ Certification transfer from reciprocating state
7 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
8 ❍ None of the above

J3. For what age range is a special educator (early intervention service provider) certification or credential applicable in your state?

Select one only

1 ❍ Birth to age 3
2 ❍ Birth to age 5
3 ❍ Birth to age 8
4 ❍ Other *(please specify)*

_____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

K. STAFFING

The next questions focus on the availability of staff to provide services to infants and toddlers with disabilities.

K1. Please indicate below the disciplines for which your statewide early intervention system has experienced *difficulty finding qualified Part C early intervention professionals* during the current (2020) or preceding two fiscal years (2018 and 2019).

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Audiologists
2 ☐ Behavioral analysts or experts
3 ☐ Family therapists
4 ☐ Nurses
5 ☐ Occupational therapists
6 ☐ Orientation/mobility specialists
7 ☐ Pediatricians and other physicians
8 ☐ Physical therapists
9 ☐ Psychologists
10 ☐ Registered dietitians
11 ☐ Service coordinators
12 ☐ Social workers
13 ☐ Special instructors
14 ☐ Speech/language pathologists
15 ☐ Vision specialists including ophthalmologists and optometrists
16 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
17 ❍ None of the above

K2. Please indicate below the disciplines for which your statewide early intervention system has experienced difficulty *retaining qualified Part C early intervention professionals* during the current (2020) or preceding two fiscal years (2018 and 2019).

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Audiologists
2 ☐ Behavioral analysts or experts
3 ☐ Family therapists
4 ☐ Nurses
5 ☐ Occupational therapists
6 ☐ Orientation/mobility specialists
7 ☐ Pediatricians and other physicians
8 ☐ Physical therapists
9 ☐ Psychologists
10 ☐ Registered dietitians
11 ☐ Service coordinators
12 ☐ Social workers
13 ☐ Special instructors
14 ☐ Speech/language pathologists
15 ☐ Vision specialists including ophthalmologists and optometrists
16 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
17 ❍ None of the above

K3. During the current (2020) and past (2019) fiscal years, what strategies has your state used to *increase the number of qualified Part C early intervention professionals*?

Please do not include strategies that are initiated at the local level.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Collaborated with universities to develop programs and curricula to prepare providers in specific shortage areas

2 ☐ Paid fees for tests/licensure exams

3 ☐ Paid for tutoring to prepare individual providers for certification tests/licensure exams

4 ☐ Provided time or funding for individual providers to participate in professional development opportunities (for example, institute of higher education tuition, workshop fees)

5 ☐ Provided alternative routes to certification for any person with a bachelor's degree

6 ☐ Provided alternative routes to certification for persons with an early childhood or general education degree

7 ☐ Provided alternative routes to certification for persons with a special education degree

8 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

9 ❍ None of the above

K4. During the current (2020) and past (2019) fiscal years, what initiatives or incentives has your state used to *retain* qualified Part C professionals?

***Tuition "Pay Back"**: For every year of tuition, educators owe the district a year of service.*

Please do not include initiatives or incentives that are initiated at the local level.

Select all that apply

0 ❍ Our state has not had problems with retention
1 ☐ Cover continuing education costs to attain a higher degree
2 ☐ Cover continuing education costs to maintain certification
3 ☐ Provide mentoring or induction programs
4 ☐ Offer full-time positions
5 ☐ Offer part-time positions
6 ☐ Offer same salary levels as pre-K–12 educators
7 ☐ Provide smaller caseloads
8 ☐ Offer student loan forgiveness
9 ☐ Offer tuition "pay back" or partial reimbursement
10 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
11 ❍ None of the above

L. FUNDING ALLOCATION

The next questions focus on funding for Part C early intervention services.

L1. What does your state's System of Payments policy include?

Select one only

1 ❍ Private insurance only
2 ❍ Family fees only (for example, sliding fee scale, co-payment, participation fee, cost share)
3 ❍ Both private insurance and family fees
4 ❍ None of the above

L2. What funding sources support Part C early intervention services as required by IFSPs?

*Please select **any funding sources** that support Part C early intervention services.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ IDEA, Part B
2 ☐ IDEA, Part C (infants and toddlers)
3 ☐ State early intervention funds
4 ☐ Local municipality or county funds
5 ☐ Family fees/co-payments/sliding fee
6 ☐ Head Start
7 ☐ Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V
8 ☐ Medicaid/Title XIX
9 ☐ Private insurance
10 ☐ State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)
11 ☐ Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)
12 ☐ Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
13 ☐ TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)
14 ☐ Other federal funding sources *(please specify)* _____
15 ☐ Other state funding sources *(please specify)*_____
16 ☐ Other local funding sources *(please specify)* _____

L2a. IF YOU SELECTED **THREE OR MORE** ITEMS IN L2:

Please write a "1" for the source that provides the largest share of funding, a "2" for the source that provides the next largest share of funding, and a "3" for the third largest funding source, based on the responses provided in L2.

IF YOU SELECTED **TWO ITEMS** IN L2:

Please write a "1" for the source listed below that provides the largest share of funding, and a "2" for the source that provides the next largest share of funding, based on the responses provided in L2.

IF YOU SELECTED **ONE ITEM** IN L2:

Please write a "1" next to the source selected in L2, and continue to the next survey item.

		Rank 1, 2, and 3 by share of funding.
a.	IDEA, Part B	|___|
b.	IDEA, Part C (infants and toddlers)	|___|
c.	State early intervention funds	|___|
d.	Local municipality or county funds	|___|
e.	Family fees/co-payments/sliding fee	|___|
f.	Head Start	|___|
g.	Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	|___|
h.	Medicaid/Title XIX	|___|
i.	Private insurance	|___|
j.	State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)	|___|
k.	Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)	|___|
l.	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	|___|
m.	TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	|___|
n.	Other federal funding sources *(please specify)* _____	|___|
o.	Other state funding sources *(please specify)* _____	|___|
p.	Other local funding sources *(please specify)* _____	|___|

L3. ***In the last three fiscal years,*** **has your lead agency taken any steps to help meet the costs of continued participation in the Part C program?**

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Reduced provider reimbursements

2 ☐ Reduced administrative staff at the state level

3 ☐ Use of data management systems, communication systems, or other technologies to reduce costs

4 ☐ Changed processes to reduce administrative costs

5 ☐ Changed eligibility criteria to be more restrictive

6 ☐ Changed State Medicaid Plan to increase Medicaid coverage for early intervention services

7 ☐ Changed regulations or legislation to increase private insurance coverage for early intervention services

8 ☐ Increased state funding for early intervention services

9 ☐ Increased State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) coverage for early intervention services

10 ☐ Increased reliance on local municipality or county funds for early intervention services

11 ☐ Increased reliance on private donations including money from foundations, United Way or other fundraising

12 ☐ Increased use of Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) for early intervention services

13 ☐ Increased use of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) for early intervention services

14 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

15 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

16 ❍ Not applicable.

L4. Which of the following methods are used to determine how special education funding (including federal and state) is allocated to local programs in your state that provide early intervention services to infants and toddlers?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ A state central vendor system that pays individual providers by a calculated fee per service

2 ☐ A fixed amount based on children from birth through age 2 serviced in the area

3 ☐ A fixed amount based on children and families served in a previous year

4 ☐ A fixed amount based on birth rate in the area

5 ☐ Predetermined amounts based on birth rate in the area, depending on risk factors such as registered defects, premature birth, or birth to a teen mother

6 ☐ A formula based on past changes in the number of children served per year

7 ☐ A formula based on a measure of local poverty

8 ☐ A formula based on the area's geography (for example, urban or rural)

9 ☐ A formula based on the rate of private insurance coverage

10 ☐ A formula based on the rate of public insurance coverage

11 ☐ A formula based on expenditures in a base year or a previous year

12 ☐ A formula based on allocations in a base year or a previous year

13 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

14 ❍ Not applicable: The state provides early intervention services directly on a statewide basis

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

M. EVIDENCE FROM RESEARCH

The next questions focus on the use of evidence from research.

M1. How often does your lead agency draw on the following sources of information when selecting early intervention policies and practices?

Select one only per row

	Never or not applicable	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Don't know
a. Information provided by the intervention's developer or vendor	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
b. Recommendations from colleagues in other state early intervention agencies or education departments	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
c. Information from a federally funded technical assistance center	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
d. Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
e. Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory (REL)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
f. Information from the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
g. Information from the state's research/evaluation office	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
h. Information from professional associations	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
i. Information from a college/university researcher	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
j. Information from a research journal	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
k. Social media (Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, other)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
l. Other (*please specify)* _____	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍

M2. Does your lead agency do any of the following to support or ensure that local early intervention programs use evidence-based early intervention policies, procedures, and practices?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Share an approved list of evidence-based programs, interventions, and practices with providers

2 ☐ Provide training and technical assistance to providers on implementing evidence-based practices

3 ☐ Use a checklist to observe providers to assess the use of a particular required evidence-based practice, or to review videos submitted to state

4 ☐ Provide a checklist to providers to support their assessment of the use of a particular required evidence-based practice

5 ☐ Conduct focus groups or surveys with families in order to assess the extent to which evidence-based practices are being used

6 ☐ Conduct focus groups or surveys with providers in order to assess the extent to which evidence-based practices are being used

7 ☐ Develop online modules or other materials to assist programs/agencies in identifying and selecting evidence-based programs, interventions, and/or practices

8 ☐ Use existing online modules or other materials to assist programs/agencies in identifying and selecting evidence-based programs, interventions, and/or practices

9 ☐ Have providers complete self-assessments on practices

10 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

11 ❍ The state does not take particular steps to ensure that local early intervention providers use evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices

M3. Does your lead agency currently use any of the following to implement or scale up the evidence-based practices identified in your State Systemic Improvement Plans (SSIPs) for Part C?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide online training (including single or modular courses) to support local implementation
2 ☐ Encourage local staff participation in federal model programs (for example, the Pyramid Model)
3 ☐ Support local staff participation in federal model programs (for example, the Pyramid Model)
4 ☐ Pilot implementation of the practice(s) in order to prepare for more widespread implementation
5 ☐ Disseminate information to parents/guardians to inform them of scale-up plans
6 ☐ Disseminate written materials that provide training or information to support local implementation
7 ☐ Host informational webinars to support local implementation
8 ☐ Provide coaches to support local implementation
9 ☐ Support communities of practice
10 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

M4. Which of the following statements best describes the current status of your lead agency's efforts in implementing or scaling up the evidence-based practices identified in your SSIPs?

Select one only

1 ❍ We are in the early planning stages
2 ❍ We are developing materials but have not put any practices in place yet
3 ❍ We have begun implementation but at a small scale
4 ❍ We have expanded beyond an initial phase to reach more parts of the state
5 ❍ We have scaled up or implemented statewide
6 ❍ Different practices are in different stages of implementation

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IDEA Implementation Study

Mathematica

District survey on IDEA implementation for school-age children

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) State and Local Implementation Study 2019

DISTRICT PART B 611

November 2019

NOTE: The hardcopy version of this survey is for reference purposes only. All instructions and FAQs pertain to the online version of the survey. To access the survey online, please use the link below. Enter the username and password provided to you in the letter included in the mailing packet.

Survey Link: IDEA-Survey.com/District611

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995
According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1850-0949. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 60 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (Education Department General Administrative Regulations Section, 34 C.F.R. § 76.591). If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this survey, please contact the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20202-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov directly. [Note: Please do not return the completed survey to this address.]

Notice of Confidentiality
Responses to this data collection will be used only for statistical purposes. The reports prepared for this study will summarize findings across the sample and will not associate responses with a specific individual. All information that would permit identification of the district or individual respondent will be kept confidential (per The Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002), will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey, and will not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose except as required by law. Study reports may present information by state.

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) State and Local Implementation Study 2019, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), is an important study that will develop a national picture of state, district, and school implementation of IDEA. It will provide (1) the Department of Education, Congress, and other stakeholders with knowledge that can inform how special education and related services are provided to children, and (2) states, districts, and schools with an understanding of how others are implementing IDEA.

The IDEA Implementation Study is not a compliance study, nor a study of the results of effectiveness of IDEA.

We are requesting you complete this questionnaire because you and your staff have the most knowledge about special education policies and practices in your district. If there are questions you are not able to answer, please feel free to draw on the expertise and knowledge of others within your district. As grantees under IDEA, local education agencies are expected to participate in this data collection (34 C.F.R. § 76.591). With your contribution, ED and Congress will gain a more accurate and complete understanding of how IDEA is being implemented for preschool- and school-age students at the district level.

All information that would permit identification of the district or individual respondent will be held in strict confidence, will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey, and will not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose except as required by law.

Thank you for joining us in our effort to understand the current implementation of IDEA. We appreciate your time and cooperation.

Please see the next pages for instructions for completing this survey, as well as a set of key definitions and frequently asked questions.

If you have any questions, contact:
Lisbeth Goble, 833-238-7224
email: IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com

Before you answer the questions, please carefully read the instructions, key definitions, and frequently asked questions. You can refer back to these as you complete the survey by clicking on the Instructions, Key Definitions, and FAQs link on the upper right-hand side of the screen.

INSTRUCTIONS

- When completing the survey, please consider "school-age children with disabilities" as students who are in kindergarten or age 6 or older.
- All items request information pertaining to the 2019–2020 school year unless otherwise specified.
- The primary respondent for this survey is intended to be the person most knowledgeable about special education policies and practices in your district. In most cases, the primary respondent will be the special education director.
- Certain questions may require the help of other staff, such as the director of pupil/student services and staff from human resources, finance, and general education. If you need input from other staff, you may share your unique survey hyperlink, which will give them full access to the survey, or you can print off specific questions for them to answer on paper and then fill in the online responses yourself.
- Throughout the survey, you'll see some terms in blue. You can click on those to see a definition of the term.
- Items on this survey cover the following topics: Agency Role; Identification for Special Education and Related Services; Significant Disproportionality; IEP Development and Quality; Monitoring School-Age Children with Disabilities; Alternate Diplomas; Supports for Transitions; Access to General Education Programs and Supports; Discipline; Social-Emotional, Behavioral, and Mental Health Supports; Funding Allocation; Staffing; and Evidence from Research.

KEY DEFINITIONS

Students with disabilities is used to reflect school-age students with intellectual disabilities; hearing impairments, including deafness; speech or language impairments; visual impairments, including blindness; serious emotional disturbance (hereafter referred to as emotional disturbance); orthopedic impairments; autism; traumatic brain injuries; developmental delays; other health impairments; specific learning disabilities; deaf-blindness; or multiple disabilities, and who, by reason thereof, receive special education and related services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) according to an Individualized Education Program (IEP).

Special education teachers are teachers employed and contracted to work with children with disabilities. For this survey, we would like you to consider teachers who work with students who are in kindergarten through high school graduation or age 21. If your state's IDEA eligibility extends past age 21, please consider the highest age for which teachers serve students with disabilities.

Professional development includes a range of learning and support activities designed to prepare individuals to work with, and on behalf of, children and their families, as well as ongoing experiences to enhance this work. Professional development encompasses education, training, and technical assistance.

Training is a learning experience, or series of experiences, specific to an area of inquiry and related set of skills, delivered by a professional(s) with subject matter and adult learning

knowledge and skills. This could include seminars, workshops, or courses about specific topics or key concepts.

Technical assistance (TA) is the provision of targeted and customized supports by a professional(s) with subject matter and adult learning knowledge and skills with the goal of developing or strengthening processes, knowledge application, or implementation of services by recipients. This could include coaching, consulting, or other ongoing support.

School levels are defined as follows:

- **Elementary schools** are schools that can serve students in kindergarten to grades 4–8, depending on state and school district policy.
- **Middle schools** are schools that can serve students between grades 4 and 9, with most in the grade 6–8 range. Middle schools in the upper grade range (7–9) are sometimes referred to as junior high schools.
- **High schools** are schools that can serve students between grades 7 and 12, with most in the grade 9–12 range.
- **Other schools** are all other grade configurations, including schools that are completely ungraded.

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

How do I navigate the survey? You can access the survey by clicking on the unique hyperlink we provided to you via email. Once you have started the survey, you can navigate through it by answering each question and clicking the NEXT button at the bottom of the page. To navigate between survey sections, click on the [Survey Menu] button at the top right of your screen. This will allow you go to select the section you wish to complete. To go back to a previous page, click the BACK button. Do not use your internet browser back/forward buttons to move through the survey.

Do I have to complete the survey all at one time? No. You can revisit the website as many times as needed to complete the survey. However, if you need to stop before finishing the survey, **please be sure to click on the NEXT button before closing out so that your response(s) on that page are saved**. You will resume at the next unanswered question when you return to the survey. Once you have finished and submitted your survey, you will no longer have access to it. **Please note that each session will time out after 30 minutes of inactivity**.

Can I complete the survey on my tablet or smartphone? Yes. The survey has been optimized to run on desktop computers, tablets, or smartphones. The survey is best viewed in the latest versions of Chrome, Safari, Firefox, or Internet Explorer (IE 11 or Edge).

How long does the survey take? About 60 minutes. You can preview the questions and are not required to complete the survey all at once. The data you provide each time you log in will be securely stored and available when you return to complete the survey.

Do I have to answer all the questions? Please try to answer all questions that are relevant for your district, so the U.S. Department of Education can gain a more accurate and complete understanding of how IDEA is being implemented. You will automatically be skipped past some questions that do not apply to your situation, depending on your answer to an earlier question. You may choose to skip any question in the survey that you cannot or do not wish to answer. To skip a question, leave the question blank and then click the NEXT button to proceed.

Can I have my staff complete some of the questions instead of me? Yes. Certain questions may require the help of other staff. You may share your unique survey hyperlink with these individuals, which will give them full access to the survey, or you can print off specific questions and then fill in the responses yourself at a later time.

Can multiple people work on completing the survey at the same time? No. If multiple people are logged into the same survey at the same time, responses may not be recorded correctly. Only one person on one computer should be completing the survey at any given time.

Can I print individual questions? Yes. You may print an individual page at any time by using your computer's usual method of printing.

Can I print a copy of the questionnaire when I am finished? If you would like a copy of your responses once you complete the survey, please email IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com and we will send you a copy of the survey with your responses.

Can I obtain a paper version of the questionnaire? Yes. If you would like to see a paper version for reference purposes, please email IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com and we will send you a copy.

Will my answers be kept confidential? Yes. All information that would permit identification of the district, school, or individual respondent will be held in strict confidence, will be used only by persons engaged in the survey and only for the purposes of the survey, and will not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose except as required by law.

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

Whom should I contact if I have a question? If you have any questions, please contact Lisbeth Goble at 833-238-7224 or at IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com. When sending emails, in addition to the question, please be sure to include your name and a phone number where you can be reached.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Please write the contact information of the primary respondent below in case we need to contact your district to clarify responses to any questions.

First Name: _____

Last Name: _____

Title/Position: _____

Phone: |__|__|__| - |__|__|__| - |__|__|__|__|

Email Address:_____

District Name: _____

Best days and times to reach you (in case of questions): _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

A. AGENCY ROLE

The first question is about your role in your district.

A1. As the designated special education coordinator for your district, which of the following describes the population(s) of students for which you have responsibility?

Please indicate any other responsibilities or obligations in the 'other' response options

Select all that apply

1 ☐ School-age children with disabilities

2 ☐ Preschool-age children with disabilities

3 ☐ School-age children *without* disabilities

4 ☐ Preschool-age children *without* disabilities

5 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

B. IDENTIFICATION FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND RELATED SERVICES

The next questions focus on the identification and eligibility of school-age children for special education services.

B1. How does your district work with other agencies and programs (such as public health, substance abuse treatment, mental health, and social services) to identify or determine eligibility of school-age children who have experienced the following emerging health concerns?

Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) *is the term used to describe all types of abuse, neglect, and other potentially traumatic experiences that occur to people under age 18.*

Select all that apply

	Have occasional or regular conversations	Jointly develop or share guidance for personnel	Hold joint professional development for personnel	Share identification and screening data	Establish interagency agreements	Don't work with other agencies/ programs on this condition
a. Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
b. Fetal alcohol spectrum disorders	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
c. Lead or other heavy metal poisoning	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
d. Neonatal abstinence syndrome	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
e. Opioid addiction	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
f. Prenatal substance use	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
g. Zika virus	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍

B2. Does your district administer a Kindergarten Readiness screener?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Yes, a commercial screener
2 ☐ Yes, a district-developed screener
3 ☐ Yes, a state-developed screener
4 ☐ Yes, a state-recommended screener
0 ❍ No, we currently do not

IF YOUR ANSWER TO B2 = 1, 2, 3, OR 4, THEN COMPLETE B3

B3. What does your district's Kindergarten Readiness screener measure?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Self-care or self-help skills
2 ☐ Language skills
3 ☐ Cognitive skills, including pre-academic skills
4 ☐ Gross motor skills
5 ☐ Fine motor skills
6 ☐ Social-emotional skills

IF YOUR ANSWER TO B2 = 1, 2, 3, OR 4, THEN COMPLETE B4

B4. Does your district use the results of the Kindergarten Readiness screener to inform student evaluation for special education services?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Yes, students are referred for evaluation for special education services based on the screener results
2 ☐ Yes, screener results are used to initiate a monitoring process which may then indicate the student should receive special education services
3 ☐ Yes, screener results are used to assign targeted or supplemental supports within the context of a multi-tiered system
0 ❍ No, they are not used to inform further evaluation

B5. Does your district use progress monitoring data from a *tiered intervention system* to inform any aspect of special education services?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Yes, to determine if students are eligible for special education services
2 ☐ Yes, to refer students for evaluation for special education services
3 ☐ Yes, to assign targeted or supplemental supports for students with disabilities
0 ❍ No, we do not use progress monitoring data from a tiered intervention system to inform any aspect of special education services

The next two questions focus on children who are suspected of having dyslexia.

B6. When determining eligibility for special education, does your district require or recommend a special type of assessment for school-age children who are suspected of having *dyslexia*?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, we require a special type of assessment

2 ❍ Yes, we recommend a special type of assessment, but do not require it

0 ❍ No, we currently do not

IF YOUR ANSWER TO B6 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE B7

B7. What types of special assessments does your district require or recommend to determine eligibility for special education for school-age children with *dyslexia*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Auditory processing assessments

2 ☐ Developmental vision assessments, in addition to routine vision screenings

3 ☐ Nonverbal cognitive assessments

4 ☐ Phonological assessments, including measurement of awareness, memory, phones, and decoding

5 ☐ Psychomotor assessments

6 ☐ Rapid automatic naming assessments

7 ☐ Reading fluency assessments

8 ☐ Reading comprehension assessments

9 ☐ Spelling assessments

10 ☐ Verbal cognitive assessments

11 ☐ Visual memory assessments

12 ☐ Visual perception assessments

13 ☐ Vocabulary assessments

14 ☐ Writing assessments

15 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

The next two questions focus on children who are suspected of having Autism Spectrum Disorder.

