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Preparations for the 2017 Representative Assembly (RA) meeting at CEC 2017 in Boston are underway. The RA will meet on Friday, April 21, from 12:30–4:30 pm. A major portion of this year’s discussion will focus on the work that has been accomplished throughout the past year and a half by CEC’s Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Reauthorization Workgroup. The workgroup was established by the CEC Board of Directors in Fall 2015 to begin developing principles and recommendations for future IDEA reauthorization. The workgroup has conducted town hall meetings and surveys to identify potential issues for reauthorization in this member-driven process.

At this time, CEC is not calling on Congress to reauthorize IDEA; our leadership is simply doing its due diligence as the largest special education professional association to be prepared with principles and recommendations when IDEA reauthorization is taken up by Congress.

This upcoming discussion is a critical part of the process in order to obtain further input from CEC members through their units, divisions, and the student membership. This preliminary draft of principles and recommendations, along with a series of questions for input and discussion at the RA Meeting in April, will prepare you to obtain and provide input at the RA meeting. RA members are asked to plan now for obtaining input from members of their units, divisions, and student members in order to be prepared for the discussion at the meeting.

Please reach out to your unit or division CAN Coordinator to coordinate your process for obtaining input. As you may know, the CEC CAN Coordinators gathered initial input on IDEA reauthorization from your members through a CEC Survey Monkey, CEC Town Halls, and CAN meetings.

The members of the IDEA Reauthorization Workgroup have been invited to attend the meeting as a resource during the discussion. The members of CEC’s IDEA Reauthorization Work Group include:

- Timothy Lewis, Chair
- Kaitlyn Brennan
- Gwendolyn Cartledge
- Vivian Correa
- John Eisenberg
- Linda Lewis
- Brandi Simonsen
- Russell Skiba
- Martha Thurlow
- Sharon Walsh

- Denise Whitford
- Phyllis Wolfram
- Mitchell Yell
- Gayle Zavala

- CEC Staff:
  - Alex Graham, CEC Executive Director
  - Deb Ziegler, CEC Director of Policy & Advocacy
  - Katie Grady, CEC Coordinator of Policy & Advocacy
CEC’s Commitment to Core Purposes of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

As the nation recently recognized the 40th anniversary of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), CEC is proud to take this time to reflect on the efforts of children and youth with disabilities, families, educators, and policy makers who were instrumental in the passage of this legislation and who remain committed to ensuring that individuals with disabilities attain a lifetime of success.

On November 29, 1975, President Gerald R. Ford signed into law the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (Public Law 94-142), legislation which paved the way for improved outcomes for individuals with disabilities. CEC was proud to lead the advocacy effort—alongside many parents, organizations, and individuals with disabilities—to secure Congressional passage of this landmark legislation, which marked a pivotal shift in how our nation perceived individuals with disabilities.

IDEA includes state formula grant programs, as well as a national program that supports professional development, technical assistance, and parent information and training, as well as dissemination, media, and technology investments. CEC recognizes that Parts A and B of the Act are permanently authorized, while Parts C and D need to be reauthorized.

CEC fully supports IDEA and remains committed to the continuing successful implementation of this essential law.

CEC supports the core purposes of IDEA, as stated in the Act:

- To ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education that emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living;

- To ensure that the rights of children with disabilities and parents of such children are protected;

- To assist States, localities, educational service agencies, and Federal agencies to provide for the education of all children with disabilities;

- To assist States in the implementation of a statewide, comprehensive, coordinated, multidisciplinary, interagency system of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families;

- To ensure that educators and parents have the necessary tools to improve educational results for children with disabilities by supporting system improvement activities; coordinated research and personnel preparation; coordinated technical assistance, dissemination, and support; and technology development and media services; and

- To assess, and ensure the effectiveness of, efforts to educate children with disabilities.
While CEC commends all involved for this dramatic progress, we also recognize the need to build upon our successes and continue to hold high expectations and outcomes for all children and youth with disabilities. CEC looks forward to continued collaboration with its members and policy makers to ensure that all individuals with disabilities have access to an environment that fosters academic, developmental, and social growth, as we move forward in the continued implementation and reauthorization of IDEA.
Well-Qualified and Supported Workforce

Principle

CEC supports the provision of the identification, cultivation, and continued support of a highly effective workforce. A highly effective workforce includes personnel who have a responsibility for the developmental, academic, and behavioral growth of children and youth in special education (e.g., special, gifted, and general education teachers; paraprofessionals; early childhood interventionists; specialized instructional support personnel\(^1\); and administrators).