B8. When determining eligibility for special education, does your district require or recommend a special type of assessment for school-age children who are suspected of having *Autism Spectrum Disorder*?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, we require a special type of assessment
2 ❍ Yes, we recommend a special type of assessment, but do not require it
0 ❍ No, we currently do not

IF YOUR ANSWER TO B8 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE B9

B9. What types of special assessments does your district require or recommend to determine eligibility for special education for school-age children with *Autism Spectrum Disorder*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Nonverbal cognitive assessments
2 ☐ Verbal cognitive assessments
3 ☐ Systematic observations of students in the classroom by a specialist, such as a psychologist, occupational therapist, etc.
4 ☐ Teacher ratings of students' communication, behavior, and functioning in the classroom
5 ☐ Parent/guardian ratings of students' communication, behavior, and functioning at home
6 ☐ Collection of information directly from students about their communication, social interactions, and functioning
7 ☐ Collection of pediatrician referrals and/or medical information
8 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

The next questions focus on children who are English Learners (ELs).

B10. When determining eligibility for special education, does your district require or recommend a special type of assessment for school-age children who are *English Learners*?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, we require a special type of assessment
2 ❍ Yes, we recommend a special type of assessment, but do not require it
0 ❍ No, we currently do not

IF YOUR ANSWER TO B10 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE B11

B11. What types of special assessments does your district require or recommend to determine eligibility for special education services for school-age children who are *English Learners (ELs)*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Systematic observations of students in the classroom by a specialist, such as a psychologist, occupational therapist, etc.

2 ☐ Use classroom performance assessments and/or observations

3 ☐ Use nonverbal cognitive assessments such as the Leiter, TONI-4, Raven's Progressive Matrices

4 ☐ Gather information from families through interviews or forms in the family's primary language

5 ☐ Gather information from teachers of ELs

6 ☐ Use an English-language screener

7 ☐ Use screening instruments that have been translated to EL's first language

8 ☐ Use assessments that have evidence of validity with students speaking EL's first language

9 ☐ Use the same assessments used with students whose primary language is English, but with a bilingual assessor or interpreter

10 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

B12. Does your district do any of the following to ensure *non-English-speaking parents/guardians* understand their role in the referral and evaluation processes for school-age children?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Parents/guardians are asked to state their primary language as part of standard procedure at intake

2 ☐ An interpreter is provided for parents/guardians as needed

3 ☐ Parents/guardians are encouraged to bring someone who can interpret for them

4 ☐ Parents/guardians are provided with translated written resources

5 ☐ A toll-free phone number staffed by multilingual special education staff is provided for non-English-speaking parents/guardians

6 ☐ A toll-free vendor interpreter service is used as needed

7 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

B13. What challenges has your district experienced in ensuring that *referrals and evaluations* are linguistically and culturally competent?

Linguistically and culturally competent practices *include understanding and honoring differences in customs, beliefs, values, and language preferences among families from different ethnic, socioeconomic, religious, cultural, or linguistic groups.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Addressing family reluctance to engage with schools around special education
2 ☐ Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status
3 ☐ Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals
4 ☐ Having an insufficient number of interpreters
5 ☐ Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes
6 ☐ Having assessments for evaluation that are not normed for other languages
7 ☐ Difficulty determining if eligibility for services is due to lack of skills in native language, rather than a disability
8 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
9 ❍ None of the above

B14. Whatchallenges has your district experienced in ensuring that *services* are linguistically and culturally competent?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Addressing family reluctance to engage with schools around special education
2 ☐ Addressing family reluctance to engage with professionals due to concerns about legal status
3 ☐ Having an insufficient number of multilingual professionals
4 ☐ Having an insufficient number of interpreters
5 ☐ Having limited resources for staff training on linguistically and culturally competent processes
6 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
7 ❍ None of the above

The next two questions focus on children with specific learning disabilities.

B15. In your district, which of the following kinds of data are part of the process for determining special education eligibility for *elementary students* with specific learning disabilities?

If your district does not serve elementary students, please select "Not Applicable."

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Data and other information from the Response to Intervention (RtI) process

2 ☐ Data based on cognitive and academic assessments that demonstrate a discrepancy between expected and actual performance (such as an IQ-achievement discrepancy)

3 ☐ Data from other research-based procedures

4 ❍ Not applicable; district does not serve elementary students

B16. In determination of eligibility for special education under Specific Learning Disability (SLD), which best describes your state's policy with respect to Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), including RtI?

Select one only

1 ❍ The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility

2 ❍ The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is prohibited and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) is used to determine eligibility

3 ❍ The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data are explicitly required in determining eligibility

4 ❍ The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and MTSS data may be used in determining eligibility

5 ❍ The use of an IQ-achievement discrepancy model is permitted and an alternative method (not specifically MTSS) may be used to determine eligibility

6 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

7 ❍ None of the above

B17. In the first column, please indicate how many students were newly evaluated for IDEA Part B special education during the 2018-2019 school year, by grade.

In the second column, please indicate how many of these students were found eligible for special education services.

*Please **do not include** students who transferred into your district already eligible for special education.*

*Please **do include** students who received early intervention services under Part C Option and are not being evaluated under Part B.*

The intention of this question is to obtain the number of students newly evaluated and those found eligible for special education or related services under all disability categories. We want to count all children who were evaluated for the possibility of receiving an IEP, including those who might end up with a speech-only IEP.

	2018–2019 School Year	
	Number of students *evaluated*	Number of students *found eligible*
a. Kindergarten		
b. 1st grade		
c. 2nd grade		
d. 3rd grade		
e. 4th grade		
f. 5th grade		
g. 6th grade		
h. 7th grade		
i. 8th grade		
j. 9th grade		
k. 10th grade		
l. 11th grade		
m. 12th grade		

B18. During the eligibility determination process, is there anything your district does to help staff apply exclusionary criteria?

The purpose of this exclusionary clause is to help prevent the improper determination of eligibility of children for special education services, especially those from distinct cultures who have acquired learning styles, language, or behaviors that are not compatible with academic requirements of schools in the dominant culture.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Develop procedures for application of exclusionary criteria

2 ☐ Provide professional development for school staff

3 ☐ Provide written materials to school staff

4 ☐ Provide guidelines for staff to follow before screening children who are English Learners

5 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

C. SIGNIFICANT DISPROPORTIONALITY

The next section focuses on significant disproportionality. The first set of questions focuses specifically on significant disproportionality in identification.

C1. In any of the past five school years, has the state identified your district as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities?

Significant disproportionality in identification occurs when districts identify children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ 2014–2015

2 ☐ 2015–2016

3 ☐ 2016–2017

4 ☐ 2017–2018

5 ☐ 2018–2019

6 ❍ No, our district has not been identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years

7 ❍ Don't know if our district has been identified as having significant disproportionality in identification of school-age children with disabilities in the past five school years

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C1 = 1, 2, 3, 4, OR 5, THEN COMPLETE C2

C2. Did your district do any of the following to address or prevent significant disproportionality in *identification* of children with disabilities in the past five school years, and if so, how was it funded?

Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) are services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services, but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment. CEIS can be mandatory (Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services, or CCEIS) or voluntary.

Please include all actions that were used in the district, even if they were not used in all situations.

Select all that apply

		Through CCEIS (mandatory) funds	Through voluntary CEIS funds	Through other funds	District did not do this
a.	Reviewed and/or changed assessment/ evaluation instruments	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
b.	Reviewed and/or changed screening procedures	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
c.	Increased monitoring and analysis of school referral or assessment data	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
d.	Hired additional staff, such as reading specialists or mental health specialists	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
e.	Reduced class size	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
f.	Required progress monitoring	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
g.	Reviewed administrative and classroom staff effectiveness	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
h.	Developed a specific plan for school staff to address significant disproportionality in identification	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
i.	Provided targeted supports to all schools	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
j.	Provided targeted supports only to schools with evidence of significant disproportionality, or near-significant disproportionality	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
k.	Provided targeted supports for elementary schools	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
l.	Provided targeted supports for middle schools	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
m.	Provided targeted supports for high schools	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
n.	Provided or supported interventions to address issues in literacy	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍

	Through CCEIS (mandatory) funds	Through voluntary CEIS funds	Through other funds	District did not do this
o. Provided or supported interventions to address issues in math	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
p. Provided or supported interventions to address issues in science	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
q. Provided or supported behavioral supports	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
r. Initiated Multi-tiered Systems of Support	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
s. Initiated other specific interventions *Please specify* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
t. Other *Please specify* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C1 = 1, 2, 3, 4, OR 5, THEN COMPLETE C3

C3. Did your district provide any of the following types of *professional development* to address or prevent significant disproportionality in *identification* of children with disabilities in the past five school years, and if so, how was it funded?

Select all that apply

		Through CCEIS (mandatory) funds	Through voluntary CEIS funds	Through other funds	District did not provide
a.	Training to help general education teachers identify students who should be referred for evaluation	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
b.	Training to help special education teachers identify students who should be referred for evaluation	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
c.	Training to help school administrative staff identify students who should be referred for evaluation	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
d.	Training to help other school staff identify students who should be referred for evaluation	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
e.	Training about instructional strategies for meeting the diverse needs of students in a classroom	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
f.	Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for general education teachers	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
g.	Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for special education teachers	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
h.	Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for school administrative staff	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
i.	Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for other school staff	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
j.	Other *Please specify* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍

The next questions focus specifically on significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) placement.

C4. In any of the past five school years, has the state identified your district as having significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or *Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)* placement?

Significant disproportionality in LRE placement occurs when districts place in more restrictive settings children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ 2014–2015

2 ☐ 2015–2016

3 ☐ 2016–2017

4 ☐ 2017–2018

5 ☐ 2018–2019

6 ❍ No, our district has not been identified as having significant disproportionality in LRE placement for school-age children in the past five school years

7 ❍ Don't know if our district has been identified as having significant disproportionality in LRE placement for school-age children in the past five school years

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C4 = 1, 2, 3, 4, OR 5, THEN COMPLETE C5

C5. Did your district do any of the following to address or prevent significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or *LRE placement,* in the past five school years, and if so, how was it funded?

Please include all actions that were used in the district, even if they were not used in all situations.

Select all that apply

		Through CCEIS (mandatory) funds	Through voluntary CEIS funds	Through other funds	District did not do this
a.	Conducted a review of district policies and procedures related to IEPs	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
b.	Reviewed practices used to facilitate parent/guardian involvement in LRE placement decisions	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
c.	Provided funding for additional staff, such as reading specialists or mental health specialists	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
d.	Reviewed supplementary aids and services provided to support LRE placements	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
e.	Implemented general education/special education team teaching	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
f.	Increased frequency of analysis of assessment data	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
g.	Required progress monitoring in primary grades	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
h.	Developed a specific plan for school staff to address significant disproportionality in LRE placement	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
i.	Provided targeted supports to all schools	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
j.	Provided targeted supports only to schools with evidence of significant disproportionality, or near-significant disproportionality	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
k.	Provided targeted supports for elementary schools	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
l.	Provided targeted supports for middle schools	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
m.	Provided targeted supports for high schools	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
n.	Provided or supported interventions to address issues in literacy	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
o.	Provided or supported interventions to address issues in math	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
p.	Provided or supported interventions to address issues in science	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍

		Through CCEIS (mandatory) funds	Through voluntary CEIS funds	Through other funds	District did not do this
q.	Provided or supported behavioral supports	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
r.	Initiated Multi-tiered Systems of Support	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
s.	Initiated other specific interventions	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
	Please specify _____				
t.	Other	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
	*Please specify*_____				

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C4 = 1, 2, 3, 4, OR 5, THEN COMPLETE C6

C6. Did your district provide any of the following types of *professional development* to address or prevent significant disproportionality in the placement of school-age children in particular educational settings, or *LRE placement,* in the past five school years, and if so, how was it funded?

Select all that apply

		Through CCEIS (mandatory) funds	Through voluntary CEIS funds	Through other funds	District did not provide
a.	Training about instructional strategies for meeting the diverse needs of students in a classroom	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
b.	Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for general education teachers	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
c.	Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for special education teachers	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
d.	Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for school administrative staff	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
e.	Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for other school staff	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
f.	Other	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
	Please specify _____				

The next questions focus specifically on significant disproportionality in discipline.

C7. In any of the past five school years, has the state identified your district as having significant disproportionality in *discipline*?

Significant disproportionality in discipline occurs when districts discipline children from any racial or ethnic group at markedly higher or lower rates than their peers. States determine whether significant disproportionality is occurring in a given district.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ 2014–2015

2 ☐ 2015–2016

3 ☐ 2016–2017

4 ☐ 2017–2018

5 ☐ 2018–2019

6 ❍ No, our district has not been identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline for school-age children in the past five school years

7 ❍ Don't know if our district has been identified as having significant disproportionality in discipline for school-age children in the past five school years

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C7 = 1, 2, 3, 4, OR 5, THEN COMPLETE C8

C8. Did your district do any of the following to address or prevent significant disproportionality in *discipline* in the past five school years, and if so, how was it funded?

Please include all actions that were used in the district, even if they were not used in all situations.

Select all that apply

		Through CCEIS (mandatory) funds	Through voluntary CEIS funds	Through other funds	District did not do this
a.	Changed student code of conduct	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
b.	Made environmental changes to schools (for example, cameras in blind hallways; classroom communication systems) to prevent or address problems	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
c.	Increased monitoring of school disciplinary actions	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
d.	Used a support team to review general education student behavioral plans, ensure they have needed support(s), and track progress	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
e.	Used Interdisciplinary Team Teaching or Schools-within-Schools approach	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
f.	Developed a specific plan for school staff to address significant disproportionality in discipline	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
g.	Provided targeted supports to all schools	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
h.	Provided targeted supports only to schools with evidence of significant disproportionality, or near-significant disproportionality	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
i.	Provided targeted supports for elementary schools	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
j.	Provided targeted supports for middle schools	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
k.	Provided targeted supports for high schools	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
l.	Provided or supported interventions to address issues in literacy	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
m.	Provided or supported interventions to address issues in math	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
n.	Provided or supported interventions to address issues in science	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
o.	Provided or supported behavioral supports	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍

		Through CCEIS (mandatory) funds	Through voluntary CEIS funds	Through other funds	District did not do this
p.	Initiated a tiered system of support for behavior (for example, Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports [PBIS] / School-Wide PBIS)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	❍
q.	Used Reconnecting Youth program	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
r.	Used Restorative Justice approach	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
s.	Used Safe and Responsive Schools Guide	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
t.	Provided school resource officers at schools	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
u.	Used social-emotional or character development curriculum	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
v.	Used trauma-informed practices or programs	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
w.	Initiated other specific interventions *Please specify*_____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
x.	Developed guidance on office referrals for all staff	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
y.	Other *Please specify* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C7 = 1, 2, 3, 4, OR 5, THEN COMPLETE C9

C9. Did your district provide any of the following types of *professional development* to address or prevent significant disproportionality in discipline in the past five school years, and if so, how was it funded?

Select all that apply

	Through CCEIS (mandatory) funds	Through voluntary CEIS funds	Through other funds	District did not provide
a. Training for school staff on how to manage behavior in the classroom	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
b. Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for general education teachers	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
c. Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for special education teachers	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
d. Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for school administrative staff	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
e. Technical assistance (specialized advice and customized support) for other school staff	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
f. Other *Please specify* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C1, C4, OR C7 = 1, 2, 3, 4, OR 5, THEN COMPLETE C10

C10. Please provide the total State Part B allocation amount and the amount reserved for *voluntary* CEIS activities for school-age children with disabilities in your district, for the most recently completed school year (2018–2019). Your best estimates are fine.

a. State Part B allocation (2018–2019) $ | _____ |

b. Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS (2018–2019) $ | _____ |

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

D. IEP DEVELOPMENT AND QUALITY

The next questions focus on the development and quality of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs).

D1. Does your district provide *professional development* on any of the following topics to help promote the quality of the IEP process for school-age children with disabilities?

Professional development can occur either in person or online.

***A quality IEP** is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student.*

***Standards-based IEPs** are those that align goals for students with disabilities with the content and academic achievement standards that form the basis of each state's general education curriculum.*

***Appropriately ambitious** goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Developing standards-based IEPs
2 ☐ Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals
3 ☐ Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals
4 ☐ Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process
5 ☐ Engaging school staff (for example, general educators) in the IEP process
6 ☐ Engaging students in the IEP process
7 ☐ Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data
8 ☐ Other professional development to promote the quality of IEPs *(please specify)*

_____

9 ❍ None of the above

IF YOUR ANSWER TO D1 = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, OR 8, THEN COMPLETE D2

D2. Who was the target audience for professional development on topics to help promote the quality of the IEP process?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Principals
2 ☐ School administrative officials
3 ☐ Special education teachers
4 ☐ General education teachers
5 ☐ Paraprofessionals or instructional learning assistants
6 ☐ Reading specialists
7 ☐ Math specialists
8 ☐ Speech and language therapists/pathologists
9 ☐ School counselors
10 ☐ School psychologists
11 ☐ School or district nurse
12 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

D3. Does your district provide *written policies or guidelines* on any of the following topics to help promote the quality of the IEP process for school-age children with disabilities?

Appropriately ambitious *goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Developing standards-based IEPs
2 ☐ Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals
3 ☐ Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals
4 ☐ Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process
5 ☐ Engaging school staff (for example, general educators) in the IEP process
6 ☐ Engaging students in the IEP process
7 ☐ Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data
8 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
9 ❍ None of the above

D4. Does your district provide any of the following *resources* to help promote the quality of the IEP process for school-age children with disabilities?

Appropriately ambitious *goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ A *mandated* standards-based IEP form or template

2 ☐ A *suggested* standards-based IEP form or template

3 ☐ A rubric or other resource describing features of quality IEPs, including appropriately ambitious IEP goals

4 ☐ A coach, mentor, or IEP facilitator to assist with writing the IEP

5 ☐ A list of contact information for Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) and/or intervention staff

6 ☐ Staff handbook or procedures manual with example IEPs

7 ☐ Other resources to promote the quality of IEPs *(please specify)* _____

8 ❍ None of the above

D5. Does your district provide any of the following types of assistance to enable parents/guardians to participate in IEP meetings (for school-age children with disabilities)?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Child care assistance

2 ☐ Interpreters

3 ☐ Transportation vouchers

4 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

5 ❍ No, we do not provide this type of assistance

D6. Does your district have a process to assess the quality of IEPs?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

d ❍ Don't know

IF YOUR ANSWER TO D6 = 1, THEN COMPLETE D7

D7. What approaches does your district use to assess the quality of IEPs?

***Quality of IEPs**: A quality IEP is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student.*

***Appropriately ambitious** goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Periodic review of completed IEPs
2 ☐ Interview students about IEP goals and supports
3 ☐ Interview teachers about IEP goals and supports
4 ☐ Interview parents/guardians about IEP goals and supports
5 ☐ Interview administrators about IEP provisions
6 ☐ Monitor the services and supports specified in the IEP
7 ☐ Monitor participation rates of parents/guardians in IEP meetings
8 ☐ Monitor participation rates of students in IEP meetings
9 ☐ Monitor participation rates of district and school staff in IEP meetings
10 ☐ Monitor participation rates of staff from agencies outside the district in IEP meetings
11 ☐ Monitor academic outcomes of students with an IEP
12 ☐ Monitor disciplinary actions of students with an IEP
13 ☐ Monitor the development of appropriately ambitious goals, as documented in an IEP

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

D8. For the 2019–2020 school year, has your district made available written materials, or offered any workshops, discussions or support groups *specifically for parents/guardians of students with IEPs* on any of the following topics?

Select all that apply

	Provided written materials	Offered workshops, discussions, or support groups	We did not offer materials or supports to parents/guardians on this topic
a. Understanding student accommodations to help them access the general education curriculum	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
b. Developing and implementing a standards-based IEP	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
c. Understanding accommodations offered to students when taking state or districtwide assessments, including the use of alternative assessments	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
d. Understanding their child's disability	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
e. Understanding the law and their legal rights under IDEA	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
f. Using alternative dispute resolution procedures	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
g. Understanding any of the five special factors (behavior, limited English proficiency, Braille instruction, language and communication, and assistive technology) as part of the development, review, and revision of IEPs	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
h. Using interventions for children with behavioral challenges	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
i. Using strategies for making successful transitions between schools, such as elementary and middle schools	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
j. Understanding how to file a complaint and where to receive assistance in drafting an effective complaint	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

E. MONITORING SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

The next questions focus on monitoring and analyzing the outcomes of school-age children with disabilities and related dropout prevention strategies.

E1. Does your district use an early warning system to identify students with disabilities who are at risk of dropping out of school?

An early warning system is based on student data and is used to help identify students who exhibit behavior or academic performance that puts them at risk of dropping out of school.

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO E1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE E2

E2. Do the indicators used in the early warning system vary depending on the disability category of the student?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO E1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE E3

E3. How are the early warning system data used to help students with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ The data are used to identify students for participation in dropout prevention programs

2 ☐ The data are used to provide targeted interventions to children with IEPs

3 ☐ The data are used to monitor progress toward attainment of IEP goals

4 ☐ The data are used to inform professional development for educators about preventing dropout

5 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

0 ❍ None of the above

E4. Does yourdistrict have a dropout prevention program?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO E4=1, THEN COMPLETE E5

E5. Which of the following strategies are part of your district's *dropout prevention program* to help students with and without disabilities who are at risk of dropping out?

		Select all that apply		
		Used for students *with disabilities*	Used for students *without disabilities*	This is not part of our district's dropout prevention program
a.	Provide mentoring to students	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
b.	Provide tutoring to students	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
c.	Engage students in community service opportunities	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
d.	Provide alternative or nontraditional schooling options, such as alternative times or environments	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
e.	Offer career and technical education courses to students	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
f.	Provide after-school enhancement programs	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
g.	Provide summer enhancement programs	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
h.	Provide individualized learning to allow students to move through courses at their own pace	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
i.	Provide personalized learning tailored to the preferences and interests of students	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
j.	Ensure a safe learning environment through the use of a comprehensive discipline plan or violence prevention plan	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
k.	Engage families to help assess student needs and reduce absenteeism and truancy	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
l.	Review attendance and tardiness data to determine any patterns related to poor attendance	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
m.	Other *Please specify*_____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍

E6. Does your district use student outcome data to inform any of the following types of targeted assistance your district provides to some or all schools that serve children with IEPs?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide additional staff to schools
2 ☐ Provide additional professional development to school staff
3 ☐ Provide resources to help schools increase progress monitoring of students with disabilities
4 ☐ Provide resources to help schools make curriculum adaptations
5 ☐ Provide resources to help schools implement programs and interventions

E7. Which of the following components of Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) does your district implement and/or have challenges implementing when serving school-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

	District implements this component	District has challenges implementing this component	District does not implement this component
a. Universal screening	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
b. Data-driven decision making	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
c. Progress monitoring	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
d. Evidence-based instruction and supplemental support	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

F. ALTERNATE DIPLOMAS

The next questions focus on alternate diplomas for school-age children with disabilities.

F1. Does your state have a policy to offer an *alternate diploma* for school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities that is standards-based and aligned with state requirements for the regular high school diploma?

1 ❍ Yes
0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE F2

F2. Who decides if a school-age child with disabilities is eligible to be awarded a state-defined alternate diploma?

Select one only

1 ❍ IEP team
2 ❍ Special education staff, not the full IEP team
3 ❍ Other school staff
4 ❍ District staff
5 ❍ State agency

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE F3

F3. Who decides if a school-age child with disabilities has met the requirements for, and should be awarded, a state-defined alternate diploma?

Select one only

1 ❍ IEP team
2 ❍ Special education staff, not the full IEP team
3 ❍ Other school staff
4 ❍ District staff
5 ❍ State agency

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE F4

F4. For school-age children with *significant cognitive disabilities*, do the requirements to earn an alternate diploma in your district exceed the requirements of the state-defined alternate diploma?

1 ❍ Yes, our district's requirements to earn an alternate diploma *exceed* the requirements of the state-defined alternate diploma *(Please specify how your requirements exceed the requirements of the state-defined alternate diploma)*

_____

0 ❍ No, our district's requirements to earn an alternate diploma are *the same* as the requirements of the state-defined alternate diploma

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE F5

F5. What percentage of students with significant cognitive disabilities have earned a state-defined alternate diploma in your district in the 2018–2019 school year?

|_____| %

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE F6

F6. How does your district provide support for teachers using grade-level content to teach school-age children with significant cognitive disabilities, working toward a state-defined alternate diploma?

Select all that apply

	To help teachers adapt curriculum with appropriate complexity and breadth, including incorporation of Universal Design Learning principles	To help teachers provide accommodations	To help teachers manage student behavior	Support not provided through this mechanism
a. Training through a workshop, institute, or online module	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
b. Ongoing individualized support (such as consultation, coaching, or mentoring)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
c. Ongoing group support (in the form of special education department meetings or community of practice/professional learning communities)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
d. Release time (including common preparation periods and non-student days) to attend conferences and workshops outside of school	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
e. Other *Please specify* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

G. SUPPORTS FOR TRANSITIONS

The next questions are related to supports provided to school-age children with disabilities during school transitions, including the post-high school transition.

G1. For school-age children with disabilities who are preparing to transition from high school, how does your district ensure the quality of the transition component of IEPs?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Conduct on-site monitoring visits at school districts (for example, stakeholder interviews or observation of IEP meetings)

2 ☐ Identify schools that need to improve transition process

3 ☐ Recommend or require that schools needing improvement implement a quality improvement plan

4 ☐ Provide technical assistance on approaches for developing quality IEP transition components

5 ☐ Review a selection of IEPs for quality

6 ☐ Survey parents/guardians about IEP transition outcomes or supports

7 ☐ Use a transition planning rubric or guidance on best practices that focuses on compliance only

8 ☐ Use a transition planning rubric or guidance on best practices that focuses on compliance and quality indicators

9 ☐ Use a transition procedures manual

10 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

11 ❍ None of the above

G2. What programs and supports does your district provide to school-age children with disabilities to prepare them for further education, jobs, and independent living?

Please include programs offered through your district, as well as programs and supports your district makes available through coordination with other partners.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Advanced placement or other courses (including dual enrollment programs) that earn college credit
2 ☐ Counseling on federal or state benefits (such as Medicaid or Supplemental Security Income)
3 ☐ Career and technical education courses
4 ☐ Career awareness instruction
5 ☐ Counseling on postsecondary career and technical education and employment training program options
6 ☐ Counseling on postsecondary education, including course guidance
7 ☐ Independent living/self-care skills instruction
8 ☐ Self-advocacy/self-determination instruction
9 ☐ Supported employment in community settings in which students with and without disabilities work
10 ☐ Test-taking strategies and study skills instruction
11 ☐ Work-based learning experiences in community settings in which students with and without disabilities work
12 ☐ Workplace readiness training
13 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
14 ❍ None of the above

G3. How does your district obtain data on *post-high school* transition outcomes?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ State or district data systems
2 ☐ State or district surveys of providers who support former students after high school
3 ☐ State or district surveys of former students or their parents/guardians
4 ☐ Summary reports from other agencies
5 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
6 ❍ We do not currently obtain data on post-high school transition outcomes

G4. On average, for what percentage of former students are you able to obtain required outcomes for IDEA Part B Indicator 14?

IDEA Part B Indicator 14 includes the post-high school outcomes of enrollment in higher education, enrollment in other postsecondary education or training, competitive employment, and other employment. Your best estimate is fine.

Select one only

1 ❍ 0 to 25% of former students
2 ❍ 26 to 50% of former students
3 ❍ 51 to 75% of former students
4 ❍ 76 to 100% of former students

G5. What post-high school outcomes does your district collect, in addition to the required outcomes for IDEA Part B Indicator 14 (enrollment in higher education, enrollment in other postsecondary education or training program, competitive employment, and other employment within one year of leaving high school)?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Enrollment in higher education more than one year after leaving high school
2 ☐ Enrollment in other postsecondary education or training program more than one year after leaving high school
3 ☐ Completion of higher education, postsecondary education, or training program
4 ☐ Any employment more than one year after leaving high school
5 ☐ Competitive employment more than one year after leaving high school
6 ☐ Independent living arrangements
7 ☐ Supervised living arrangements
8 ☐ Incarceration
9 ☐ Hospitalization
10 ☐ Activities used by schools to prepare students for success after leaving high school
11 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
12 ❍ None of the above

G6. For school-age children with disabilities, what does your district share or coordinate with the following programs or entities to support the transition out of high school?

Select all that apply

	Share data	Share funding	Share personnel	Coordinate service provision	Share other information (such as IEPs)	No sharing or coordination occurs
a. Postsecondary education and training programs	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
b. Independent living agencies	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
c. Health care agencies	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
d. Mental health agencies	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
e. Social service agencies (for example, Department of Developmental Services)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
f. Vocational rehabilitation services (for example, Department of Rehabilitation Services)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
g. Employers or potential employers of students	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍
h. Juvenile court or probation officers	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ☐	6 ❍

G7. During the current (2019–2020) or preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019), what actions has your district taken to change *transition* policies, procedures, and practices for school-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Revised or developed memorandums of understanding and collaboration agreements with other entities, such as workforce agencies, vocational rehabilitation agencies, or social service agencies

2 ☐ Provided targeted professional development, including materials and funds, to schools with below-target outcomes

3 ☐ Updated guidance on transition procedures for families and former students

4 ☐ Revised transition supports offered to families and former students

5 ☐ Added transition supports offered to families and former students (including hiring additional staff)

6 ☐ Revised practices to better support student attendance and participation in the transition meeting

7 ☐ Analyzed data to identify the relationship between school-based practices and post-high school outcomes to determine areas for improvement and continued implementation

8 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

9 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

H. ACCESS TO GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND SUPPORTS

The next questions focus on efforts to support school-age children with disabilities and their families in accessing general education programs.

H1. For which of the following groups of students does your district modify its general education curriculum?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ School age-children with significant cognitive disabilities
2 ☐ School age-children with disabilities, other than significant cognitive disabilities
3 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
0 ❍ We do not adapt our curriculum for students with disabilities

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H1 = 1, 2, OR 3, THEN COMPLETE H2

H2. Is the adapted general education curriculum aligned with state standards?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, alignment has been documented
2 ❍ We are in the process of conducting a check for alignment
3 ❍ There has been no check for alignment

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H1 = 1, 2, OR 3, THEN COMPLETE H3

H3. Which entity or entities conducted (or is/are conducting) the check for alignment?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ State
2 ☐ District
3 ☐ Curriculum developer
4 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

H4. How does your district provide support to teachers to help them ensure school-age children with disabilities have access to the *general education curriculum*?

Select all that apply

	To help teachers adapt curriculum with appropriate complexity and breadth, including incorporation of Universal Design Learning principles	To help teachers provide accommodations	To help teachers manage student behavior	Support not provided through this mechanism
a. Training through a workshop, institute, or online module	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
b. Ongoing individualized support (such as consultation, coaching, or mentoring)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
c. Ongoing group support (in the form of special education department meetings or community of practice/professional learning communities)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
d. Release time (including common preparation periods and non-student days) to attend conferences and workshops outside of school	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
e. Other *Please specify* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍

H5. Does your district have a policy to support access to and participation in *nonacademic activities* for school-age children with disabilities?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H5 = 1, THEN COMPLETE H6

H6. Does your district use any of the following methods to support the participation of school-age children with disabilities in the *same nonacademic extracurricular activities as children without disabilities*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide individualized accommodations to students with disabilities
2 ☐ Provide professional development to personnel supervising nonacademic activities
3 ☐ Offer a specific disability awareness program
4 ☐ Provide assistive technology to help students participate in activities
5 ☐ Assign students without disabilities to be “buddies" to students with disabilities
6 ☐ Prompt and reinforce students without disabilities to initiate and maintain interactions with students with disabilities
7 ☐ Structure activities that require interaction between students with and without disabilities
8 ☐ Provide or assist students in getting the necessary transportation to these activities

The next questions are about charter schools in your district.

H7. Which of the following best describes your district and the charter schools that operate as part it?

Select one only

1 ❍ My district is a traditional public school district that does not include any charter schools
2 ❍ My district is a traditional public school district that does include charter schools
3 ❍ My district consists of only charter school(s)

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H7 = 2, THEN COMPLETE H8

H8. Who serves as the authorizer for charter schools that operate as part of your district?

Select one only

1 ❍ My district authorizes all charter schools that operate as part of the district
2 ❍ Another entity authorizes all charter schools that operate as part of the district
3 ❍ Some charter schools that operate as part of my district are authorized by my district and some are authorized by another entity

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H8 = 1 OR 3, THEN COMPLETE H9

H9. For school-age children with disabilities who attend *public charter schools that operate as part of your district and are authorized by your district,* who has responsibility for the following, either for policy or contractual reasons?

Select one only per row

	Charter schools have primary responsibility	Shared responsibility between the charter schools and your district	District has primary responsibility	Don't know
a. Identification and evaluation of school-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
b. Coordination of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
c. Development of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
d. Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
e. Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
f. Provision of special education teachers and staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
g. Provision of related services staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
h. Provision of special education supports within the general education class	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
i. Provision of special education supports within specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
j. Transportation for school-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
k. Required qualifications for educators who serve school-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
l. Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting school-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
m. Funding for special education and related services	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
n. Determining discipline policy or procedures	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H8 = 2 OR 3, THEN COMPLETE H10

H10. For school-age children with disabilities who attend *public charter schools that operate as part of your district but are authorized by another entity,* who has responsibility for the following, either for policy or contractual reasons?

Select one only per row

	Charter schools have primary responsibility	Shared responsibility between the charter schools and your district	District has primary responsibility	Don't know
a. Identification and evaluation of school-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
b. Coordination of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
c. Development of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
d. Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
e. Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
f. Provision of special education teachers and staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
g. Provision of related services staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
h. Provision of special education supports within the general education class	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
i. Provision of special education supports within specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
j. Transportation for school-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
k. Required qualifications for educators who serve school-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
l. Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting school-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
m. Funding for special education and related services	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
n. Determining discipline policy or procedures	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍

H11. Are there charter schools within your district's geographic area that operate *independently from your district*?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H11 = 1, THEN COMPLETE H12

H12. For school-age children with disabilities who attend *public charter schools that operate independently from your district within your district's geographic area*, who has responsibility for the following, either for policy or contractual reasons?

*Note: Please focus on charter schools that exist **as their own school district** within your district's geographic area.*

Select one only per row

	Charter school district has primary responsibility	Shared responsibility between charter school district and your district	Your district has primary responsibility	Don't know
a. Identification and evaluation of school-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
b. Coordination of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
c. Development of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
d. Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
e. Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
f. Provision of special education teachers and staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
g. Provision of related services staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
h. Provision of special education supports within the general education class	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
i. Provision of special education supports within specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
j. Transportation for school-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
k. Required qualifications for educators who serve school-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
l. Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting school-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
m. Funding for special education and related services	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
n. Determining discipline policy or procedures	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H7 = 3, THEN COMPLETE H13

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

H13. For school-age children with disabilities in your district, who has responsibility for the following, either for policy or contractual reasons?

Select one only per row

	Primary responsibility belongs to charter schools or charter district	Shared responsibility between the charter schools/charter district and local school district of residence	Local school district of residence has primary responsibility	Don't know
a. Identification and evaluation of school-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
b. Coordination of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
c. Development of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
d. Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
e. Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
f. Provision of special education teachers and staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
g. Provision of related services staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
h. Provision of special education supports within the general education class	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
i. Provision of special education supports within specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
j. Transportation for school-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
k. Required qualifications for educators who serve school-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
l. Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting school-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
m. Funding for special education and related services	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
n. Determining discipline policy or procedures	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍

H14. Are there *public virtual schools* that operate as part of your district?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H14 = 1, THEN COMPLETE H15

H15. For school-age children with disabilities who attend *public virtual schools that operate as part of your district*, who has responsibility for the following, either for policy or contractual reasons?

Select one only per row

	Virtual schools have primary responsibility	Shared responsibility between the virtual schools and your district	District has primary responsibility	Don't know
a. Identification and evaluation of school-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
b. Coordination of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
c. Development of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
d. Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
e. Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
f. Provision of special education teachers and staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
g. Provision of related services staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
h. Provision of special education supports within the general education class	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
i. Required qualifications for educators who serve school-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
j. Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting school-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
k. Funding for special education and related services	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
l. Determining discipline policy or procedures	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍

The next questions focus on students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools.

H16. Are there currently students with disabilities in your district who have been parentally placed in a private school?

Please exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools.

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

H17. In your district, who is currently responsible for identifying students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools?

Please exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Our district assumes responsibility for identifying these students

2 ☐ Our district contracts with another public agency to identify these students

3 ☐ Our district contracts with a third party other than a public agency to identify these student

H18. Which of the following approaches does your district use to identify students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools?

Please exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Distribute materials to parents/guardians to help in the identification of these students

2 ☐ Work with representatives from private schools to identify these students

3 ☐ Provide staff with guidance specifically designed to support referrals and identification of school-age children in private schools (for example, written guidance or webinars)

4 ☐ Work with the state's Parent Training and Information Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate for school-age children in private schools

5 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H16 = 1, THEN COMPLETE H19

H19. In the 2018–2019 school year, how many students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools did your district evaluate for special education services?

Please exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools.

|_____|

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H16 = 1, THEN COMPLETE H20

H20. In the 2018–2019 school year, how many students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools were found *eligible* for special education services?

Please exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools.

|_____|

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H20 = GREATER THAN ZERO, THEN COMPLETE H21

H21. What services did your district provide in the 2018–2019 school year to support students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private schools?

Please exclude private schools that only serve students with disabilities, such as residential schools.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Individualized tutoring
2 ☐ Speech or language therapy
3 ☐ Training to teachers/staff who work with students with disabilities
4 ☐ Support with diagnostic assessments
5 ☐ Provision of supplementary curricular materials
6 ☐ Provision of assistive technology
7 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
8 ❍ No services were provided

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H21 = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 OR 7, THEN COMPLETE H22

H22. Where were these services provided in the 2018–2019 school year?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ On site at the student's private school
2 ☐ On site at a public school in the district
3 ☐ At an alternative location *(please specify)*

_____

The next questions focus on the access and use of assistive technology (AT) by school-age children with disabilities.

H23. What does your district do to support school use of assistive technology (AT) for school-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Offer information about AT to families, such as through AT fairs
2 ☐ Provide designated funding to support AT devices and use
3 ☐ Provide a list of AT for students with different challenges to IEP teams for consideration
4 ☐ Require IEP teams to assess the AT needs of individual students
5 ☐ Provide professional development to general education teachers on use of AT
6 ☐ Provide professional development to special education teachers on use of AT
7 ☐ Provide professional development to Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) on use of AT
8 ☐ Review IEPs to determine the extent of AT use
9 ☐ Monitor use of AT to ensure effective implementation
10 ☐ Hire or contract with AT experts to promote effective implementation strategies
11 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

H24. Are school-age children with disabilities allowed to use district- or school-provided AT *outside* of district buildings and classrooms?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, my district permits all AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)
2 ❍ Yes, my district permits some AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)
0 ❍ No, my district restricts the use of all AT to district buildings and classrooms

H25. Schools and districts provide a variety of services to students with IEPs, either directly or through contracts/arrangements with independent providers. During the current (2019–2020) or preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019), which of the following services were provided or funded by your district for school-age children with disabilities?

In Column A, please check the services that your district provides **directly through staff it employs.**

In Column B, please check the services **funded by the district, but provided by non-district staff**.

In Column C, please check the services that are **not currently provided** by district or non-district staff.

Select all that apply

	A. Services are provided directly by your district staff	**B.** Services are funded by your district, but provided by non-district staff	**C.** Services are not provided or funded by your district
a. Assistive technology	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
b. Audiology	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
c. Applied behavior analysis	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
d. Other behavior management services	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
e. Orientation and mobility support	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
f. Mental health counseling	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
g. Diagnostic services/psychological assessments	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
h. Training for families, parents, or guardians	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
i. Social work services	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
j. Other family services	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
k. Occupational therapy	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
l. Physical therapy	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
m. Speech and language therapy	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
n. Specialized academic instruction	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
o. Education in a private institution or school	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO ANY ROWS IN H25 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE H26

H26. IF YOU SELECTED **THREE OR MORE** ITEMS IN H25**: Which *three services* for school-age children with disabilities did you spend the most money on during the past three years? Please write a "1" for the service that you spent the most money on during the past three years, a "2" for the service that you spent the second highest amount of money on during the past three years, and a "3" for the service you spent the next highest amount of money on during the past three years.**

IF YOU SELECTED **TWO** ITEMS IN H25**: Please write a "1" for the service that you spent the most money on during the past three years, and a "2" for the service that you spent the next highest amount of money on during the past three years, based on the responses provided in H25.**

IF YOU SELECTED **ONE** ITEM IN H25: **Please write a "1" next to the service selected in H25 and continue to the next survey item.**

		Rank 1, 2, and 3 by most money spent
a.	Assistive technology	|___|
b.	Audiology	|___|
c.	Applied behavior analysis	|___|
d.	Other behavior management services	|___|
e.	Orientation and mobility support	|___|
f.	Mental health counseling	|___|
g.	Diagnostic services/psychological assessments	|___|
h.	Training for families, parents, or guardians	|___|
i.	Social work services	|___|
j.	Other family services	|___|
k.	Occupational therapy	|___|
l.	Physical therapy	|___|
m.	Speech and language therapy	|___|
n.	Specialized academic instruction	|___|
o.	Education in a private institution or school	|___|

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

I. DISCIPLINE

The next questions focus on your district's discipline policies for school-age children with disabilities.

When answering these questions, please assume manifestation determination review has taken place and it has been determined that the infraction is not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement the IEP.

I1. Does your district have a zero-tolerance policy?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO I1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE I2

I2. Does your district's zero-tolerance policy differ based on whether a student has a disability?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, it always differs for students with and without disabilities

2 ❍ Sometimes, it depends on the infraction

0 ❍ No, the policy is the same for all students

I3. Does your district have a policy pertaining to suspensions (both in-school and out-of-school) *and expulsions*?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO I3 = 1, THEN COMPLETE I4

I4. Does your district's policy pertaining to *in-school suspensions* differ based on whether a student has a disability?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, it always differs for students with and without disabilities

2 ❍ Sometimes, it depends on the infraction

0 ❍ No, the policy is the same for all students

IF YOUR ANSWER TO I3 = 1, THEN COMPLETE I5

I5. Does your district's policy pertaining to *out-of-school suspensions* differ based on whether a student has a disability?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, it always differs for students with and without disabilities

2 ❍ Sometimes, it depends on the infraction

0 ❍ No, the policy is the same for all students

IF YOUR ANSWER TO I3 = 1, THEN COMPLETE I6

I6. Does your district's policy pertaining to *expulsions* differ based on whether a student has a disability?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, it always differs for students with and without disabilities

2 ❍ Sometimes, it depends on the infraction

0 ❍ No, the policy is the same for all students

IF YOUR ANSWER TO I3 = 1, THEN COMPLETE I7

I7. For each of the following groups of students, who has the authority to *suspend/expel* school-age children?

Select all that apply

	Teacher	Assistant principal	Principal	Superintendent	District does not specify who has the authority
a. Elementary school students *with disabilities*	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ❍
b. Elementary school students *without disabilities*	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ❍
c. Middle school students *with disabilities*	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ❍
d. Middle school students *without disabilities*	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ❍
e. High school students *with disabilities*	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ❍
f. High school students *without disabilities*	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ☐	5 ❍

I8. Does your district have a policy restricting the use of *restraints and seclusion* in schools?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO I8 = 1, THEN COMPLETE I9

I9. Does your district's policy restricting the use of *restraints and seclusion* in schools differ *based on whether a student has a disability*?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, it always differs for students with and without disabilities

2 ❍ Sometimes, it depends on the infraction

0 ❍ No, the policy is the same for all students

I10. Please write the web address where we may view your district's current discipline policy.

If this information is not available on a website, please select the response below and scan and email a hard copy to IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com.

1 ❍ Information available on a website

_____

0 ❍ Information not available on a website

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

J. SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL, BEHAVIORAL, AND MENTAL HEALTH SUPPORTS

The next questions focus on the social-emotional, behavioral, and mental health supports provided to school-age children with disabilities.