Rationale

Research has overwhelmingly demonstrated positive relationships between a highly effective workforce and (a) children and youth’s developmental outcomes, (b) children and youth’s achievement, and (c) children and youth’s access to the general education curriculum. Further, children and youth from characteristically disadvantaged backgrounds, also termed at risk (e.g., economically disadvantaged, as well as culturally and linguistically diverse children and youth), tend to have inequitable access to highly effective personnel and a high turnover of personnel, consequently limiting their opportunities for favorable developmental outcomes, academic advancement, and steady progress toward individualized family services plan (IFSP) or individualized education program (IEP) goals.

In addition, special education is facing a crisis in terms of teacher recruitment and retention. The teacher shortage is at epidemic levels and must be addressed in order to sustain the profession and ensure access to highly effective instruction for children and youth with disabilities. In a recent report, 47 states reported shortages of special education teachers.\(^2\) Several factors currently influence teacher recruitment, including the reputation of the field, the cost of higher education outweighing the financial benefits of entering the profession, the lack of recruitment of culturally and linguistically diverse professionals. Further, factors are also currently influencing teacher retention (e.g., lack of administrative support, lack of personnel preparation programs and activities, low job satisfaction, difficult working conditions, the burden of paperwork). CEC recognizes that only some of these areas can be realistically addressed in IDEA reauthorization and will therefore focus on a commitment to efforts directed at the following:

- Recruitment of a diverse and highly effective workforce.

---

\(^1\) ESSA language used to represent related service providers

• Preparation of a diverse and highly effective workforce equipped to integrate 21st-century skills, tools, and strategies into its educational practice emphasizing
  • Use of performance-based preparation standards.
  • Skills in collecting, evaluating, and making decisions based on data for children and youth.
  • Ability to effectively engage and work with professionals across education settings to improve outcomes for children and youth.
  • Ability to effectively advocate for the profession, self, children, youth, and families.
  • Retention of a diverse and highly effective workforce.
  • Innovative methods for restructuring the responsibilities of special education teachers, specialized instructional support personnel, and school administrators as well as continued funding to conduct high-quality personnel preparation research.

Recommendations

Recruitment

• CEC recommends that personnel preparation programs increase the recruitment and retention of highly effective special education personnel, with a focus on preparing individuals from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

• CEC recommends significantly increasing the federal authorization and appropriation of funds under IDEA Part D for personnel preparation activities in order to address critical shortages in highly effective special education and specialized instructional support personnel.

Preparation

• CEC recommends that all children and youth with disabilities receive services from highly effective special and general education teachers, administrators, specialized instructional support personnel, as well as early childhood and early intervention personnel, consistent with the requirements of professional endorsed standards (e.g., CEC Initial and Advanced Preparation Standards).

• CEC recommends that all teacher and administrator preparation programs use measures of effective practice for program evaluation and/or approval on professional endorsed standards, whether from traditional programs, alternative programs, or teaching academies.

• CEC recommends that paraprofessionals who provide support to children and youth with disabilities receive systematic training based on professionally endorsed standards (e.g., CEC Standards for Paraprofessionals) to work collaboratively with the special and
general education teacher. Preparation of special and general education teachers should also include effective collaboration with paraprofessionals.

- CEC recommends that personnel preparation programs (traditional, alternative, or teaching academies) blend coursework with high quality clinical practice and performance based accountability which results in effective outcomes for children and youth with disabilities. High-quality clinical or field experiences should include work in high-need community agencies and schools.

- CEC recommends that, in addition to knowledge of academic subject matter content of the general curriculum, special and general education teachers be prepared to implement a set of evidence-based and high-leverage practices that improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities (e.g., assessment-based accommodations, differentiated instruction, data-based decision making, universal design for learning, functional behavioral assessments, multitiered systems of support, positive behavioral interventions and supports).

- CEC recommends that preparation and professional development programs integrate early childhood, school, and community mental health issues in training.

- CEC recommends that programs that prepare special and general education teachers, administrators, early childhood interventionists, and specialized instructional support personnel focus on meeting the needs of children from culturally and linguistically diverse groups by developing leaders in areas that will resolve issues of disproportionality (e.g., using culturally responsive pedagogy, differentiating the impact of culture and language from disability, understanding language development and language acquisition of English language learners).

Retention

- CEC recommends that special and general education teachers, administrators, early childhood interventionists, and specialized instructional support personnel be prepared and be given time and opportunities to work in teams to improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities.