J1. Which of the following strategies, programs, or curricula does your district recommend to support the *positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns* of school-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Mental health specialists to work with children needing individualized support
2 ☐ Early warning indicator systems
3 ☐ Trauma-informed curriculum
4 ☐ Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)
5 ☐ Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports
6 ☐ Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA), including Pivotal Response Training (PRT) and discrete trials
7 ☐ Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) and Behavioral Intervention Plans (BIPS)
8 ☐ Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL) training modules
9 ☐ Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence
10 ☐ Calm Classroom
11 ☐ First Step to Success
12 ☐ Incredible Years
13 ☐ Lions Quest
14 ☐ Mandt System
15 ☐ Positive Action
16 ☐ Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS)
17 ☐ Second Step
18 ☐ Tools of the Mind
19 ☐ Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training
20 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

J2. Which of the following types of support does your district provide to teachers who are using *positive behavioral development/social-emotional skills curricula* with school-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Training to learn new curricula (such as workshops, institutes, or online modules)

2 ☐ Ongoing *individualized support* to classroom teachers (such as consultation, coaching, or mentoring) for implementing curricula or interventions

3 ☐ Ongoing *group support* (in the form of special education department meetings or community of practice/professional learning communities) for implementing curricula or interventions

4 ☐ Release time to attend conferences and workshops outside of school

5 ☐ Other types of support for implementing curricula *(please specify)*

_____

6 ❍ Not applicable, my district does not provide support for implementing curricula

J3. Has your district developed formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide *mental health and/or social-emotional supports* to school-age children with disabilities?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO J3 = 1, THEN COMPLETE J4

J4. Which agencies or entities has your district developed formal agreements with to provide *direct mental health and/or social-emotional supports* to school-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Behavioral/mental health agency

2 ☐ Court system

3 ☐ Developmental disabilities agency

4 ☐ Health agency

5 ☐ Local or state disability advocacy groups

6 ☐ Private therapists or therapy organizations (for example, trauma-informed therapists, applied behavior analysis providers)

7 ☐ Social services

8 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

K. FUNDING ALLOCATION

The next questions focus on the funding of services and supports for school-age children with disabilities.

K1. What funding sources support services for school-age children with disabilities, as required by their IEPs?

*Please select **any funding sources** that support school-age children with disabilities*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ IDEA, Part B

2 ☐ General education funds

3 ☐ Local municipality or county funds

4 ☐ Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V

5 ☐ Medicaid/Title XIX

6 ☐ Private insurance

7 ☐ State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)

8 ☐ Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)

9 ☐ Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)

10 ☐ TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)

11 ☐ Other federal funding sources *(please specify)* _____

12 ☐ Other state funding sources *(please specify)* _____

13 ☐ Other local funding sources *(please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

K1a. IF YOU SELECTED **THREE OR MORE** ITEMS IN K1**: Please write a "1" for the source that provides the largest share of funding, a "2" for the source that provides the next largest share of funding, and a "3" for the third largest funding source, based on the responses selected in K1.**

IF YOU SELECTED **TWO** ITEMS IN K1: **Please write a "1" for the source that provides the largest share of funding, and a "2" for the source that provides the next largest share of funding, based on the responses selected in K1.**

IF YOU SELECTE **ONE** ITEM IN K1: **Please write a "1" next to the source selected in K1 and continue to the next survey item.**

		Rank 1, 2, and 3 by share of funding. Use each number only once.
a.	IDEA, Part B	|___|
b.	General education funds	|___|
c.	Local municipality or county funds	|___|
d.	Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	|___|
e.	Medicaid/Title XIX	|___|
f.	Private insurance	|___|
g.	State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)	|___|
h.	Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)	|___|
i.	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	|___|
j.	TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	|___|
k.	Other federal funding sources *(Please specify)* _____	|___|
l.	Other state funding sources *(Please specify)* _____	|___|
m.	Other local funding sources *(Please specify)* _____	|___|

K2. What funding sources do you blend with Part B IDEA funds to support CCEIS or CEIS, for school-age children *not yet identified* with disabilities?

Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) are services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services, but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment. CEIS can be mandatory (Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services or CCEIS) or voluntary.

Select all that apply

	A. *Blended with Part B IDEA funds to support CCEIS*	B. *Blended with Part B IDEA funds to support voluntary CEIS*	C. *Not used to support CCEIS or voluntary CEIS*
a. General education funds	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
b. State education funds	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
c. Local municipality or county funds	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
d. Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
e. Medicaid/Title XIX	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
f. Private insurance	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
g. State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
h. Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
i. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
j. TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
k. Other *federal* funding sources *Please specify*_____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
l. Other *state* funding sources *Please specify* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
m. Other *local* funding sources *Please specify*_____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍

K3. In your district, how are training and implementation of Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) including RtI, currently being funded?

*Please select **any funding sources** that support training and implementation of MTSS or RtI.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Title I-A Schoolwide or Targeted Assistance funds
2 ☐ Title I-B Reading First funds
3 ☐ Title II-A funds
4 ☐ Title III funds
5 ☐ Title V grants for innovation
6 ☐ IDEA Early Intervening Services (EIS) funds
7 ☐ IDEA Part B flow-through funds, other than funds used for EIS
8 ☐ IDEA district discretionary funds, other than funds used for EIS
9 ☐ IDEA state discretionary funds
10 ☐ District general funds
11 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

K3a. IF YOU SELECTED **THREE OR MORE** ITEMS IN K3: **Please write a "1" for the source that provides the largest share of funding, a "2" for the source that provides the next largest share of funding, and a "3" for the third largest funding source, based on the responses selected in K3.**

IF YOU SELECTED **TWO** ITEMS IN K3: **Please write a "1" for the source that provides the largest share of funding, and a "2" for the source that provides the next largest share of funding, based on the responses selected in K3.**

IF YOU SELECTED **ONE** ITEM IN K3: **Please write a "1" next to the source selected in K3 and continue to the next survey item.**

		Rank 1, 2, and 3 by share of funding. Use each number only once.
a.	Title I-A School-wide or Targeted Assistance funds	|___|
b.	Title I-B Reading First funds	|___|
c.	Title II-A funds	|___|
d.	Title III funds	|___|
e.	Title V grants for innovation	|___|
f.	IDEA Early Intervening Services (EIS) funds	|___|
g.	IDEA Part B flow-through funds, other than funds used for EIS	|___|
h.	IDEA district discretionary funds, other than funds used for EIS	|___|
i.	IDEA state discretionary funds	|___|
j.	District general funds	|___|
k.	Other *(please specify)*	|___|
	_____	

K4. For school-age children with IEPs, what are *Medicaid funds* used to support?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Disability screening and diagnosis
2 ☐ Case management and referrals to services
3 ☐ Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid
4 ☐ Equipment and assistive technologies
5 ☐ Transportation services
6 ☐ Mental and behavioral health services
7 ☐ Occupational therapy
8 ☐ Personal aide services
9 ☐ Physical therapy
10 ☐ Speech therapy
11 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

K5. For school-age children with IEPs, what are *general education funds* used to support?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Disability screening and diagnosis
2 ☐ Case management and referrals to services
3 ☐ Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid
4 ☐ Equipment and assistive technologies
5 ☐ Transportation services
6 ☐ Mental and behavioral health services
7 ☐ Occupational therapy
8 ☐ Personal aide services
9 ☐ Physical therapy
10 ☐ Speech therapy
11 ☐ Professional development for administrators
12 ☐ Professional development for guidance counselors
13 ☐ Professional development for paid teacher aides/instructional assistants
14 ☐ Professional development for nursing/medical personnel
15 ☐ Professional development for reading specialists
16 ☐ Professional development for school psychologists or other diagnostic personnel
17 ☐ Professional development for special education resource room teachers
18 ☐ Professional development for speech/communication therapists
19 ☐ Professional development for other related services personnel (such as occupational or physical therapists)

20 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

21 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

22 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

K6. For school-age children with IEPs, what are *special education funds* used to support?

*Please select any **activities** that are supported with special education funds.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Disability screening and diagnosis
2 ☐ Case management and referrals to services
3 ☐ Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid
4 ☐ Equipment and assistive technologies
5 ☐ Transportation services
6 ☐ Mental and behavioral health services
7 ☐ Occupational therapy
8 ☐ Personal aide services
9 ☐ Physical therapy
10 ☐ Speech therapy
11 ☐ Professional development for administrators
12 ☐ Professional development for guidance counselors
13 ☐ Professional development for paid teacher aides/instructional assistants
14 ☐ Professional development for nursing/medical personnel
15 ☐ Professional development for reading specialists
16 ☐ Professional development for school psychologists or other diagnostic personnel
17 ☐ Professional development for special education resource room teachers
18 ☐ Professional development for speech/communication therapists
19 ☐ Professional development for other related services personnel (such as occupational or physical therapists)
20 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

K6a. IF YOU SELECTED **THREE OR MORE** ITEMS IN K6: **Please write a "1" for the activity that requires the largest share of funding, a "2" for the activity that requires the next largest share of funding, and a "3" for the activity that requires the third largest share of funding, based on the responses selected in K6.**

IF YOU SELECTED **TWO** ITEMS IN K6**: Please write a "1" for the activity that requires the largest share of funding, and a "2" for the activity that requires the next largest share of funding, based on the responses selected in K6.**

IF YOU SELECTED **ONE** ITEM IN K6: **Please write a "1" next to the activity selected in K6 and continue to the next survey item.**

		Rank 1, 2, and 3 by share of funding. Use each number only once.
a.	Disability screening and diagnosis	|___|
b.	Case management and referrals to services	|___|
c.	Outreach and facilitating eligibility determinations for Medicaid	|___|
d.	Equipment and assistive technologies	|___|
e.	Transportation services	|___|
f.	Mental and behavioral health services	|___|
g.	Occupational therapy	|___|
h.	Personal aide services	|___|
i.	Physical therapy	|___|
j.	Speech therapy	|___|
k.	Professional development for administrators	|___|
l.	Professional development for guidance counselors	|___|
m.	Professional development for paid teacher aides/instructional assistants	|___|
n.	Professional development for nursing/medical personnel	|___|
o.	Professional development for reading specialists	|___|
p.	Professional development for school psychologists or other diagnostic personnel	|___|
q.	Professional development for special education resource room teachers	|___|
r.	Professional development for speech/communication therapists	|___|
s.	Professional development for other related services personnel (such as occupational or physical therapists)	|___|
t.	Other *(please specify)* _____	|___|

K7. Which funding sources are used to support IEP-specified *residential placements* for school-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V
2 ☐ General education funds
3 ☐ Local municipality or county funds
4 ☐ IDEA, Part B
5 ☐ Private insurance
6 ☐ Medicaid/Title XIX
7 ☐ Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)
8 ☐ State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)
9 ☐ State education funds
10 ☐ Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
11 ☐ TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)
12 ☐ Other federal funding sources *(please specify)* _____
13 ☐ Other state funding sources *(please specify)* _____
14 ☐ Other local funding sources *(please specify)* _____

K8. Which funding sources are used to fund IEP-specified placements of school-age children with disabilities in *separate non-public day schools*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V
2 ☐ General education funds
3 ☐ Local municipality or county funds
4 ☐ IDEA, Part B
5 ☐ Private insurance
6 ☐ Medicaid/Title XIX
7 ☐ Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)
8 ☐ State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)
9 ☐ State education funds
10 ☐ Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
11 ☐ TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)
12 ☐ Other federal funding sources *(please specify)* _____
13 ☐ Other state funding sources *(please specify)* _____
14 ☐ Other local funding sources *(please specify)* _____

K9. What percentage of special education funding for school-age children with disabilities is provided by the following?

Your best estimate is fine.

	Percentage of special education funding provided
a. Federal Funding Sources	|___|%
b. State Funding Sources	|___|%
c. Local District Funding Sources	|___|%

K10. In the current (2019–2020) or preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019), has there been a change in the proportion of the district budget provided by state special education funding?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO K10 = 1, THEN COMPLETE K11

K11. In the current (2019–2020) or preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019), has the proportion of state funding for special education increased or decreased?

Select one only

1 ❍ Increased

2 ❍ Decreased

3 ❍ Increased and decreased over the years

4 ❍ No change over the years

K12. In the current (2019-2020) or preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019), what has your district done to reduce the costs of providing special education services for school-age children?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Changed educational placement or least restrictive environment (LRE) options
2 ☐ Changed processes to reduce administrative costs
3 ☐ Changed use of data management, communication systems, or other technologies to reduce costs
4 ☐ Changed level of contracted services
5 ☐ Changed local municipality, county, or school district funding
6 ☐ Changed policy related to State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) billing
7 ☐ Changed use of general state funds
8 ☐ Changed level of administrative staffing
9 ☐ Changed level of general education aide or paraprofessional staffing
10 ☐ Changed level of special education aide or paraprofessional staffing
11 ☐ Changed level of general education teacher staffing
12 ☐ Changed level of special education teacher staffing
13 ☐ Changed level of Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) staffing
14 ☐ Changed class size
15 ☐ Renegotiated provider reimbursements
16 ☐ Changed the amount of professional development activities
17 ☐ Changed the amount of spending on materials, buildings, or grounds
18 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
19 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
20 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

K13. Which of the following methods are used to determine how all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) is allocated to schools that serve children in your district?

*Do not include **high-cost funds**.*

***High-cost funds** help offset the financial impact on Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ A fixed amount based on all students enrolled in the school district

2 ☐ A fixed amount per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district

3 ☐ Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on disability category

4 ☐ Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on specific services required

5 ☐ Predetermined amounts per student with disabilities enrolled in the school district, depending on type of student placement

6 ☐ Predetermined amounts per teacher, supportive services staff position, or other resource required given the number of students with disabilities

7 ☐ A formula based on the amount of specific allowable special education expenses actually incurred (for example, full reimbursement or percentage reimbursements)

8 ☐ A formula based on a measure of local poverty

9 ☐ A formula based on funding allocations in a base year or a previous year

10 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

11 ❍ None of the above, funding to support special education is not separated out from the general education funding formula

12 ❍ None of the above, only one school in the district serves school-age children with disabilities

13 ❍ None of the above, no funds go directly to the school

K14. How are Part B special education program funds used to support *direct service personnel* (such as special education teachers, paraprofessionals, and related services providers) who serve school-age children with disabilities in your district?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ To fund their salaries

2 ☐ To fund their benefits

3 ☐ To provide professional development

4 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

5 ❍ None of the above

K15. How are Part B special education program funds used to support *administrators and administrative support staff* (including clerical, data, accounting, and Medicaid billing personnel) who serve school-age children with disabilities in your district?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ To fund their salaries
2 ☐ To fund their benefits
3 ☐ To provide professional development
4 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
5 ❍ None of the above

K16. Are Part B special education program funds used to support the *salaries, benefits, or contracts* of any of the following personnel who serve school-age children with disabilities in your district?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Guidance counselors
2 ☐ Nursing/medical personnel
3 ☐ Paraprofessionals, such as teacher aides/instructional assistants, occupational therapy assistants, personal aides, or health aides
4 ☐ Reading specialists
5 ☐ School psychologists or other diagnostic personnel
6 ☐ Special education teachers, including itinerant teachers or coaches
7 ☐ Speech/communication therapists or pathologists
8 ☐ Other related services personnel (for example, occupational or physical therapists)
9 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
10 ❍ None of the above

K17. Are Part B special education program funds used to provide any of the following *direct services* for school-age children with disabilities in your district?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Special education or related services provided directly by the district
2 ☐ Special education or related services provided through contracted services
3 ☐ Contracted student placements outside of the school district
4 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
0 ❍ None of the above

K18. Are Part B special education program funds used for any of the following *supplies, equipment, or facilities modifications* for school-age children with disabilities in your district?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide assistive technology or specialized equipment

2 ☐ Maintain, repair, manage, and upgrade assistive technology or specialized equipment

3 ☐ Make modifications to facilities to meet the unique needs of school-age children with disabilities

4 ☐ Provide instructional materials, specialized curriculum, or instructional software

5 ☐ Provide non-instructional software, supplies, and equipment

6 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

0 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

L. STAFFING

The next questions focus on the hiring and retention of special education teachers and other personnel.

L1. What do you consider when assigning Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP), or non-teaching staff, to schools to work with students with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Level of effort required based on IEPs of students in the school
2 ☐ Number of students in the school needing service
3 ☐ Distance from another school
4 ☐ Prior experience with the school staff
5 ☐ Tenure
6 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

L2. School districts may employ a variety of personnel who work with school-age children with disabilities, either directly or through contracts with independent providers.

*In Column A, please indicate which personnel who work with school-age children with disabilities are **employed directly by your district**.*

*In Column B, please indicate which personnel who work with school-age children with disabilities are **employed through contracts with outside providers**.*

Select all that apply

	A. Personnel employed directly by district	**B.** Personnel employed through contracts with outside providers
a. Audiologists	1 ☐	2 ☐
b. Behavioral analysts or experts	1 ☐	2 ☐
c. Family therapists	1 ☐	2 ☐
d. Nurses	1 ☐	2 ☐
e. Pediatricians and other physicians	1 ☐	2 ☐
f. Physical therapists	1 ☐	2 ☐
g. Psychologists	1 ☐	2 ☐
h. Occupational therapists	1 ☐	2 ☐
i. Orientation/mobility specialists	1 ☐	2 ☐
j. Registered dieticians	1 ☐	2 ☐
k. Service coordinators	1 ☐	2 ☐
l. Speech/language therapists/pathologists	1 ☐	2 ☐
m. Social workers	1 ☐	2 ☐
n. Teacher aides, paraprofessionals, or personal care assistants	1 ☐	2 ☐
o. Transition specialists	1 ☐	2 ☐
p. Vision specialists, including ophthalmologists and optometrists	1 ☐	2 ☐
q. Sign language interpreters	1 ☐	2 ☐
r. Other *(please specify)* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

L3. Please indicate the types of effective *special education personnel* who work with school-age children that your district has had difficulty finding and retaining during the current (2019–2020) or preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019).

Select all that apply

	Difficulty finding personnel	Difficulty retaining personnel	No difficulty finding or retaining personnel
a. Special education teachers who serve children in:			
1. Elementary school	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
2. Middle school	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
3. High school	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
4. Vocational or alternative school	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
b. Special education teachers who primarily serve children with:			
1. Developmental delays	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
2. Specific learning disabilities	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
3. Emotional disturbance/behavior disorders	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
4. Intellectual disability	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
5. Autism	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
6. Speech or language impairment	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
7. Traumatic brain injury	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
8. Sensory impairments (hearing/vision)	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
9. Other low-incidence disabilities (for example, other health impairments, orthopedic impairments, or multiple disabilities)	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
10. Other disability *Please specify* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
c. Secondary school special education teachers of:			
1. English/language arts	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
2. Mathematics	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
3. Science	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
4. Social studies (including history, civics, geography and economics)	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
5. Other subjects *Please specify* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
d. Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP):			
1. Audiologists	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
2. Behavioral analysts or experts	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
3. Family therapists/mental health providers	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍

	Difficulty finding personnel	Difficulty retaining personnel	No difficulty finding or retaining personnel
4. Nurses	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
5. Pediatricians and other physicians	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
6. Physical therapists	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
7. Psychologists	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
8. Occupational therapists	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
9. Orientation/mobility specialists	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
10. Registered dieticians	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
11. Service coordinators	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
12. Speech/language therapists/pathologists	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
13. Social workers	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
14. Teacher aides, paraprofessionals, or personal care assistants	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
15. Transition specialists	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
16. Vision specialists, including ophthalmologists and optometrists	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
17. Sign language interpreters	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
e. Bilingual staff	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
f. Other staff *Please specify*_____	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍

L4. During the current (2019–2020) or preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019), what strategies has your district used to *increase the number of effective special education teachers*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Collaborated with universities to develop programs and curricula to prepare teachers in specific shortage areas

2 ☐ Paid fees for tests/licensure exams

3 ☐ Paid for tutoring to prepare teachers for certification tests/licensure exams

4 ☐ Provided free or subsidized training for secondary school teachers to obtain special education credentials

5 ☐ Provided free or subsidized training for special education teachers to obtain content area credentials

6 ☐ Provided time or funding for teachers to participate in professional development opportunities (for example, institute of higher education tuition, workshop fees)

7 ☐ Supported participation in dual certification preparation programs

8 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

9 ❍ None of the above

10 ❍ Not applicable

L5. Which supports or incentives did your district use to recruit new special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ A signing bonus

2 ☐ A bonus supplement to regular compensation

3 ☐ A permanent salary augmentation or adjustment to normal base salary

4 ☐ Placement of a teacher on a higher step of the salary schedule

5 ☐ Relocation assistance

6 ☐ Payoff of student loans

7 ☐ Finder's fee to existing staff for new teacher referrals

8 ☐ Mentoring or induction programs

9 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

10 ❍ None of the above

IF YOUR ANSWER TO ANY ROWS IN L3 (A-F) = 2, THEN COMPLETE L6

L6. During the current (2019–2020) or preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019), what initiatives or incentives has your district used to *retain* effective special education teachers?

***Tuition "pay back"**: For every year of tuition, teachers owe the district a year of service.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Cover continuing education costs to get a higher degree
2 ☐ Cover continuing education costs to maintain certification
3 ☐ Provide mentoring or induction programs
4 ☐ Offer full-time teaching positions
5 ☐ Offer part-time teaching positions
6 ☐ Provide additional planning or release time
7 ☐ Provide smaller caseloads
8 ☐ Provide smaller class sizes
9 ☐ Offer student loan forgiveness
10 ☐ Offer tuition "pay back" or partial reimbursement
11 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____
12 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

M. EVIDENCE FROM RESEARCH

The final section focuses on the use of evidence from research.

M1. Does your district provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools should use to provide services to students with disabilities?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO M1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE M2

M2. How does your district help ensure that schools use evidence-based special education programs and services?

Tier 1 *– Strong Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented randomized control experimental studies.*

Tier 2 *– Moderate Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well- implemented quasi-experimental studies.*

Tier 3 *– Promising Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented correlational studies (with statistical controls for selection bias).*

Tier 4 *– Demonstrates a Rationale: practices that have a well-defined logic model or theory of action, are supported by research, and have some effort underway by an SEA, LEA, or outside research organization to determine their effectiveness.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ We provide a curated list of *suggested* evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices

2 ☐ We *require* that schools only purchase materials and programs from a curated list of suggested evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices

3 ☐ We conduct a formal review of the materials and programs used by schools to make sure they are evidence-based

4 ☐ We recommend materials based on the level of evidence of their effectiveness (Tier 1 to Tier 4, under ESSA), specifically for children with disabilities

5 ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

M3. How often does your district draw on the following sources of information when selecting special education policies and practices?

Select one only per row

	Never or not applicable	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Don't know
a. Guidance or advice from the state education department or a technical assistance center funded by the state	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
b. A list of vendors approved by the state	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
c. Information provided by the intervention's developer or vendor	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
d. Recommendations from colleagues in my own or other school districts	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
e. Information from a federally funded technical assistance center	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
f. Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
g. Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory (REL)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
h. Information from the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
i. Information from the district's research/evaluation office	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
j. Information from professional associations	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
k. Information from a college/university researcher	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
l. Information from a research journal	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
m. Social media (Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, other)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
n. Other	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍

Please specify _____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IDEA Implementation Study

Mathematica

District survey on IDEA implementation for preschool-age children

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) State and Local Implementation Study 2019

DISTRICT PART B 619

November 2019

NOTE: The hardcopy version of this survey is for reference purposes only. All instructions and FAQs pertain to the online version of the survey. To access the survey online, please use the link below. Enter the username and password provided to you in the letter included in the mailing packet.

Survey Link: IDEA-Survey.com/District619

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995
According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1850-0949. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 60 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (Education Department General Administrative Regulations Section, 34 C.F.R. § 76.591). If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this survey, please contact the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20202-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov directly. [Note: Please do not return the completed survey to this address.]

Notice of Confidentiality
Responses to this data collection will be used only for statistical purposes. The reports prepared for this study will summarize findings across the sample and will not associate responses with a specific individual. All information that would permit identification of the district or individual respondent will be kept confidential (per The Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002), will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey, and will not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose except as required by law. Study reports may present information by state."

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) State and Local Implementation Study 2019, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), is an important study that will develop a national picture of state, district, and school implementation of IDEA. It will provide (1) the Department of Education, Congress, and other stakeholders with knowledge that can inform how special education and related services are provided to children, and (2) states, districts, and schools with an understanding of how others are implementing IDEA.

The IDEA Implementation Study is not a compliance study, nor a study of the results of effectiveness of IDEA.

We are requesting you complete this questionnaire because you and your staff have the most knowledge about special education policies and practices in your district. If there are questions you are not able to answer, please feel free to draw on the expertise and knowledge of others within your district. As grantees under IDEA, local education agencies are expected to participate in this data collection (34 C.F.R. § 76.591). With your contribution, ED and Congress will gain a more accurate and complete understanding of how IDEA is being implemented for preschool-age and school-age students at the district level.

All information that would permit identification of the district or individual respondent will be held in strict confidence, will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey, and will not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose except as required by law.

Thank you for joining us in our effort to understand the current implementation of IDEA. We appreciate your time and cooperation.

Please see the next pages for instructions for completing this survey, as well as a set of key definitions and frequently asked questions.

If you have any questions, contact:

Lisbeth Goble, 833-238-7224

email: IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com

Before you answer the questions, please carefully read the instructions, key definitions, and frequently asked questions. You can refer back to these as you complete the survey by clicking on the Instructions, Key Definitions, and FAQs link on the upper right-hand side of the screen.

INSTRUCTIONS

- All items request information pertaining to the 2019–2020 school year unless otherwise specified.
- The primary respondent for this survey is intended to be the person most knowledgeable about preschool special education policies and practices in your district. In most cases, the primary respondent will be the Part B 619 coordinator.
- Certain questions may require the help of other staff, such as the director of pupil/student services and staff from human resources, finance, and general education. If you need input from other staff, you may share your unique survey hyperlink, which will give them full access to the survey, or you can print off specific questions for them to answer on paper and then fill in the online responses yourself.
- Throughout the survey, you'll see some terms in blue. You can click on those to see a definition of the term.
- Items on this survey cover the following topics: Agency Role; Identification for Special Education and Related Services;; IEP Development and Quality; Monitoring Preschool-Age Children with Disabilities; Supports for Transitions; Access to General Education Programs and Supports; Discipline; Social-Emotional, Behavioral, and Mental Health Supports; Funding Allocation; Staffing; and Evidence from Research.

KEY DEFINITIONS

Children with disabilities is used to reflect children ages 3 through 5 with intellectual disabilities; hearing impairments, including deafness; speech or language impairments; visual impairments, including blindness; serious emotional disturbance (hereafter referred to as emotional disturbance); orthopedic impairments; autism; traumatic brain injuries; developmental delays; other health impairments; specific learning disabilities; deaf-blindness; or multiple disabilities, and who, by reason thereof, receive special education and related services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) according to an Individualized Education Program (IEP).

Preschool special education services is used to reflect publicly funded services provided through an IEP or IFSP to children ages 3 through 5 who are not yet attending kindergarten. These are services funded under Part B of IDEA for which the state education agency has oversight responsibility.

Special education teachers are teachers employed and contracted to work with children with disabilities. For this survey, we would like you to consider teachers who work with children who are ages 3 through 5 who are not yet attending kindergarten.

Professional development includes a range of learning and support activities designed to prepare individuals to work with, and on behalf of, children and their families, as well as ongoing experiences to enhance this work. Professional development encompasses education, training, and technical assistance.

Training is a learning experience, or series of experiences, specific to an area of inquiry and related set of skills, delivered by a professional(s) with subject matter and adult learning knowledge and skills. This could include seminars, workshops, or courses about specific topics or key concepts.

Technical assistance (TA) is the provision of targeted and customized supports by a professional(s) with subject matter and adult learning knowledge and skills with the goal of developing or strengthening processes, knowledge application, or implementation of services by recipients. This could include coaching, consulting, or other ongoing support.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

How do I navigate the survey? You can access the survey by clicking on the unique hyperlink we provided to you via email. Once you have started the survey, you can navigate through it by answering each question and clicking the NEXT button at the bottom of the page. To navigate between survey sections, click on the [Survey Menu] button at the top right of your screen. This will allow you go to select the section you wish to complete. To go back to a previous page, click the BACK button. Do not use your internet browser back/forward buttons to move through the survey.

Do I have to complete the survey all at one time? No. You can revisit the website as many times as needed to complete the survey. However, if you need to stop before finishing the survey, **please be sure to click on the NEXT button before closing out so that your response(s) on that page are saved**. You will resume at the next unanswered question when you return to the survey. Once you have finished and submitted your survey, you will no longer have access to it. **Please note that each session will time out after 30 minutes of inactivity**.

Can I complete the survey on my tablet or smartphone? Yes. The survey has been optimized to run on desktop computers, tablets, or smartphones. The survey is best viewed in the latest versions of Chrome, Safari, Firefox, or Internet Explorer (IE 11 or Edge).

How long does the survey take? About 60 minutes. You can preview the questions and are not required to complete the survey all at once. The data you provide each time you log in will be securely stored and available when you return to complete the survey.

Do I have to answer all the questions? Please try to answer all questions that are relevant for your district, so the U.S. Department of Education can gain a more accurate and complete understanding of how IDEA is being implemented. You will automatically be skipped past some questions that do not apply to your situation, depending on your answer to an earlier question. You may choose to skip any question in the survey that you cannot or do not wish to answer. To skip a question, leave the question blank and then click the NEXT button to proceed.

Can I have my staff complete some of the questions instead of me? Yes. Certain questions may require the help of other staff. You may share your unique survey hyperlink with these individuals, which will give them full access to the survey, or you can print off specific questions and then fill in the responses yourself at a later time.

Can multiple people work on completing the survey at the same time? No. If multiple people are logged into the same survey at the same time, responses may not be recorded correctly. Only one person on one computer should be completing the survey at any given time.

Can I print individual questions? Yes. You may print an individual page at any time by using your computer's usual method of printing.

Can I print a copy of the questionnaire when I am finished? If you would like a copy of your responses once you complete the survey, please email IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com and we will send you a copy of the survey with your responses.

Can I obtain a paper version of the questionnaire? Yes. If you would like to see a paper version for reference purposes, please email IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com and we will send you a copy.

Will my answers be kept confidential? Yes. All information that would permit identification of the district, school, or individual respondent will be held in strict confidence, will be used only by persons engaged in the survey and only for the purposes of the survey, and will not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose except as required by law.

Whom should I contact if I have a question? If you have any questions, please contact Lisbeth Goble at 833-238-7224 or at IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com. When sending emails, in addition to the question, please be sure to include your name and a phone number where you can be reached.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Please write the contact information of the primary respondent below in case we need to contact your district to clarify responses to any questions.

First Name:_____

Last Name: _____

Title/Position:_____

Phone: |__|__|__| - |__|__|__| - |__|__|__|__|

Email Address: _____

District Name: _____

Best days and times to reach you (in case of questions): _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

A. AGENCY ROLE

The first question is about your role in your district.

A1. As the designated special education coordinator for your district, which of the following describes the population(s) of students for which you have responsibility?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Preschool-age children with disabilities
2 ☐ School-age children with disabilities
3 ☐ Children, birth through age 2, with disabilities
4 ☐ Preschool-age children *without* disabilities
5 ☐ School-age children *without* disabilities
6 ☐ Children, birth through age 2, *without* disabilities
7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

B. IDENTIFICATION FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND RELATED SERVICES

The next questions focus on the identification and eligibility of preschool-age children for special education services.

B1. Which activities does your district conduct to support the identification of preschool-age children in need of special education services?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Child Find screenings

2 ☐ Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to pediatricians and other health care providers

3 ☐ Development/dissemination of written materials (such as posters, pamphlets) to child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities

4 ☐ Workshops for pediatricians and other health care providers

5 ☐ Workshops for staff from child care centers, nursery schools, and other facilities

6 ☐ Outreach to referral sources

7 ☐ Web-based information and other electronic materials

8 ☐ Outreach through radio, TV, newspapers, and other print media to promote awareness of disabilities and services for young children

9 ☐ Outreach through community events, such as health fairs

10 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

11 ❍ None of the above

B2. For infants and toddlers who received early intervention services who are *not* determined eligible for preschool special education services, does your district provide any of the following to parents/guardians?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Information about preschool programs in the local area
2 ☐ Information about other agencies in the local area
3 ☐ Referrals to other agencies and programs
4 ☐ Referrals to specialists who can assess the child's developmental and learning needs
5 ☐ The opportunity to continue current services, paid for by parents/guardians
6 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
7 ❍ None of the above

B3. In the first column, please indicate how many preschool-age and prekindergarten children were newly evaluated for IDEA Part B special education during the 2018–2019 school year.

In the second column, please indicate how many of these children were found eligible for special education services.

*Please **do not include** children who transferred into your district already eligible for special education.*

*Please **do include** children who received early intervention services under Part C Option and are not being evaluated under Part B.*

The intention of this question is to obtain the number of preschool-age and prekindergarten children newly evaluated and those found eligible for special education or related services under all disability categories. We want to count all children who were evaluated for the possibility of receiving an IEP, including those who might end up with a speech-only IEP.

2018–2019 School Year	
Number of preschool and prekindergarten students *evaluated*	Number of preschool and prekindergarten students *found eligible*
| _____ |	| _____ |

B4. During the eligibility determination process, is there anything your district does to help staff apply exclusionary criteria?

The purpose of this exclusionary clause is to help prevent the improper determination of eligibility of children for special education services, especially those from distinct cultures who have acquired learning styles, language, or behaviors that are not compatible with academic requirements of schools in the dominant culture.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Develop procedures for application of exclusionary criteria
2 ☐ Provide professional development for school staff
3 ☐ Provide written materials to school staff
4 ☐ Provide guidelines for staff to follow before screening students who are English Learners
5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

C. IEP DEVELOPMENT AND QUALITY

The next questions focus on the development and quality of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs).

C1. During the 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 school years, what proportion of your district staff who work with preschool-age children participated in professional development on the development of standards-based IEPs for preschool-age children with disabilities?

Your best estimate is fine.

Select one only

1 ❍ 0 to 20 percent
2 ❍ 21 to 40 percent
3 ❍ 41 to 60 percent
4 ❍ 61 to 80 percent
5 ❍ 81 to 100 percent

C2. Does your district provide *professional development* on any of the following topics to help promote the quality of the IEP process for preschool-age children with disabilities?

Professional development can occur either in person or online.

***A quality IEP** is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student.*

***Standards-based IEPs** are those that align goals for students with disabilities with the content and academic achievement standards that form the basis of each state's general education curriculum.*

***Appropriately ambitious goals** are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Developing standards-based IEPs
2 ☐ Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals
3 ☐ Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals
4 ☐ Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process
5 ☐ Engaging early childhood program staff (for example, Head Start or childcare staff) in the IEP process
6 ☐ Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data
7 ☐ Other professional development to promote the quality of IEPs *(Please specify)*

_____

8 ❍ None of the above

C3. Does your district provide *written policies or guidelines* on any of the following topics to help promote the quality of the IEP process for preschool-age children with disabilities?

Appropriately ambitious goals *are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Developing standards-based IEPs
2 ☐ Developing appropriately ambitious IEP goals
3 ☐ Identifying appropriate services, supports, or accommodations to achieve IEP goals
4 ☐ Engaging parents/guardians in the IEP process
5 ☐ Engaging early childhood program staff (for example, Head Start or childcare staff) in the IEP process
6 ☐ Monitoring progress toward the achievement of IEP goals, including through use of data
7 ☐ Other topics *(Please specify)* _____
8 ❍ None of the above

C4. Does your district provide any of the following *resources* to help promote the quality of the IEP process for preschool-age children with disabilities?

Appropriately ambitious goals *are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ A *mandated* standards-based IEP form or template
2 ☐ A *suggested* standards-based IEP form or template
3 ☐ A rubric or other resource describing features of quality IEPs, including appropriately ambitious IEP goals
4 ☐ A coach, mentor, or IEP facilitator to assist with writing the IEP
5 ☐ A list of contact information for Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) and/or intervention staff
6 ☐ Staff handbook or procedures manual with example IEPs
7 ☐ Other resources to promote the quality of IEPs *(Please specify)*
_____
8 ❍ None of the above

C5. Does your district provide any of the following types of assistance to enable parents/guardians to participate in IEP meetings for preschool-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Child care assistance
2 ☐ Interpreters
3 ☐ Transportation vouchers
4 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
5 ❍ No, we do not provide this type of assistance

C6. Does your district coordinate with any of the following local agencies or providers to engage parents/guardians of preschool-age children with disabilities in the *development of IEPs*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Head Start agencies

2 ☐ Child care or nursery school providers, other than Head Start

3 ☐ Health care providers or agencies

4 ☐ Mental health providers or agencies

5 ☐ Home visiting providers or agencies

6 ☐ Social services providers or agencies

7 ☐ Other early intervention agencies or providers, including task forces or nonprofit organizations *(Please specify)* _____

C7. For the 2019–2020 school year, has your district made available written materials, or offered any workshops, discussions, or support groups *specifically for parents/guardians of preschool-age children with IEPs or IFSPs* on any of the following topics?

Select all that apply

		Provided written materials	Offered workshops, discussions, or support groups	We did not offer materials or supports to parents/guardians on this topic
a.	Understanding student accommodations to help them access the general education curriculum	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
b.	Developing and implementing a standards-based IEP	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
c.	Understanding their child's disability	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
d.	Understanding the law and their legal rights under IDEA	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
e.	Using alternative dispute resolution procedures	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
f.	Understanding any of the five special factors (behavior, limited English proficiency, Braille instruction, language and communication, and assistive technology) as part of the development, review, and revision of IEPs	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
g.	Using interventions for students with behavioral challenges	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
h.	Using strategies for making a successful transition from preschool to school	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
i.	Understanding how to file a complaint and where to receive assistance in drafting an effective complaint	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍

C8. Were any of the following processes or programs used to promote the involvement of families of preschool-age children with disabilities in the 2019–2020 school year?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Teachers shared information, tools, and strategies that families could apply at home and in the community to accelerate student learning and school performance

2 ☐ Teachers met with parents/guardians outside of school to build relationships and increase family involvement

3 ☐ District included families at stakeholder meetings focused on special education and related services

4 ☐ District informed parents/guardians about their rights, responsibilities, and children's educational opportunities

5 ☐ District provided resources aimed at connecting parents/guardians to community resources and special education and related services

6 ☐ District provided resources aimed at improving parenting skills, family relationships, and children's mental health and behavior

7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

8 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

D. MONITORING PRESCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

The next questions focus on monitoring and analyzing the outcomes of preschool-age children with disabilities.

D1. Does your district collect data to monitor outcomes for *all* preschool-age children with disabilities, beyond the early childhood data that states need to report to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)?

1 ❍ Yes, the district collects data to monitor outcomes for *all* preschool-age children with disabilities

0 ❍ No, the district only collects the data it needs to report to the Office of Special Education Programs **GO TO E1**

IF YOUR ANSWER TO D1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE D2

D2. Do these data inform any of the following types of targeted assistance your district provides to some or all preschools that serve children with IEPs?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide additional staff to preschools

2 ☐ Provide additional professional development to preschool staff

3 ☐ Provide resources to help preschools increase progress monitoring of preschool-age children with disabilities

4 ☐ Provide resources to help preschools make curriculum adaptations

5 ☐ Provide resources to help preschools implement programs and interventions

IF YOUR ANSWER TO D1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE D3

D3. Who examines outcome data to inform the targeted assistance your district provides for preschool-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ District level staff

2 ☐ Preschool staff

3 ☐ Other regional staff

4 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

5 ❍ Not applicable; the district does not use assessment data to inform targeted assistance

IF YOUR ANSWER TO D1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE D4

D4. Does your district examine outcomes for preschool-age children with disabilities separately based on whether they are taught primarily in inclusive classrooms versus separate classrooms?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

d ❍ Don't know

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

E. SUPPORTS FOR TRANSITIONS

The next question asks about the supports provided to preschool-age children during the transitions into preschool and elementary school.

E1. Which of the following practices does your district use to support students with disabilities and their families during transitions into preschool and elementary school?

Please select "Initial transition into preschool" if your district uses this process to support students' transition into preschool.

Please select "Initial transition into elementary school" if your district uses this process to support students' transition into elementary school.

Select all that apply

		A. Initial transition into preschool	B. Initial transition into elementary school
a.	A primary contact person is identified to support transition services for students and their families	1 ☐	2 ☐
b.	Continuity and alignment exist between curricula across special education programs and schools	1 ☐	2 ☐
c.	Families' needs related to the transition are assessed	1 ☐	2 ☐
d.	Individualized transition activities for each child and family are developed	1 ☐	2 ☐
e.	Child and family transition meetings are conducted, separately or as part of an IEP meeting	1 ☐	2 ☐
f.	Home visits with families are conducted	1 ☐	2 ☐
g.	Families are provided with enrollment packets that include information about the special education program and/or required forms to complete	1 ☐	2 ☐
h.	Timelines and roles for *special education eligibility processes*, such as assessments and evaluations, are clearly specified	1 ☐	2 ☐
i.	Timelines and roles for *enrollment processes* are clearly specified and communicated to parents/guardians	1 ☐	2 ☐
j.	Timelines and roles for *referral processes*, such as universal intake forms and memoranda of understanding, are clearly specified	1 ☐	2 ☐
k.	Special education staff from the "receiving" program attend the transition meeting at the "sending" program	1 ☐	2 ☐
l.	Staff roles and responsibilities to support student transitions are clearly specified	1 ☐	2 ☐
m.	Staff to staff communication is supported within and across special education programs and schools	1 ☐	2 ☐
n.	Transition activities, such as open houses and program visitations, are regularly scheduled	1 ☐	2 ☐
o.	Other *Please specify* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

F. ACCESS TO GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND SUPPORTS

The next questions focus on efforts to serve and support preschool-age children with disabilities and their families.

F1. Preschool programs provide a variety of services to children with IEPs, either directly or through contracts/arrangements with independent providers. In the past three years, which of the following services were provided or funded by your district for preschool-age children with disabilities?

In Column A, please check the services that your district provides **directly through staff it employs**.

In Column B, please check the services **funded by the district, but provided by non-district staff**.

In Column C, please check the services that are **not currently provided** by district or non-district staff.

Select all that apply

		A. Services are provided directly by your district staff	**B.** Services are funded by your district, but provided by non-district staff	**C.** Services are not provided or funded by district
a.	Assistive technology	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
b.	Audiology	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
c.	Applied behavior analysis	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
d.	Other behavior management services	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
e.	Orientation and mobility support	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
f.	Mental health counseling	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
g.	Diagnostic services/psychological assessments	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
h.	Training for families, parents, or guardians	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
i.	Social work services	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
j.	Other family services	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
k.	Occupational therapy	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
l.	Physical therapy	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
m.	Speech and language therapy	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
n.	Specialized academic instruction	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
o.	Education in a private institution or school	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍

IF YOUR ANSWER TO ANY ROWS IN F1 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE F2.

F2. IF YOU SELECTED THREE OR MORE ITEMS IN F1: Which *three services* for preschool-age children with disabilities did you spend the most money on during the past three years?

Please write a "1" for the service that you spent the most money on during the past three years, a "2" for the service that you spent the second highest amount of money on during the past three years, and a "3" for the service you spent the next highest amount of money on during the past three years.

IF YOU SELECTED TWO ITEMS IN F1: Please write a "1" for the service that you spent the most money on during the past three years, and a "2" for the service that you spent the next highest amount of money on during the past three years, based on the responses provided in F1.

IF YOU SELECTED ONE ITEM IN F1: Please write a "1" next to the service selected in F1 and continue to the next survey item.

		Rank 1, 2, and 3 by most money spent. Use each number only once.
a.	Assistive technology	|___|
b.	Audiology	|___|
c.	Applied behavior analysis	|___|
d.	Other behavior management services	|___|
e.	Orientation and mobility support	|___|
f.	Mental health counseling	|___|
g.	Diagnostic services/psychological assessments	|___|
h.	Training for families, parents, or guardians	|___|
i.	Social work services	|___|
j.	Other family services	|___|
k.	Occupational therapy	|___|
l.	Physical therapy	|___|
m.	Speech and language therapy	|___|
n.	Specialized academic instruction	|___|
o.	Education in a private institution or school	|___|

F3. Which entity is responsible for setting the approach for serving preschool-age children with disabilities? By *approach* we mean whether children are served within elementary schools, whether there is a partnership with child care or Head Start programs, etc.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ State education agency
2 ☐ District (local education agency)
3 ☐ School

F4. What does your district do to support collaboration among the Part B preschool-age special education program and other entities that serve preschool-age children, such as local child care programs, including Head Start and Early Childhood Education programs?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Collaborate on planning and development of services for children
2 ☐ Collaborate on delivering services to children
3 ☐ Collaborate on funding and staffing of services for children (for example, braided funding, blended staff, etc.)
4 ☐ Provide joint professional development to staff
5 ☐ Coordinate when requesting information from parents/guardians and other agencies
6 ☐ Coordinate when planning meetings with parents/guardians
7 ☐ Coordinate the collection and use of assessment data
8 ☐ Establish formal interagency agreement(s) or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
9 ☐ Establish an interagency coordinating body that includes parents/guardians, educators, service providers, community agencies, and other relevant stakeholders
10 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
11 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

These next questions are about charter schools in your district.