- CEC recommends that mentoring, coaching, and induction programs in consultation with institutions of higher education (IHES) and school districts be encouraged and strengthened to support the special education workforce.

- CEC recommends the use of evidence-based strategies for professional development (PD; e.g., year-long PD, coaching and mentoring, professional learning communities, technical assistance).
Innovation

- CEC recommends that special education personnel be prepared for serving in diverse roles on teams (e.g., case managers/service coordinators who provide oversight of the special education process and paperwork; teachers who provide direct instruction to children and youth; interventionists who design developmental, academic, and behavioral interventions and co-implement them with team members).

- CEC recommends that federal funds be made available to conduct high-quality teacher education research that links teacher candidates’ performance in field experiences to growth in outcomes for children and youth. The funded research should also focus on the impact that specialized instructional support personnel and administrators have on outcomes for children and youth.

- CEC recommends that federal funds be made available to address problems of practice through partnerships with universities, technical assistance centers, and practitioners.

- CEC recommends that federal funds incentivize entering and remaining in the special education field through scholarships and employer-supported career advancement (e.g., teacher leadership and special education administration).
Principle

CEC supports the continued use of categorical disability identification for all categories currently identified in current federal law. CEC recognizes that several definitions and criteria need revisions to support a prevention focus, address mental health issues, reflect current research and practices, and ensure accurate counts of children who have hearing and visual impairments.

Rationale

Students benefit from empirically supported academic, behavioral, social, and related instruction and support. As stated in previous iterations of the IDEA, before a student is identified with a disability, educators should document efforts to

- Implement effective instructional, behavioral, and related supports with fidelity for all students.
- Use a universal screening process to identify students who require additional support to achieve academic, behavioral, and social (i.e., educational) benefits.
- Provide targeted supports (e.g., small-group, skill-focused academic instruction, small-group social skills instruction, tier-2 behavior intervention) to students identified with some level of risk through universal screening.
- Carefully monitor supports to identify and evaluate students who demonstrate significant (chronic or intense) risk.
- Provide intensive intervention to students with significant risk and special education and related services to students identified with disabilities.

Currently, response to intervention (RtI) is tied to the procedures to identify students with specific learning disabilities (SLD). CEC intends to continue discussing potential recommendations regarding response to intervention and multi-tiered systems of support, but further guidance from CEC members and the field is needed.

Recommendations

- CEC recommends the use of the phrase *emotional or behavioral disorder* instead of the phrase *emotionally disturbed*, and recommends that the following definition\(^3\) for

emotional or behavioral disorder replace the current definition for emotionally disturbed:

The term *emotional or behavioral disorder* (EBD) means a disability characterized by behavioral or emotional responses in school so different from appropriate age, cultural, or ethnic norms that they adversely affect educational performance. Educational performance includes academic, social, vocational, and personal skills. Such a disability—

Is more than a temporary, expected response to stressful events in the environment.
Is consistently exhibited in two different settings, at least one of which is school-related; and
Is unresponsive to direct intervention in general education, or the child's condition is such that general education interventions would be insufficient.

Presents emotional and behavioral disorders that can co-exist with other disabilities.

Categorically may include children or youth with identified mental health disorders when those disorders adversely affect educational performance.

- CEC recommends the use of culturally sensitive practices and materials in the evaluation section.
- CEC recommends adding language to ensure that students with identified mental health disorders may be included in the identification of other health-impaired students.

### Questions for the Representative Assembly

CEC intends to continue discussing potential recommendations regarding response to intervention and multi-tiered systems of support framework but needs further guidance from CEC members and the field.

Currently, response to intervention is tied to the procedures to identify students with specific learning disabilities.

- Should this identification procedure be retained for students with specific learning disabilities?
- Should this identification procedure be expanded to include all disability categories?
- Should multi-tiered systems of support framework replace response to intervention in the identification of students with specific learning disabilities?
- Should multitiered systems of support framework be used in the identification of all disability categories?
3 Equal Access to General Education Opportunities

Principle

CEC supports continued expansion of monitoring and protections in order to ensure equity and appropriate levels of service for culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students, in an effort to overcome historical inequality in service trends for those students. CEC also supports continued attention to reducing disproportionate rates of exclusionary discipline (out-of-school suspension and expulsion) for all students with disabilities, especially where those disproportionate rates affect CLD students with disabilities. Finally, CEC supports continued efforts to ensure that English learners with disabilities receive an appropriate level of special education support to meet their needs, and that the reauthorization of IDEA places particular emphasis on continued efforts to determine how best to make appropriate eligibility determinations for English learners.