F5. Which of the following best describes your district and the charter schools that operate as part it?

Select one only

1 ❍ My district is a traditional public school district that does not include any charter schools **GO TO F9**

2 ❍ My district is a traditional public school district that *does include* charter schools

3 ❍ My district consists of *only* charter school(s) **GO TO F9**

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F5 = 2, THEN COMPLETE F6

F6. Who serves as the authorizer for charter schools that operate as part of your district?

Select one only

1 ❍ My district authorizes all charter schools that operate as part of the district

2 ❍ Another entity authorizes all charter schools that operate as part of the district **GO TO F8**

3 ❍ Some charter schools that operate as part of my district are authorized by my district and some are authorized by another entity

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F6 = 1 OR 3, THEN COMPLETE F7

F7. For preschool-age children with disabilities who attend *public charter schools that operate as part of your district and are authorized by your district*, who has responsibility for the following, either for policy or contractual reasons?

Select one only per row

		Charter schools have primary responsibility	Shared responsibility between the charter schools and your district	District has primary responsibility	Don't know
a.	Identification and evaluation of preschool-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
b.	Coordination of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
c.	Development of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
d.	Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
e.	Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
f.	Provision of special education teachers and staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
g.	Provision of related services staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
h.	Provision of special education supports within the general education class	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
i.	Provision of special education supports within specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
j.	Transportation for preschool-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
k.	Required qualifications for educators who serve preschool-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
l.	Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting preschool-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
m.	Funding for special education and related services	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
n.	Determining discipline policy or procedures	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F6 = 2 OR 3, THEN COMPLETE F8

F8. For preschool-age children with disabilities who attend *public charter schools that operate as part of your district but are authorized by another entity,* who has responsibility for the following, either for policy or contractual reasons?

Select one only per row

		Charter schools have primary responsibility	Shared responsibility between the charter schools and your district	District has primary responsibility	Don't know
a.	Identification and evaluation of preschool-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
b.	Coordination of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
c.	Development of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
d.	Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
e.	Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
f.	Provision of special education teachers and staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
g.	Provision of related services staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
h.	Provision of special education supports within the general education class	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
i.	Provision of special education supports within specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
j.	Transportation for preschool-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
k.	Required establishment of qualifications for educators who serve preschool-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
l.	Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting preschool-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
m.	Funding for special education and related services	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
n.	Determining discipline policy or procedures	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍

F9. Are there charter schools within your district's geographic area that operate *independently from your district*?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F9 = 1, THEN COMPLETE F10

F10. For preschool-age children with disabilities who attend *public charter schools that operate independently from your district within your district's geographic area*, who has responsibility for the following, either for policy or contractual reasons?

*Note: Please focus on charter schools that exist **as their own school district** within your district's geographic area.*

Select one only per row

		Charter school district has primary responsibility	Shared responsibility between the charter school district and your district	Your district has primary responsibility	Don't know
a.	Identification and evaluation of preschool-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
b.	Coordination of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
c.	Development of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
d.	Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
e.	Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
f.	Provision of special education teachers and staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
g.	Provision of related services staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
h.	Provision of special education supports within the general education class	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
i.	Provision of special education supports within specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
j.	Transportation for preschool-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
k.	Required qualifications for educators who serve preschool-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
l.	Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting preschool-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
m.	Funding for special education and related services	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
n.	Determining discipline policy or procedures	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F5 = 3, THEN COMPLETE F11

F11. For preschool-age children with disabilities in your district, who has responsibility for the following, either for policy or contractual reasons?

Select one only per row

		Primary responsibility belongs to charter schools or charter district	Shared responsibility between the charter schools/charter district and local school district of residence	Local school district of residence has primary responsibility	Don't know
a.	Identification and evaluation of preschool-age children suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
b.	Coordination of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
c.	Development of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
d.	Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
e.	Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
f.	Provision of special education teachers and staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
g.	Provision of related services staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
h.	Provision of special education supports within the general education class	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
i.	Provision of special education supports within specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
j.	Transportation for preschool-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
k.	Required qualifications for educators who serve preschool-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
l.	Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting preschool-age children with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
m.	Funding for special education and related services	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
n.	Determining discipline policy or procedures	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍

The next questions focus on children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschool programs.

F12. Are there currently children with disabilities in your district who have been parentally placed in a private preschool?

Please exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities.

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

F13. In your district, who is currently responsible for identifying children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools?

Please exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Our district assumes responsibility for identifying these children

2 ☐ Our district contracts with another public agency to identify these children

3 ☐ Our district contracts with a third party other than a public agency to identify these children

F14. Which of the following approaches does your district use to identify children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools?

Please exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Distribute materials to parents/guardians to help in the identification of these children

2 ☐ Work with representatives from private schools to identify these children

3 ☐ Provide staff with guidance specifically designed to support referrals and identification of preschool-age children in private schools (for example, written guidance or webinars)

4 ☐ Work with the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center(s) to ensure materials and processes are appropriate for preschool-age children in private schools

5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F12 = 1, THEN COMPLETE F15

F15. In the 2018–2019 school year, how many children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools did your district evaluate for special education services?

Please exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities.

|_____|

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F12 = 1, THEN COMPLETE F16

F16. In the 2018–2019 school year, how many students with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools were found *eligible* for special education services?

Please exclude private preschools that only serve students with disabilities.

I_____I

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F16 = GREATER THAN ZERO, THEN COMPLETE F17

F17. What services did your district provide in the 2018–2019 school year to support children with disabilities who have been parentally placed in private preschools?

Please exclude private preschools that only serve children with disabilities.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Individualized tutoring
2 ☐ Speech or language therapy
3 ☐ Training to teachers/staff who work with children with disabilities
4 ☐ Support with diagnostic assessments
5 ☐ Provision of supplementary curricular materials
6 ☐ Provision of assistive technology
7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
8 ❍ No services were provided **GO TO F19**

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F17 = 1-7, THEN COMPLETE F18

F18. Where were these services provided in the 2018–2019 school year?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ On site at the child's private preschool
2 ☐ On site at a public school in the district
3 ☐ At an alternative location *(Please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

The next questions focus on the access and use of assistive technology (AT) by preschool-age children.

F19. What does your district do to support the use of assistive technology (AT) for preschool-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Offer information about AT to families, such as through AT fairs
2 ☐ Provide designated funding to support AT devices and use
3 ☐ Provide a list of AT for students with different challenges to IEP teams for consideration
4 ☐ Require IEP teams to assess the AT needs of individual students
5 ☐ Provide professional development to *general education teachers* on use of AT
6 ☐ Provide professional development to *special education teachers* on use of AT
7 ☐ Provide professional development to *Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP)* on use of AT
8 ☐ Review IEPs to determine the extent of AT use
9 ☐ Monitor use of AT to ensure effective implementation
10 ☐ Hire or contract with AT experts to promote effective implementation strategies
11 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

F20. Are preschool-age children with disabilities allowed to use district- or school-provided AT *outside* of district buildings and classrooms?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, my district permits *all* AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)
2 ❍ Yes, my district permits *some* AT devices to be used outside of the district (such as in home or community-based settings)
0 ❍ No, my district restricts the use of *all* AT to district buildings and classrooms

F21. When preschool-age children with disabilities transition into elementary school, are they allowed to take district- or school-provided AT devices with them?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, children can take *all* AT devices with them
2 ❍ Yes, children can take *some* AT devices with them
0 ❍ No, children are not allowed to take devices with them

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

G. DISCIPLINE

The next questions focus on your districts' discipline policies for preschool-age children with disabilities. When answering these questions, please assume manifestation determination review has taken place and it's been determined that the infraction is not due to the student's disability or the district's inability to implement their IEP.

G1. Does your district ever remove preschool-age children with disabilities from their preschool program for disciplinary purposes for the remainder of the school year or longer?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes
0 ❍ No
2 ❍ Not applicable

G2. Does your district collaborate with other agencies to develop or support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities?

1 ❍ Yes
0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO G2 = 1, THEN COMPLETE G3

G3. Which of the following agencies or organizations does your district work with to support the implementation of disciplinary policies for preschool-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Behavioral/mental health agency
2 ☐ Developmental disabilities agency
3 ☐ Early Intervention Part C
4 ☐ Head Start
5 ☐ Health agency
6 ☐ Local or state disability advocacy groups
7 ☐ Private therapists or therapy organizations (for example, trauma-informed therapists, applied behavior analysis providers)
8 ☐ Social services
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

H. SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL, BEHAVIORAL, AND MENTAL HEALTH SUPPORTS

The next questions focus on the social-emotional, behavioral, and mental health supports provided to preschool-age children with disabilities.

H1. Has your district developed formal agreements with other agencies or entities to provide *mental health and/or social-emotional supports* to preschool-age children with disabilities?

1 ❍ Yes
0 ❍ No **GO TO H3**

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE H2

H2. Which agencies or entities has your district developed formal agreements with to provide *direct mental health and/or social-emotional supports* to preschool-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Behavioral/mental health agency
2 ☐ Developmental disabilities agency
3 ☐ Early Intervention Part C
4 ☐ Head Start
5 ☐ Health agency
6 ☐ Local or state disability advocacy groups
7 ☐ Private therapists or therapy organizations (for example, trauma-informed therapists, applied behavior analysis providers)
8 ☐ Social services
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

H3. Does your district recommend the use of any programs, practices, or curricula to support the *positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns* of preschool-age children with disabilities?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, my district recommends *one specific* program, practice, or curriculum
2 ❍ Yes, my district recommends *several* programs, practices, or curricula
0 ❍ No **GO TO I1**

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H3 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE H4

H4. Which of the following strategies, programs, or curricula does your district recommend to support the *positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns* of preschool-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Early childhood mental health specialists to work with children needing individualized support
2 ☐ Early warning indicator systems
3 ☐ Trauma-informed curriculum
4 ☐ Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)
5 ☐ Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports
6 ☐ Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA), including Pivotal Response Training (PRT) and discrete trials
7 ☐ Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) and Behavioral Intervention Plans (BIPS)
8 ☐ Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL) training modules
9 ☐ Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence
10 ☐ Calm Classroom
11 ☐ First Step to Success
12 ☐ Incredible Years
13 ☐ Lions Quest
14 ☐ Mandt System
15 ☐ Positive Action
16 ☐ Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS)
17 ☐ Second Step
18 ☐ Tools of the Mind
19 ☐ Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training
20 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO H3 = 1 OR 2, THEN COMPLETE H5

H5. Which of the following types of support does your district provide to teachers who are *using positive behavioral development/social-emotional skills curricula* with preschool-age children with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Training to learn new curricula (such as workshops, institutes, or online modules)

2 ☐ Ongoing *individualized support* to classroom teachers (such as consultation, coaching, or mentoring) for implementing curricula or interventions

3 ☐ Ongoing *group support* (in the form of special education department meetings or community of practice/professional learning communities) for implementing curricula or interventions

4 ☐ Release time to attend conferences and workshops outside of school

5 ☐ Other types of support for implementing curricula *(Please specify)* _____

6 ❍ Not applicable, my district does not provide support for implementing curricula

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

I. FUNDING ALLOCATION

The next questions focus on the funding of services and supports for preschool-age children with disabilities.

I1. Which of the following methods are used to determine how all special education funding (including federal, state, and local) is allocated for services for preschool-age children in your district?

Do not include high-cost funds.

High-cost funds *help offset the financial impact on Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that provide educational services to high-need children with disabilities*.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ A fixed amount based on all children enrolled in preschool in the school district

2 ☐ A fixed amount per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district

3 ☐ Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district, depending on disability category

4 ☐ Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district, depending on specific services required

5 ☐ Predetermined amounts per child with disabilities enrolled in preschool in the school district, depending on type of student placement

6 ☐ Predetermined amounts per teacher, supportive services staff position, or other resource required given the number of students with disabilities

7 ☐ A formula based on the amount of specific allowable special education expenses actually incurred (for example, full reimbursement or percentage reimbursements)

8 ☐ A formula based on a measure of local poverty

9 ☐ A formula based on funding allocations in a base year or a previous year

10 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

11 ❍ None of the above, funding to support special education is not separated out from the general preschool funding formula

12 ❍ None of the above, only one school in the district serves preschool-age children with disabilities

13 ❍ None of the above, the district or a regional organization directly provides special education services to preschool-age children

I2. What funding sources support *services* for preschool-age children with disabilities, as required by their IEPs?

*Please select **any funding sources** that support preschool-age children with disabilities*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ IDEA, Part B
2 ☐ General education funds
3 ☐ State education funds
4 ☐ Local municipality or county funds
5 ☐ Head Start
6 ☐ Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V
7 ☐ Medicaid/Title XIX
8 ☐ Private Insurance
9 ☐ State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)
10 ☐ Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)
11 ☐ Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)
12 ☐ TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)
13 ☐ Other federal funding sources *(Please specify)*_____
14 ☐ Other state funding sources *(Please specify)* _____
15 ☐ Other local funding sources *(Please specify)*_____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO I2 = 1 – 15, THEN COMPLETE I2a

I2a. IF YOU SELECTED **THREE OR MORE** ITEMS IN I2: **Please write a "1" for the source that provides the largest share of funding, a "2" for the source that provides the next largest share of funding, and a "3" for the third largest funding source, based on the responses provided in I2.**

IF YOU SELECTED **TWO** ITEMS IN I2: **Please write a "1" for the source that provides the largest share of funding, and a "2" for the source that provides the next largest share of funding, based on the responses provided in I2.**

IF YOU SELECTED **ONE** ITEM IN I2: **Please write a "1" next to the source selected in I2 and continue to the next survey item.**

	Rank 1, 2, and 3 by share of funding. Use each number only once.
a. IDEA, Part B	|___|
b. General education funds	|___|
c. State education funds	|___|
d. Local municipality or county funds	|___|
e. Head Start	|___|
f. Children with Special Health Care Needs/Title V	|___|
g. Medicaid/Title XIX	|___|
h. Private insurance	|___|
i. State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)	|___|
j. Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)	|___|
k. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	|___|
l. TRICARE (formerly CHAMPUS, Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services)	|___|
m. Other federal funding sources *(Please specify)* _____	|___|
n. Other state funding sources *(Please specify)* _____	|___|

	Rank 1, 2, and 3 by share of funding. Use each number only once.
o. Other local funding sources *(Please specify)* _____	|___|

I3. How are Part B special education program funds used to support direct service personnel (such as special education teachers, paraprofessionals, and related services providers) who serve preschool-age children with disabilities in your district?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ To fund their salaries
2 ☐ To fund their benefits
3 ☐ To provide professional development
4 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
5 ❍ None of the above

I4. How are Part B special education program funds used to support *administrators and administrative support staff* (including clerical, data, accounting, and Medicaid billing personnel) who serve preschool-age children with disabilities in your district?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ To fund their salaries
2 ☐ To fund their benefits
3 ☐ To provide professional development
4 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
5 ❍ None of the above

I5. Are Part B special education program funds used to support the *salaries, benefits, or contracts* of any of the following personnel who serve preschool-age children with disabilities in your district?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Nursing/medical personnel
2 ☐ Paraprofessionals, such as teacher aides/instructional assistants, occupational therapy assistants, personal aides, or health aides
3 ☐ School psychologists or other diagnostic personnel
4 ☐ Preschool special education teachers, including itinerant teachers or coaches
5 ☐ Speech/communication therapists or pathologists
6 ☐ Other related services personnel (for example, occupational or physical therapists)
7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
8 ❍ None of the above

I6. Are Part B special education program funds used to provide any of the following *direct services* for preschool-age children with disabilities in your district?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Special education or related services provided directly by the district
2 ☐ Special education or related services provided through contracted services
3 ☐ Contracted student placements outside of the school district
4 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
0 ❍ None of the above

I7. Are Part B special education program funds used for any of the following *supplies, equipment, or facilities modifications* for preschool-age children with disabilities in your district?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide assistive technology or specialized equipment
2 ☐ Maintain, repair, manage, and upgrade assistive technology or specialized equipment
3 ☐ Make modifications to facilities to meet the unique needs of preschool-age children with disabilities
4 ☐ Provide instructional materials, specialized curriculum, or instructional software
5 ☐ Provide non-instructional software, supplies, and equipment
6 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
7 ❍ None of the above

I8. What *special education supports* are provided to preschool-age children in your district through funding collaboration or contracts with other agencies or service providers?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Child Find disability screening
2 ☐ Evaluations and diagnostic services
3 ☐ Case management and referrals to services
4 ☐ Equipment and assistive technologies
5 ☐ Transportation services
6 ☐ Mental and behavioral health services
7 ☐ Personal aide services
8 ☐ Occupational therapy
9 ☐ Physical therapy
10 ☐ Speech or language therapy
11 ☐ Professional development for staff supporting preschool-age children with IEPs
12 ☐ Specialized instruction (for example, Braille, orientation and mobility, sign language, or applied behavioral analysis)
13 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

The next questions focus on your district's funding for and collaboration with regional cooperative, intermediate, and/or service centers.

I9. Does your district have *regional cooperative, intermediate, and/or service centers* that provide services to preschool-age children with special education needs?

1 ❍ Yes
0 ❍ No **GO TO J1**

IF YOUR ANSWER TO I9 = 1, THEN COMPLETE I10

I10. Is Part B special education funding in your district used to support *regional cooperative, intermediate, and/or service centers* for preschool-age children with special education needs?

1 ❍ Yes
0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO I9 = 1, THEN COMPLETE I11

I11. What special education supports are provided to preschool-age children in your district through *regional cooperative, intermediate, and/or service centers*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Child Find disability screening
2 ☐ Evaluations and diagnostic services
3 ☐ Case management and referrals to services
4 ☐ Equipment and assistive technologies
5 ☐ Transportation services
6 ☐ Mental and behavioral health services
7 ☐ Personal aide services
8 ☐ Occupational therapy
9 ☐ Physical therapy
10 ☐ Speech or language therapy
11 ☐ Professional development for staff supporting preschool-age children with IEPs
12 ☐ Specialized instruction (for example, Braille, orientation and mobility, sign language, or applied behavioral analysis)
13 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO I9 = 1, THEN COMPLETE I12

I12. What ages of preschool-age children with disabilities do *regional cooperative, intermediate, and/or service centers* serve?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ 3-year-olds

2 ☐ 4-year-olds

3 ☐ 5-year-olds

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

J. STAFFING

The next questions focus on the hiring and retention of special education teachers and other personnel.

J1. Please indicate the types of effective *special education personnel* who work with preschool-age children that your district has had difficulty finding and retaining during the current (2019–2020) or preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019).

Select all that apply

	Difficulty finding personnel	Difficulty retaining personnel	No difficulty finding or retaining personnel
a. Early childhood special educators	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
b. Special education teachers who primarily serve children with:			
1. Developmental delays	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
2. Specific learning disabilities	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
3. Emotional disturbance/behavior disorders	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
4. Intellectual disability	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
5. Autism	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
6. Speech or language impairment	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
7. Traumatic brain injury	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
8. Sensory impairments (hearing/vision)	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
9. Other low incidence disabilities (for example, other health impairments, orthopedic impairments, or multiple disabilities)	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
10. Other disability *Please specify* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
c. Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP):			
1. Audiologists	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
2. Behavioral analysts or experts	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
3. Family therapists/mental health providers	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
4. Nurses	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
5. Pediatricians and other physicians	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
6. Physical therapists	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
7. Psychologists	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
8. Occupational therapists	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
9. Orientation/mobility specialists	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
10. Registered dieticians	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
11. Service coordinators	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍

	Difficulty finding personnel	Difficulty retaining personnel	No difficulty finding or retaining personnel
12. Speech/language therapists/pathologists	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
13. Social workers	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
14. Teacher aides, paraprofessionals, or personal care assistants	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
15. Transition specialists	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
16. Vision specialists, including ophthalmologists and optometrists	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
17. Sign language interpreters	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
d. Bilingual staff	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
e. Other staff	1 ☐	2 ☐	0 ❍
Please specify _____			

J2. During the current (2019–2020) or preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019), what strategies has your district used to *increase the number of effective preschool special education teachers*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Collaborated with universities to develop programs and curricula to prepare teachers in specific shortage areas

2 ☐ Paid fees for tests/licensure exams

3 ☐ Paid for tutoring to prepare teachers for certification tests/licensure exams

4 ☐ Provided time or funding for teachers to participate in professional development opportunities (for example, institute of higher education tuition, workshop fees)

5 ☐ Supported participation in dual certification preparation programs

6 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

7 ❍ None of the above

8 ❍ Not applicable

J3. Which supports or incentives did your district use to recruit new preschool special education teachers for the 2019–2020 school year?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ A signing bonus
2 ☐ A bonus supplement to regular compensation
3 ☐ A permanent salary augmentation or adjustment to normal base salary
4 ☐ Placement of a teacher on a higher step of the salary schedule
5 ☐ Relocation assistance
6 ☐ Payoff of student loans
7 ☐ Finder's fee to existing staff for new teacher referrals
8 ☐ Mentoring or induction programs
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
10 ❍ None of the above

IF YOUR ANSWER TO ANY ROW IN J1 = 2, THEN COMPLETE J4

J4. During the current (2019–2020) or preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019), what initiatives or incentives has your district used to *retain* effective preschool special education teachers?

***Tuition "pay back"**: For every year of tuition, teachers owe the district a year of service.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Cover continuing education costs to get a higher degree
2 ☐ Cover continuing education costs to maintain certification
3 ☐ Provide mentoring or induction programs
4 ☐ Offer full-time teaching positions
5 ☐ Offer part-time teaching positions
6 ☐ Offer same salary levels as K-12 educators
7 ☐ Provide additional planning or release time
8 ☐ Provide smaller caseloads
9 ☐ Provide smaller class sizes
10 ☐ Offer student loan forgiveness
11 ☐ Offer tuition "pay back" or partial reimbursement
12 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____
13 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

K. EVIDENCE FROM RESEARCH

The final section focuses on the use of evidence from research.