Rationale

The disproportionate representation of students with disabilities, especially African American students in the categories of Intellectual Disability and Emotional Disturbance, have been identified as an issue in special education almost since the founding of the field, and remains a pressing issue today. Despite provisions intended to address disproportionality in both IDEA 1997 and IDEA 2004, issues of over- and underrepresentation of CLD students remain critical considerations. Further, disciplinary provisions in IDEA 1997 and especially IDEA 2004 were intended to protect the rights of students with disabilities to a free and appropriate public education, and to minimize the disproportionality of CLD students in special education and in exclusionary discipline. Yet, for example, students with disabilities remain significantly overrepresented in rates of out-of-school suspension and expulsion, and emerging research has shown that race interacts with disability to significantly increase risk of school exclusion. Finally, provisions in IDEA are intended to ensure that English learners are not identified for special education services solely due to language deficits but rather meet criteria for eligibility, regardless of native language. Yet determining how to measure a disability across both English and one's native language has proven difficult in theory and practice, and a reticence to refer students based on language issues may have led to service-related implementation issues for English learners with legitimate disabilities. CEC will focus on a commitment to efforts directed at the following:

- A change in terminology in regard to students from diverse backgrounds.
- An expansion of oversight to ensure appropriate levels of service for CLD students.
• An expansion of oversight to ensure that English learners receive an appropriate level of support.

• An expansion of efforts to reduce disproportionate rates of exclusionary discipline.

• An expansion of reporting efforts in the area of disproportionality

Recommendations

Change in Terminology

• CEC recommends a change in federal terminology regarding students and personnel from diverse backgrounds. CEC supports the elimination of the term minority group and instead the use of the term culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) to describe students, families, and personnel who do not currently represent the dominant group in the United States.

Appropriate Levels of Service

• CEC recommends strengthening provisions that would require state education agencies to detail state improvement plans for preventing and reducing disproportionate outcomes in both the short and long term, as well as supporting regulations put in place by the Department of Education and integrating them into IDEA reauthorization.

• CEC recommends additional allowable uses of authorized IDEA funds for the use of culturally responsive practices in pre- and post-referral interventions for students who are CLD. Funds may be used to carry out the following activities:
  • To assist local education agencies in providing practices that increase equity and prevent, reduce, or eliminate racial, ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic disparities for children with disabilities (e.g., culturally responsive practices).

English Learners

• CEC recommends data collection, analysis, and appropriate methods for improvement that meet the needs of English learners that can continuously improve the differentiation between issues of language learning and disability. Funds may be used to carry out the following activities:
  • Data collection on the representation of English learners, as well as the subgroups within English Learners, in special education; and
  • Data collection to conduct a root-cause analysis to inform intervention planning and provide information to make improvements to identification.

---
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**Reduction in Exclusionary Discipline**

- CEC recommends additional allowable uses of authorized IDEA funds for the implementation of multitiered systems of support as preventative alternatives to suspension and expulsion. Funds may be used to carry out the following activities:
  - Assisting local education agencies in providing practices that increase equity and prevent, reduce, or eliminate racial, ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic disparities for children with disabilities (e.g., culturally responsive practices).
  - Assisting local educational agencies in providing multi-tiered systems to reduce reliance on exclusionary discipline.
  - CEC recommends that no child enrolled in special education or early intervention through IDEA (birth through the third grade) can be suspended or expelled.

**Reporting**

- CEC recommends additional data-reporting requirements with respect to the discipline of students with and without disabilities and especially students who are CLD, with and without disabilities, to include data on findings of significant disproportionality.
Principle

CEC supports student access to and full participation in the general education curriculum supported through evidence-based instructional supports leading to improved student outcomes.

Rationale

Children with disabilities are general education students who require and benefit from special education and related services. To ensure that students with disabilities served under IDEA demonstrate improved educational outcomes, it is essential that they are taught with evidence-based practices in the least restrictive environment that supports their access to and participation in the grade-level general education curriculum aligned to the state’s academic content standards. Research and demonstration efforts have pointed to several practices that support improved outcomes. These include universally designed academic, developmental, and social-behavioral strategies, services, and supports.

Recommendations

- CEC recommends that the term general education curriculum be defined to mean “the curriculum that is applicable to all children and is based on the state's academic content standards that apply to all children within the state.”