K1. Does your district provide guidance on acceptable evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices that schools and early childhood programs should use to provide services to preschool-age children with disabilities?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No **GO TO K3**

IF YOUR ANSWER TO K1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE K2

K2. How does your district help ensure that schools and early childhood programs use evidence-based special education programs and services?

Tier 1 *– Strong Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented randomized control experimental studies.*

Tier 2 *– Moderate Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well- implemented quasi-experimental studies.*

Tier 3 *– Promising Evidence: supported by one or more well-designed and well-implemented correlational studies (with statistical controls for selection bias).*

Tier 4 *– Demonstrates a Rationale: practices that have a well-defined logic model or theory of action, are supported by research, and have some effort underway by an SEA, LEA, or outside research organization to determine their effectiveness*.

Select all that apply

1 ☐ We provide a curated list of *suggested* evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices

2 ☐ We *require* that schools and early childhood programs only purchase materials and programs from a curated list of suggested evidence-based policies, procedures, and practices

3 ☐ We conduct a formal review of the materials and programs used by schools and early childhood programs to make sure they are evidence-based

4 ☐ We recommend materials based on the level of evidence of their effectiveness (Tier 1 to Tier 4, under ESSA), specifically for preschool-age children with disabilities

5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* _____

K3. How often does your district draw on the following sources of information when selecting early childhood special education policies and practices?

Select one only per row

	Never or not applicable	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Don't know
a. Guidance or advice from the state education department or a technical assistance center funded by the state	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
b. A list of vendors approved by the state	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
c. Information provided by the intervention's developer or vendor	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
d. Recommendations from colleagues in my own or other school districts	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
e. Information from a federally funded technical assistance center	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
f. Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
g. Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory (REL)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
h. Information from the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
i. Information from the district's research/evaluation office	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
j. Information from professional associations	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
k. Information from a college/university researcher	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
l. Information from a research journal	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
m. Social media (Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, other)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
n. Other	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍

Please specify _____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

School survey on IDEA implementation for preschool- and school-age children

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

State and Local Implementation Study 2019

SCHOOL PART B 619 and 611

November 2019

NOTE: The hardcopy version of this survey is for reference purposes only. All instructions and FAQs pertain to the online version of the survey. To access the survey online, please use the link below. Enter the username and password provided to you in the letter included in the mailing packet.

Survey Link: IDEA-Survey.com/School

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995
According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1850-0949. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 45 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is voluntary. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this survey, please contact the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20202-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov directly. [Note: Please do not return the completed survey to this address.]

Notice of Confidentiality
Responses to this data collection will be used only for statistical purposes. The reports prepared for this study will summarize findings across the sample and will not associate responses with a specific individual. All information that would permit identification of the school or individual respondent will be kept confidential (per The Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002), will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey, and will not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose except as required by law. Study reports may present information by state.

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) State and Local Implementation Study 2019, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education (ED), is an important study that will develop a national picture of state, district, and school implementation of IDEA. It will provide (1) the Department of Education, Congress, and other stakeholders with knowledge that can inform how special education and related services are provided to children, and (2) states, districts, and schools with an understanding of how others are implementing IDEA.

The IDEA Implementation Study is not a compliance study, nor a study of the results of effectiveness of IDEA.

We are requesting you complete this questionnaire because you and your staff have the most knowledge about special education policies and practices at your school. If there are questions you are not able to answer, please feel free to draw on the expertise and knowledge of others within your school. With your contribution, ED and Congress will gain a more accurate and complete understanding of how IDEA is being implemented for preschool-age and school-age students at the school level.

All information that would permit identification of the school or individual respondent will be held in strict confidence, will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purposes of the survey, and will not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose except as required by law.

Thank you for joining us in our effort to understand the current implementation of IDEA. We appreciate your time and cooperation.

Please see the next pages for instructions for completing this survey, as well as a set of key definitions and frequently asked questions.

If you have any questions, contact:
Lisbeth Goble, 833-238-7224
email: IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com

Before you answer the questions, please carefully read the instructions, key definitions, and frequently asked questions. You can refer back to these as you complete the survey by clicking on the Instructions, Key Definitions, and FAQs link on the upper right-hand side of the screen.

INSTRUCTIONS

- All items request information pertaining to the 2019–2020 school year unless otherwise specified.
- The primary respondent for this survey is intended to be the person most knowledgeable about special education policies and practices in your school. In most cases, the primary respondent will be the lead special education teacher or principal.
- Certain questions may require the help of other staff. If you need input from other staff, you may share your unique survey hyperlink, which will give them full access to the survey, or you can print off specific questions for them to answer on paper and then fill in the online responses yourself.
- Throughout the survey, you'll see some terms in blue. You can click on those to see a definition of the term
- Items on this survey cover the following topics: General Information; IEP Development and Quality; Monitoring Students with Disabilities; Supports for Transitions; Access to General Education Programs and Supports; Social-Emotional, Behavioral, and Mental Health Supports; Staffing; and Evidence from Research.

KEY DEFINITIONS

Students with disabilities is used to reflect children ages 3 through 21 with intellectual disabilities; hearing impairments, including deafness; speech or language impairments; visual impairments, including blindness; serious emotional disturbance (hereafter referred to as emotional disturbance); orthopedic impairments; autism; traumatic brain injuries; developmental delays; other health impairments; specific learning disabilities; deaf-blindness; or multiple disabilities, and who, by reason thereof, receive special education and related services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) according to an Individualized Education Program (IEP) or an Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP). If your state's eligibility extends past age 21, please consider the highest age for which teachers serve IDEA individuals.

Special education teachers are teachers employed and contracted to work with students with disabilities at your school.

Professional development includes a range of learning and support activities designed to prepare individuals to work with, and on behalf of, children and their families, as well as ongoing experiences to enhance this work. Professional development encompasses education, training, and technical assistance.

Training is a learning experience, or series of experiences, specific to an area of inquiry and related set of skills, delivered by a professional(s) with subject matter and adult learning knowledge and skills. This could include seminars, workshops, or courses about specific topics or key concepts.

Technical assistance (TA) is the provision of targeted and customized supports by a professional(s) with subject matter and adult learning knowledge and skills with the goal of developing or strengthening processes, knowledge application, or implementation of services by recipients. This could include coaching, consulting, or other ongoing support.

School levels are defined as follows:

- **Prekindergarten** is a grade at the school for children not old enough to enroll in kindergarten.
- **Elementary schools** are schools that can serve students in kindergarten to grades 4–8, depending on state and school district policy.
- **Middle schools** are schools that can serve students between grades 4 and 9, with most in the grade 6–8 range. Middle schools in the upper grade range (7–9) are sometimes referred to as junior high schools.
- **High schools** are schools that can serve students between grades 7 and 12, with most in the grade 9–12 range.
- **Other schools** are all other grade configurations, including schools that are completely ungraded.

Unless specified in a question, when answering items in this survey please consider the full age and grade range of students served in your school.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

How do I navigate the survey? You can access the survey by clicking on the unique hyperlink we provided to you via email. Once you have started the survey, you can navigate through it by answering each question and clicking the NEXT button at the bottom of the page. To navigate between survey sections, click on the [Survey Menu] button at the top right of your screen. This will allow you go to select the section you wish to complete. To go back to a previous page, click the BACK button. Do not use your internet browser back/forward buttons to move through the survey.

Do I have to complete the survey all at one time? No. You can revisit the website as many times as needed to complete the survey. However, if you need to stop before finishing the survey, **please be sure to click on the NEXT button before closing out so that your response(s) on that page are saved**. You will resume at the next unanswered question when you return to the survey. Once you have finished and submitted your survey, you will no longer have access to it. **Please note that each session will time out after 30 minutes of inactivity**.

Can I complete the survey on my tablet or smartphone? Yes. The survey has been optimized to run on desktop computers, tablets, or smartphones. The survey is best viewed in the latest versions of Chrome, Safari, Firefox, or Internet Explorer (IE 11 or Edge).

How long does the survey take? About 45 minutes. You can preview the questions and are not required to complete the survey all at once. The data you provide each time you log in will be securely stored and available when you return to complete the survey.

Do I have to answer all the questions? Please try to answer all questions that are relevant for your school, so the U.S. Department of Education can gain a more accurate and complete understanding of how IDEA is being implemented. You will automatically be skipped past some questions that do not apply to your situation, depending on your answer to an earlier question. You may choose to skip any question in the survey that you cannot or do not wish to answer. To skip a question, leave the question blank and then click the NEXT button to proceed.

Can I have my staff complete some of the questions instead of me? Yes. Certain questions may require the help of other staff. You may share your unique survey hyperlink with these individuals, which will give them full access to the survey, or you can print off specific questions and then fill in the responses yourself at a later time.

Can multiple people work on completing the survey at the same time? No. If multiple people are logged into the same survey at the same time, responses may not be recorded correctly. Only one person on one computer should be completing the survey at any given time.

Can I print individual questions? Yes. You may print an individual page at any time by using your computer's usual method of printing.

Can I print a copy of the questionnaire when I am finished? If you would like a copy of your responses once you complete the survey, please email IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com and we will send you a copy of the survey with your responses.

Can I obtain a paper version of the questionnaire? Yes. If you would like to see a paper version for reference purposes, you can download a PDF version by clicking the link at the top of the page that says "Download blank PDF of survey."

Will my answers be kept confidential? Yes. All information that would permit identification of the district, school, or individual respondent will be held in strict confidence, will be used only by persons engaged in the survey and only for the purposes of the survey, and will not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose except as required by law.

Whom should I contact if I have a question? If you have any questions, please contact Lisbeth Goble at 833-238-7224 or at IDEA@mathematica-mpr.com. When sending emails, in addition to the question, please be sure to include your name and a phone number where you can be reached.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Please write the contact information of the primary respondent below in case we need to contact your school to clarify responses to any questions.

First Name: _____

Last Name: _____

Title/Position: _____

Phone: |__|__|__| - |__|__|__| - |__|__|__|__|

Email Address: _____

School Name: _____

District Name: _____

Best days and times to reach you (in case of questions): _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

The first questions are related to your school.

A1. Which describes your role at this school?

Select one only

1 ❍ Special education coordinator
2 ❍ Special education teacher
3 ❍ Principal
4 ❍ Assistant principal
5 ❍ Other *(Please specify)* _____

A2. Which grade levels does your school offer?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Prekindergarten
2 ☐ Kindergarten
3 ☐ 1st grade
4 ☐ 2nd grade
5 ☐ 3rd grade
6 ☐ 4th grade
7 ☐ 5th grade
8 ☐ 6th grade
9 ☐ 7th grade
10 ☐ 8th grade
11 ☐ 9th grade
12 ☐ 10th grade
13 ☐ 11th grade
14 ☐ 12th grade

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

B. IEP DEVELOPMENT AND QUALITY

The next questions focus on the development, quality, and content of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs).

B1. Do staff at your school typically do any of the following to ensure *quality IEPs*?

A quality IEP *is in compliance with all requirements of state and federal laws and regulations and reflects decisions based on the active and meaningful involvement of all members of the IEP team. The IEP provides a clear statement of expected outcomes and the special education services and supports to be provided to the student.*

Appropriately ambitious *goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of their circumstances.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Facilitate school staff attendance and participation in IEP meetings
2 ☐ Facilitate attendance and participation of staff from agencies outside the district in IEP meetings
3 ☐ Monitor the development of appropriately ambitious goals, as documented in an IEP
4 ☐ Monitor the services and supports specified in the IEP
5 ☐ Periodic review of completed IEPs
6 ☐ Facilitate student attendance and participation in IEP meetings
7 ☐ Include the student's general education teacher(s) on the IEP team.
8 ☐ Meet with students prior to the IEP meeting to discuss how they can participate in the meeting
9 ☐ Meet with students to discuss strengths, interests, preferences, or any concerns the student may have to inform IEP development
10 ☐ Meet with students to discuss their progress, goals, current functioning, or academic performance to inform IEP development.
11 ☐ Discuss student satisfaction with goals and supports in *previous IEP*
12 ☐ Discuss student progress, current functioning, or academic performance with parents/guardians to inform IEP development
13 ☐ Facilitate parent/guardian attendance and participation in IEP meetings
14 ☐ Provide parents/guardians with materials in advance of the IEP meeting, such as current academic performance or assessment data
15 ☐ Meet with parents/guardians prior to the IEP meeting to discuss how they can participate in the meeting
16 ☐ Discuss parent/guardian satisfaction with goals and supports in *previous IEP*
17 ❍ Our school does not do any of the above

B2. What information does your school collect to assess the quality of IEPs for students with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Records of IEP meeting attendees to ensure there is appropriate representation of all key parties

2 ☐ Formal assessment of the quality of some or all IEPs based on a checklist or rubric

3 ☐ Formal assessment of goals in some or all IEPs to ensure they are appropriately ambitious

4 ☐ Interviews or surveys of teachers about IEP goals and supports

5 ☐ Interviews or surveys of students about IEP goals and supports

6 ☐ Interviews or surveys of parents/guardians about IEP goals and supports

7 ☐ Academic outcomes of students with an IEP to monitor alignment with IEP goals and supports

8 ☐ Disciplinary records of students to ensure IEP includes relevant supports

9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

10 ❍ Not applicable; we review IEPs to assess their quality, but do not collect any additional information as part of that review

B3. What factors does your school consider when determining an <u>appropriately ambitious goa</u>l for a student?

Include assessments that were used to determine eligibility for special education and related services when selecting from the list below.

Appropriately ambitious *goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ College/career readiness skills

2 ☐ Results of standardized tests to measure intelligence

3 ☐ Results of standardized academic achievement tests

4 ☐ Results of curriculum-based tests

5 ☐ Results of other assessments

6 ☐ Information from student interviews, such as the student's strengths, interests, or preferences

7 ☐ Information from parent/guardian interviews, such as parents'/guardian's goals or aspirations for their child

8 ☐ Portfolio of current student work

9 ☐ Progress monitoring data on prior goals

10 ☐ Academic checklists (non-standardized)

11 ☐ Checklists or other assessment of behavior or social-emotional development

12 ☐ Checklists or other assessment of functional skills

13 ☐ Checklists or other assessment of transition planning

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

B4. During the most recently completed school year (2018–2019), did the personnel in your school receive professional development on *setting and/or monitoring appropriately ambitious goals* in IEPs?

Professional development could be provided by your state, school district, school, or an outside agency.

Appropriately ambitious *goals are reasonably calculated goals that enable a child to make progress that is appropriate in light of their circumstances.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Yes, on setting appropriately ambitious IEP goals

2 ☐ Yes, on monitoring appropriately ambitious goals

0 ❍ No, my school personnel did not receive this professional development

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 1, THEN COMPLETE B5

B5. On average, how often are staff from an outside agency consulted when writing IEPs for prekindergarten students with disabilities at your school?

By outside agency, we mean agencies such as social services, Head Start, and other community-based child care programs.

Select one only

1 ❍ An outside agency is often consulted when writing IEPs

2 ❍ An outside agency is sometimes consulted when writing IEPs

3 ❍ An outside agency is never consulted when writing IEPs

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

C. MONITORING STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

The next questions focus on monitoring and analyzing the outcomes of students with disabilities.

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 11, 12, 13, OR 14, THEN COMPLETE C1

C1. Does your school use an early warning system to identify students with disabilities who are at risk of dropping out of school?

An early warning system is based on student data and is used to help identify students who exhibit behavior or academic performance that puts them at risk of dropping out of school.

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, we use an early warning system

2 ❍ No, we discuss students who are at risk of dropping out of school, but do not use an early warning system **GO TO C3**

3 ❍ No, we do not use an early warning system or discuss students who are at risk of dropping out of school **GO TO C3**

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C1 = 1, THEN COMPLETE C2

C2. How are the early warning system data used to help students with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ The data are used to identify students for participation in dropout prevention programs

2 ☐ The data are used to provide targeted interventions to students with IEPs

3 ☐ The data are used to monitor progress toward attainment of IEP goals

4 ☐ The data are used to inform professional development for educators about preventing dropout

5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

6 ❍ None of the above

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 11, 12, 13, OR 14, THEN COMPLETE C3

C3. Does your school have a dropout prevention program?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No **GO TO C6**

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C3 = 1, THEN COMPLETE C4

C4. Which of the following strategies are part of your school's *dropout prevention program* to help students with and without disabilities who are at risk of dropping out?

Select all that apply

	Used for students *with disabilities*	Used for students *without disabilities*	Not part of our dropout prevention program
a. Provide mentoring to students	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
b. Provide tutoring to students	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
c. Engage students in community service opportunities	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
d. Provide alternative or non-traditional schooling options, such as alternative times or environments	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
e. Offer career and technical education courses to students	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
f. Provide after-school enhancement programs	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
g. Provide summer enhancement programs	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
h. Provide individualized learning to allow students to move through courses at their own pace	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
i. Provide personalized learning tailored to the preferences and interests of students	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
j. Ensure a safe learning environment through the use of a comprehensive discipline plan or violence prevention plan	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
k. Engage families to help assess student needs and reduce absenteeism and truancy	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
l. Review attendance and tardiness data to determine any patterns related to poor attendance	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
m. Other *Please specify*_____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍

IF YOUR ANSWER TO C3 = 1, THEN COMPLETE C5

C5. In your school, are students with disabilities who are identified as *at risk of dropping out* required to participate in dropout prevention programs?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 11, 12, 13 OR 14, THEN COMPLETE ALL ROWS. OTHERWISE, COMPLETE ONLY ROWS A – G.

C6. What types of outcome data does your school examine for students with and without disabilities?

Adaptive behavior *is behavior that enables a person to get along in his or her environment with the greatest success and least conflict with others.*

Select all that apply

		Examined for students *with disabilities*	Examined for students *without disabilities*
a.	Assessment scores	1 ☐	2 ☐
b.	Attendance	1 ☐	2 ☐
c.	Course progress or completion	1 ☐	2 ☐
d.	Disciplinary actions	1 ☐	2 ☐
e.	Grades	1 ☐	2 ☐
f.	Functional performance/adaptive behavior	1 ☐	2 ☐
g.	Social-emotional skills development/behavior	1 ☐	2 ☐
h.	IF SECONDARY SCHOOL: Dropout rates	1 ☐	2 ☐
i.	IF SECONDARY SCHOOL: Graduation rates	1 ☐	2 ☐
j.	IF SECONDARY SCHOOL: Participation in AP or honors courses	1 ☐	2 ☐
k.	IF SECONDARY SCHOOL: Post-school outcomes (further education, employment)	1 ☐	2 ☐

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

D. SUPPORTS FOR TRANSITIONS

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, OR 14, THEN COMPLETE QUESTIONS IN THIS SECTION.

The next questions focus on supports provided for students with disabilities transitioning into prekindergarten and elementary school, as well as transition plan development and supports provided for students with disabilities preparing for further education, employment, and independent living.

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 1, THEN COMPLETE D1

D1. What policies, procedures, and practices does your school use to support students with disabilities and their families during *transitions into the school's prekindergarten special education program*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ A primary contact person is identified to support transition services for students and their families

2 ☐ Families' needs related to transition are assessed

3 ☐ Child and family transition meetings are conducted, separately or as part of an IEP meeting

4 ☐ Home visits with families are conducted

5 ☐ Individualized transition activities for each student and family are developed

6 ☐ Timelines and roles for *special education eligibility processes*, such as assessments and evaluations, are clearly specified

7 ☐ Timelines and roles for *enrollment processes* are clearly specified and communicated to parents

8 ☐ Timelines and roles for *referral processes*, such as universal intake forms and memoranda of understanding, are clearly specified

9 ☐ Staff roles and responsibilities to support student transitions are clearly specified

10 ☐ Transition activities, such as open houses and program visitations, are regularly scheduled

11 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

12 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, OR 7, THEN COMPLETE D2

D2. Which of the following practices does your school use to support students with disabilities and their families during *the initial transition into elementary school*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ A primary contact person is identified to support transition services for students and their families

2 ☐ Families' needs related to transition are assessed

3 ☐ Child and family transition meetings are conducted, separately or as part of an IEP meeting

4 ☐ Home visits with families are conducted

5 ☐ Individualized transition activities for each student and family are developed

6 ☐ Our school ensures continuity and alignment between curricula across special education programs and schools

7 ☐ Timelines and roles for *enrollment processes* are clearly specified and communicated to parents

8 ☐ Staff roles and responsibilities to support student transitions are clearly specified

9 ☐ Staff to staff communication is supported within and across special education programs and schools

10 ☐ Transition activities, such as open houses and program visitations, are regularly scheduled

11 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

12 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 11, 12, 13, OR 14, THEN COMPLETE D3

D3. ***What programs and supports does your school provide to students with disabilities to prepare them for further education, jobs, and independent living?***

Please include programs offered through your school, as well as programs and supports your school makes available to your students through coordination with other partners.

Soft skills *relate to qualities and behavior that apply across a variety of situations – these skills are critical to the success of students in college as well as in the workplace. Examples of soft skills include communication, teamwork, time management, self-confidence, and creativity.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Advanced placement or other courses (including dual enrollment programs) that earn college credit

2 ☐ Counseling on federal or state benefits (such as Medicaid or Supplemental Security Income)

3 ☐ Career and technical education courses

4 ☐ Career awareness instruction

5 ☐ Counseling on postsecondary career and technical education and employment training program options

6 ☐ Counseling on postsecondary education, including course guidance

7 ☐ Independent living/self-care skills instruction

8 ☐ Self-advocacy/self-determination instruction

9 ☐ Social skills instruction

10 ☐ Soft skills development

11 ☐ Student-led IEP process

12 ☐ Supports for participating in an inclusive learning environment

13 ☐ Supports for participating in extracurricular clubs and sports

14 ☐ Supported employment in community settings in which students with and without disabilities work

15 ☐ Test-taking strategies and study skills instruction

16 ☐ Work-based learning experiences in community settings in which students with and without disabilities work

17 ☐ Workplace readiness training

18 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

19 ❍ None of the above

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 11, 12, 13, OR 14, THEN COMPLETE D4

D4. When developing a transition plan for students with disabilities, does your school use a transition planning rubric or guide that focuses on a set of compliance and quality indicators?

Select one only

1 ❍ Yes, a rubric or guide that focuses on compliance only

2 ❍ Yes, a rubric or guide that focuses on both compliance and quality indicators

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 11, 12, 13, OR 14, THEN COMPLETE D5

D5. For what percentage of students with low and high incidence disabilities do the following individuals participate in transition planning meetings?

Please respond separately for students with low and high incidence disabilities. Your best estimate is fine.

***Low incidence disabilities** occur less frequently than other disabilities, and school-age children with low incidence disabilities require highly specialized services, equipment, and materials. Students with low incidence disabilities include students who are deaf or hard of hearing, blind or visually impaired, or deafblind, and students with significant cognitive and behavioral disabilities.*

***High incidence disabilities** include most students with disabilities, such as students with a specific learning disability (SLD), students with emotional disturbance (ED), and students with mild intellectual disability (MID).*

	Percentage of students with *low incidence disabilities* for which each individual participates	Percentage of students with *high incidence disabilities* for which each individual participates
a. General education academic subject teacher(s)	|____|%	|____|%
b. Generaleducation career and technical teacher or work study coordinator	|____|%	|____|%
c. Specialeducation teacher	|____|%	|____|%
d. Schooladministrator (for example, principal, special education administrator)	|____|%	|____|%
e. Schoolguidance counselor, social worker, or psychologist	|____|%	|____|%
f. Related services personnel (for example, speech pathologist, occupational therapist, orientation and mobility)	|____|%	|____|%
g. Parentor guardian	|____|%	|____|%
h. The student	|____|%	|____|%

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 11, 12, 13, OR 14, THEN COMPLETE D6

D6. For each organization below, for what percentage of students with disabilities are representatives from these organizations invited to transition planning meetings, attend transition planning meetings, and provide input related to transition plans?

Your best estimates are fine. Please write 0 if the percentage is 0 or if the question is not applicable.

	Percentage of students for which each organization is invited	Percentage of students for which each organization attends	Percentage of students for which each organization provides input
a. Health care agencies	|____|%	|____|%	|____|%
b. Mental health agencies	|____|%	|____|%	|____|%
c. Social Security Administration	|____|%	|____|%	|____|%
d. Social service agencies (for example, Department of Developmental Services)	|____|%	|____|%	|____|%
e. Independent living agencies	|____|%	|____|%	|____|%
f. Vocational rehabilitation services (for example, Department of Rehabilitation Services)	|____|%	|____|%	|____|%
g. Employers or potential employers of the student	|____|%	|____|%	|____|%
h. Postsecondary institutions and agencies	|____|%	|____|%	|____|%

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 11, 12, 13, OR 14, THEN COMPLETE D7

D7. What information does your school provide to parents/guardians and school-age children with the most significant cognitive disabilities regarding the potential implications of taking alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, in place of the standard assessment?

Academic achievement standards *gauge the proficiency with which content standards have been attained by individuals or groups of students.*

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Potential implications for high school graduation

2 ☐ Potential implications for type of diploma

3 ☐ Potential implications for higher education

4 ☐ Potential implications for work opportunities

5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

E. ACCESS TO GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND SUPPORTS

The next questions focus on efforts to support students with disabilities in accessing the general education curriculum.

E1. Which of the following services are available for students with disabilities **at your school?**

Select all that apply

1 ☐ General education classroom *with accommodations*

2 ☐ Part-time special education resource classroom, with limited general class time

3 ☐ Special education self-contained classroom

4 ☐ One-on-one instruction

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

E2. Which of the following accommodations or modifications are available to students with IEPs when *in general education classrooms*?

Select one only per row

	Available to students with disabilities, *if stipulated in IEP*	Available to all students with disabilities, *regardless of IEP*	Not available to students	Not applicable; not stipulated in any IEPs
a. Allow students additional time to complete assignments	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
b. Allow students additional time to take tests	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
c. Allow students to take more breaks	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
d. Provide feedback to students more frequently than usual	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
e. Provide students with shorter assignments	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
f. Provide students with slower-paced instructions	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
g. Provide physical adaptations (such as preferential seating, special desks)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
h. Equip students with either a home set or online version of class materials	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
i. Use modified grading standards	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
j. Use modified tests	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
k. Read test(s) aloud to students	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

E3. What additional supports and assistance are available to students with IEPs when *in general education classrooms*?

Select one only per row

	Available to students with disabilities, *if stipulated in IEP*	Available to all students with disabilities, *regardless of IEP*	Not available to students	Not applicable; not stipulated in any IEPs
a. Individual behavior management program	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
b. Teacher aides or instructional assistants (paraprofessional) assigned to individual students	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
c. Teacher aides or instructional assistants (paraprofessionals) assigned to classroom	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
d. Progress monitoring provided by special education teacher or other service provider	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
e. Assistance with study skills or learning strategies	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
f. Tutoring by special education teacher, either during or after the school day	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
g. Reader or interpreter	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
h. Scribe or note-taker	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
i. Assistive technology	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
j. Peer tutor or cross-age tutor	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
k. Peer buddy or cross-age buddy	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍
l. Other	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍

Please specify _____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

E4. Which of the following resources are available to general education teachers in your school when special education students are included in their classes?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Adult volunteers
2 ☐ Consultation by special education staff
3 ☐ Co-teaching/team teaching with a special education teacher
4 ☐ In-service training based on the needs of special education students
5 ☐ Adjustments to student load or class size
6 ☐ Specialized materials to use with special education students
7 ☐ Teacher aides, instructional assistants, or aides for individual students
8 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

E5. How dœs your school provide support to teachers to help them ensure students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum?

Select all that apply

	To help teachers adapt curriculum with appropriate complexity and breadth, including incorporation of Universal Design Learning principles	To help teachers provide accommodations	To help teachers manage student behavior	Support not provided through this mechanism
a. Training through a workshop, institute, or online module	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
b. Ongoing individualized support (such as consultation, coaching, or mentoring)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
c. Ongoing group support (in the form of special education department meetings or community of practice/professional learning communities)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
d. Release time (including common preparation periods and non-student days) to attend conferences and workshops outside of school	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
e. Other *Please specify* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 1, THEN COMPLETE E6

E6. How does your school provide support to teachers to help them ensure *prekindergarten students* with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum?

Select all that apply

	To help teachers adapt curriculum with appropriate complexity and breadth, including incorporation of Universal Design Learning principles	To help teachers provide accommodations	To help teachers manage student behavior	School does not provide support this way
a. Training through a workshop, institute, or online module	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
b. Ongoing individualized support (such as consultation, coaching, or mentoring)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
c. Ongoing group support(in the form of special education department meetings or community of practice/professional learning communities)	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
d. Release time (including common preparation periods and non-student days) to attend conferences and workshops outside of school	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍
e. Other *Please specify* _____	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐	4 ❍

E7. For students with disabilities who are receiving services in *separate classes* (that is, special education-only settings), who teaches the core subject areas?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Dual certified teachers
2 ☐ General education teachers, not certified in special education
3 ☐ Special education teacher, in consultation with general education teacher
4 ☐ Special education and general education teacher co-teach
5 ☐ Special education teacher provides individual/small group instruction
6 ☐ Paraprofessional provides individual/small group instruction

E8. What types of core-subject area curricula are used for students with disabilities who receive core-subject area instruction in *self-contained classes or schools*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ General education curriculum, without specific adaptions
2 ☐ General education curriculum with adaptations for disability type
3 ☐ General education curriculum with adaptations for intensity of need
4 ☐ General education curriculum with individualized instructional supports
5 ☐ Specialized curriculum, without specific adaptations
6 ☐ Specialized curriculum with adaptations for disability type
7 ☐ Specialized curriculum with adaptations for intensity of need
8 ☐ Specialized curriculum with individualized instructional supports

E9. Does your school use any of the following methods to support the participation of students with disabilities in the *same nonacademic extracurricular activities as students without disabilities*?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Provide individualized accommodations to students with disabilities
2 ☐ Provide professional development to personnel supervising nonacademic activities
3 ☐ Offer a specific disability awareness program
4 ☐ Provide assistive technology to help students participate in activities
5 ☐ Assign students without disabilities to be “buddies" to students with disabilities
6 ☐ Prompt and reinforce students without disabilities to initiate and maintain interactions with students with disabilities
7 ☐ Structure activities that require interaction between students with and without disabilities
8 ☐ Provide or assist students in getting the necessary transportation to these activities

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

The next questions focus on prekindergarten students at your school.

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 1, THEN COMPLETE E10

E10. Which of the following service options are available for prekindergarten students with disabilities at your school?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Classes primarily for students with disabilities

2 ☐ General education/inclusion program with special services provided in general education classroom

3 ☐ General and special education co-taught classes

4 ☐ Part-time resource or therapy room for students in special education

5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 1, THEN COMPLETE E11

E11. What is the most common way students with and without disabilities are brought together in your school's prekindergarten classes?

Select one only

1 ❍ Students with and without disabilities are seldom in contact with one another

2 ❍ Classes for students with and without disabilities share common spaces (for example, playground and/or lunch room) only

3 ❍ Students with disabilities spend part of the day in a classroom primarily for non-disabled students

4 ❍ Students with disabilities spend the entire day in a classroom primarily for non-disabled students

5 ❍ Students *without disabilities* spend part of the day in the classroom for students with disabilities

n ❍ Not applicable – we do not currently have both students with and without disabilities enrolled in this school

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 1, THEN COMPLETE E12

E12. Does your school host extended day programs that prekindergarten students with disabilities can attend?

Please consider extended day programs that are provided by your school and extended day programs that are offered at your school but run by another provider.

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO E12 = 1, THEN COMPLETE E13

E13. Which of the following extended-day options are available for prekindergarten students with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Before preschool program

2 ☐ After preschool program

The next questions focus on the access and use of assistive technology (AT) by students with disabilities.

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 1 **ONLY** THEN DO NOT COMPLETE ROW V, IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 INCLUDES 2 – 14 THEN COMPLETE ALL ROWS.

E14. Which types of school-provided assistive technology (AT) do students with IEPs have access to in your school?

Adapted, adaptive, or ability switches *make it easier for students to interact with computers, speech-generating devices, and other tools and devices.*

Select one only per row

	Not available	Available but not currently used	Available and used
a. Augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) device	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
b. Adapted keyboard	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
c. Adapted paper	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
d. Adapted pencil	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
e. Adapted, adaptive, or ability switches	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
f. Audio books	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
g. Closed captioning	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
h. FM listening system	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
i. Increased font size on materials	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
j. Larger grips	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
k. Noise-blocking headphones	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
l. Personalized devices or equipment to support student positioning and mobility	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
m. Physical objects or manipulatives for hands-on learning	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
n. Instructions using only pictures	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
o. Roller-ball mouse	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
p. Slant Board	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
q. Smart Board	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
r. Speech to Text, including real-time transcription	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

	Not available	Available but not currently used	Available and used
s. Tablets, computers, or other digital devices	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
t. Talking calculators	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
u. Text to speech	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
v. Word processing programs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍
w. Other *Please specify*_____	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍

E15. What does your school do to monitor the appropriate use of AT for students with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ We ensure the recommended AT is being used by the student

2 ☐ We ensure the AT is being used appropriately

3 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

E16. How does your school finance AT?

Select all that apply

1 ❍ District provides *all* funds towards AT

2 ☐ District provides *some* funds towards AT, but schools must fund the rest

3 ☐ School can apply for grant to pay for major AT investments, such as classroom FM system

4 ☐ School provides funds for AT purchases

5 ☐ Civic organizations help fund AT

6 ☐ Medicaid or other non-private health insurance funds AT purchases

7 ☐ Parents or guardians, through private insurance, fund AT purchases

8 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

9 ❍ Don't know

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

E17. Does your school provide professional development for the following teachers and/or aides, regarding the use and benefits of AT?

Select one only per row

	Provide AT professional development for *all teachers/aides*	Provide AT professional development for *some teachers/aides*	*We do not provide* AT professional development
a. General education teachers and/or aides	1 ❍	2 ❍	0 ❍
b. Special education teachers and/or aides	1 ❍	2 ❍	0 ❍

The next questions focus on charter schools and their relationship with local education agencies.

E18. Is your school a charter school?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

IF YOUR ANSWER TO E18 = 1, THEN COMPLETE E19

E19. For your students with disabilities, who has responsibility for the following, either for policy or contractual reasons?

Select one only per row

	My charter school or charter school district has primary responsibility	Shared responsibility between my charter school/charter school district and the student's local school district of residence	The student's local school district of residence has primary responsibility	Don't know
a. Identification and evaluation of students suspected of having a disability (for example, Child Find)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
b. Coordination of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
c. Development of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
d. Monitoring progress toward achievement of IEP goals	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
e. Provision of documents, forms, and resources to promote the quality of IEPs	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
f. Provision of special education teachers and staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
g. Provision of related services staff	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
h. Placements inside the general education class	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
i. Placements in specialized settings (for example, separate classes, separate schools, or other locations)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
j. Transportation for students with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
k. Required qualifications for educators who serve students with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
l. Provision of professional development to school staff on supporting students with disabilities	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
m. Funding for special education and related services	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍
n. Determining discipline policy or procedures	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	d ❍

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

F. SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL, BEHAVIORAL, AND MENTAL HEALTH SUPPORTS

The next questions focus on the strategies adopted to manage behavioral issues and support the positive behavioral development and social-emotional skills of students with disabilities.

F1. Which of the following strategies, programs, or curricula does your school use to support the *positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns* of students with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Mental health specialists to work with children needing individualized support
2 ☐ Early warning indicator systems
3 ☐ Trauma-informed curriculum
4 ☐ Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)
5 ☐ Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports
6 ☐ Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA), including Pivotal Response Training (PRT) and discrete trials
7 ☐ Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) and Behavioral Intervention Plans (BIPS)
8 ☐ Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL) training modules
9 ☐ Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence
10 ☐ Calm Classroom
11 ☐ First Step to Success
12 ☐ Incredible Years
13 ☐ Lions Quest
14 ☐ Mandt System
15 ☐ Positive Action
16 ☐ Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS)
17 ☐ Second Step
18 ☐ Tools of the Mind
19 ☐ Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training
20 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 1, THEN COMPLETE F2

F2. Now consider *prekindergarten students*; which of the following strategies, programs, or curricula does your school use to support the *positive behavioral development, social-emotional skills, or mental health concerns* of students with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Early childhood mental health specialists to work with children needing individualized support
2 ☐ Early warning indicator systems
3 ☐ Trauma-informed curriculum
4 ☐ Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)
5 ☐ Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports
6 ☐ Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA), including Pivotal Response Training (PRT) and discrete trials
7 ☐ Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) and Behavioral Intervention Plans (BIPS)
8 ☐ Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL) training modules
9 ☐ Pyramid Model for Supporting Social Emotional Competence
10 ☐ Calm Classroom
11 ☐ First Step to Success
12 ☐ Incredible Years
13 ☐ Lions Quest
14 ☐ Mandt System
15 ☐ Positive Action
16 ☐ Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS)
17 ☐ Second Step
18 ☐ Tools of the Mind
19 ☐ Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training
20 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

OMB Clearance Number: 1850-0949
Expiration Date: 10/31/2022

F3. Does your school collaborate with other agencies or entities to provide *mental health and/or social-emotional supports* for students with disabilities?

1 ❍ Yes

0 ❍ No

IF YOUR ANSWER TO F3 = 1, THEN COMPLETE F4

F4. Which agencies or entities has your school collaborated with to provide *direct mental health and/or social-emotional supports* for students with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Behavioral/mental health agency

2 ☐ Court system

3 ☐ Developmental disabilities agency

4 ☐ Early Intervention Part C

5 ☐ Head Start

6 ☐ Health agency

7 ☐ Local or state disability advocacy groups

8 ☐ Private therapists or therapy organizations (for example, trauma-informed therapists, applied behavior analysis providers)

9 ☐ Social services

10 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

G. STAFFING

The next questions focus on challenges related to finding and retaining effective special education teachers and program personnel, professional development for general education teachers, and filled special education positions at your school.

G1. During the 2019–2020 school year, did you have an *unfilled position* for a special education teacher or other Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP)?

	Yes	No
a. Special education teacher	1 ❍	0 ❍
b. Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP)	1 ❍	0 ❍

G2. Please indicate the types of effective *special education personnel* that your school has experienced difficulty finding or retaining during the current (2019–2020) or preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019).

Select all that apply

	Not applicable; the *district* is responsible for hiring and retaining this type of personnel	School had difficulty *finding* personnel	School had difficulty *retaining* personnel	School had *no issues* finding or retaining personnel
a. Audiologists	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
b. Behavioral analysts or experts	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
c. Nurses	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
d. Occupational therapists	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
e. Orientation/mobility specialists	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
f. Physical therapists	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
g. Psychologists	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
h. Service coordinators	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
i. Sign language interpreters	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
j. Speech/language pathologists	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
k. Social workers	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
l. Teacher aides, paraprofessionals, or personal care assistants	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
m. Transition specialists	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
n. Other	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍

*Please specify*_____

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 1, THEN COMPLETE G3

G3. Please indicate the types of effective *special education* personnel who work with *preschool-age children* that your school has experienced difficulty finding or retaining during the current (2019–2020) or preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019).

Select all that apply

		Not applicable; the *district* is responsible for hiring and retaining this type of personnel	School had difficulty *finding* personnel	School had difficulty *retaining* personnel	School had *no issues* finding or retaining personnel
a.	Audiologists	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
b.	Behavioral analysts or experts	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
c.	Early childhood special educators	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
d.	Nurses	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
e.	Occupational therapists	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
f.	Orientation/mobility specialists	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
g.	Physical therapists	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
h.	Psychologists	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
i.	Service coordinators	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
j.	Sign language interpreters	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
k.	Speech/language pathologists	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
l.	Social workers	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
m.	Teacher aides, paraprofessionals, or personal care assistants	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
n.	Transition specialists	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍
o.	Other *Please specify* _____	0 ❍	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ❍

G4. During the current (2019–2020) or preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019), please indicate the types of special education teachers for whom your school had *difficulty finding effective applicants*.

Select all that apply

Special education teachers who primarily serve students with:

1 ☐ Autism
2 ☐ Developmental delays
3 ☐ Emotional disturbance/behavior disorders
4 ☐ Intellectual disability
5 ☐ Learning disabilities
6 ☐ Sensory impairments (hearing/vision)
7 ☐ Other low incidence disabilities (for example, other health impairments, orthopedic impairments, or multiple disabilities)
8 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

9 ❍ We had no difficulties filling these positions

IF YOUR ANSWER TO A2 = 11, 12, 13, OR 14, THEN COMPLETE G5

G5. During the current (2019–2020) or preceding two school years (2017–2018 and 2018–2019), please indicate the types of *secondary school* special education teachers for which your school had *difficulty finding effective applicants*.

Select all that apply

Secondary school special education teachers of:

1 ☐ English/language arts
2 ☐ Mathematics
3 ☐ Science
4 ☐ Social studies (including history, civics, geography, and economics
5 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

6 ❍ We had no difficulties filling these positions

G6. During the 2018–2019 school year, how many special education teachers served students with disabilities ages 3 through 21 at your school?

Please indicate the number in full-time equivalents (FTE).

Ages 3–5	Ages 6–21
|____|	|_____|

G7. Following the 2018–2019 school year, how many special education teachers serving students with disabilities ages 3 through 21 left your school for any reason?

Please indicate the number in full-time equivalents (FTE).

Ages 3–5	Ages 6–21
|____|	|_____|

G8. How often does your school offer training *for general education teachers* that focuses on working with students with disabilities?

Select one only

1 ❍ At least once a month
2 ❍ Once every two months
3 ❍ Twice a year
4 ❍ Once a year
5 ❍ Less than every year
6 ❍ Never

IF YOUR ANSWER TO G8 = 1-5, THEN COMPLETE G9

G9. What is the typical length of your school's training sessions for *general education teachers* that are focused on working with students with disabilities?

If the session lengths vary, please select the answer that is closest to the average length.

Select one only

1 ❍ Less than an hour
2 ❍ One hour
3 ❍ Two hours
4 ❍ Three to five hours
5 ❍ Six to eight hours
6 ❍ More than eight hours

IF YOUR ANSWER TO G8 = 1-5, THEN COMPLETE G10

G10. During the 2018–19 school year (including summer 2018), which of the following topics were included in your school's training sessions for *general education teachers* focused on working with students with disabilities?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Addressing the needs of students with a specific type of disability *(Please specify disability type(s))*

_____

2 ☐ Implementing co-teaching models in the classroom

3 ☐ Delivering an intervention focused on language/literacy skills

4 ☐ Delivering an intervention focused on math/science skills

5 ☐ Delivering a curriculum or intervention focused on social-emotional/ behavioral skills

6 ☐ Effective implementation of behavioral support plans and high quality Functional Behavioral Analysis (FBA)

7 ☐ Effective implementation of assistive technology (AT)

8 ☐ Following behavioral plans for students with disabilities

9 ☐ New policies/regulations/guidelines for serving students with disabilities

10 ☐ Provision of accommodations

11 ☐ Risk factors or signs of disability

12 ☐ Use and benefits of Universal Design for Learning

13 ☐ Using assessments to inform instructional planning and data-based decision making

14 ☐ Using evidence-based practices for serving students with disabilities

15 ☐ Other topics related to serving students with disabilities *(Please specify)*

_____

H. EVIDENCE FROM RESEARCH

The final section focuses on the use of evidence from research.

H1. How often does your school draw on the following sources of information when selecting special education policies and practices?

Select one only per row

	Never or not applicable	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Don't know
a. Guidance or advice from the state education department or a technical assistance center funded by the state	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
b. A list of vendors approved by the state	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
c. Information provided by the intervention's developer or vendor	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
d. Recommendations from colleagues in my own or other school districts	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
e. Information from a federally funded technical assistance center	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
f. Information from a U.S. Department of Education Comprehensive Center	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
g. Information from a U.S. Department of Education Regional Educational Laboratory (REL)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
h. Information from the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
i. Information from the district's research/evaluation office	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
j. Information from professional associations	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
k. Information from a college/university researcher	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
l. Information from a research journal	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
m. Social media (Twitter, Facebook, Pinterest, other)	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍
n. Other	1 ❍	2 ❍	3 ❍	4 ❍	d ❍

Please specify_____

H2. How does your school ensure that staff are using evidence-based practices in providing special education and related services?

Select all that apply

1 ☐ Observations or videos of staff

2 ☐ Parent reports

3 ☐ Review of IEPs

4 ☐ Review of written materials such as lesson plans

5 ☐ Help from outside consultants or coaches

6 ☐ Teacher self-assessments of use of evidence-based practices

7 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*

_____

8 ❍ None of the above

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!