- CEC recommends that academic goals included in a child's individualized education program (IEP) be based on the state's content standards and include, as appropriate, other goals that the IEP team deems appropriate for the child, such as life skills, self-advocacy, social skills, and desired postschool activities. CEC recommends that language be included that clarifies the stipulation that alignment to the general education curriculum does not replace the individualized decision making required in the IEP process.

- CEC recommends that all children with disabilities, regardless of the severity of their disabilities, be provided universally designed, systematic, explicit instruction, learning strategy instruction, appropriate accommodations, and other evidence-based instructional strategies and supports that meet individual needs.

- CEC recommends that the progress of all children with disabilities be monitored throughout the year so that instruction, services, and supports can be adjusted to produce improved educational outcomes.
Principle

CEC supports IDEA’s requirements for inclusion of children with disabilities in all Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) accountability standards. All accountability requirements under IDEA and ESSA should be consistent.

Rationale

The continued focus on the educational outcomes of children with disabilities has had a dramatic positive effect on access and instruction for children with disabilities. IDEA accountability has evolved to a results-driven accountability (RDA) framework that is intended to shift from a compliance focus to an outcome focus, to improve educational achievement and skills of children with disabilities. Although compliance with IDEA is important, the new framework helps state education agencies (SEAs) and lead agencies under Part C create a more integrated approach to serving all children, including those with special needs. To build this capacity, states have developed and are implementing a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that serves as a new indicator for the state performance plan under IDEA. Federal-to-state determinations are now based on combined compliance and results indicators. Disproportionality in special education is a focus of monitoring, and refinements in the measurement of disproportionality are under consideration and should be reflected in IDEA monitoring as a standard measure across states. The reauthorization of ESSA continues to require that students with disabilities participate in state assessments and school accountability measures, with states allowed to define their own accountability systems within defined parameters. Both of the IDEA and ESSA accountability approaches have provided important avenues for documenting the progress of students with disabilities and for creating an impetus for greater attention to instruction for these students.

Recommendations

- CEC recommends the alignment of IDEA accountability requirements with ESSA accountability standards.
- CEC recommends that IDEA language at § 616 related to Monitoring Priorities require educational results be monitored from early childhood through transition out of IDEA eligibility.
- CEC recommends the revision of IDEA language related to Monitoring Priorities by requiring that “priorities” refer to measuring disproportionate representation of racial, linguistic, and ethnic groups receiving special education and related services to the
extent the representation is the result of inappropriate identification measured in the same way across states and local education agencies (LEAs).

- CEC recommends language that state performance plans developed under IDEA be aligned with consolidated state performance plans required under ESSA.

- CEC recommends the four determination levels the U.S. Secretary of Education assigns in the review of State Performance Plans be changed to reflect the importance of outcomes and results, as follows:
  a) Achieves results and meets requirements of this part;
  b) Substantially achieves results and meets requirements of this part;
  c) Partially achieves results and meets requirements of this part; and
  d) Does not achieve results or meet requirements of this part.

- CEC recommends that the provisions related to notice and opportunity for a hearing under § 616(d)(2)(B) be expanded to all levels of determination including “Substantially achieves results and meets requirements of this part.”

- CEC recommends the inclusion of language to confirm that earning a state-defined alternate diploma does not end a student’s free appropriate public education.

---

**Questions for the Representative Assembly**

- Should CEC recommend changes to the monitoring enforcement language that includes more options in the continuum of sanctions from technical assistance to withholding funds??

---

Principle

CEC supports including specific provisions in IDEA to promote social, emotional, and behavioral well-being of children and youth with disabilities through the use of evidence-based assessment and intervention practices.

Rationale

Many students with disabilities served under IDEA display challenging behaviors across school settings. In addition, students with disabilities are disproportionately subjected to exclusionary disciplinary practices (e.g., suspension, expulsion) and crisis intervention procedures (e.g., restraint, seclusion) in U.S. schools. The data on these short-term exclusionary disciplinary practices strongly suggest that many students with disabilities may not be receiving appropriate behavioral interventions through their individualized education programs (IEP), and thus may not be receiving a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE). A critical component to a student’s school and postsecondary success is the ability to effectively manage one’s own behavior and interact with others in socially appropriate ways. Fortunately, decades of science support the use of functional behavioral assessment (FBA) and empirically supported positive behavioral interventions and supports to address these important student needs. Unfortunately, the current statute and regulatory language promoting the use of FBA to guide individualized positive behavioral interventions and support plans is tied to reaching a 10-day limit of exclusionary discipline practices. Developing and implementing evidence-based prevention and early intervention practices, such as designing instructional environments to promote children and youth’s social and emotional development and well-being, explicitly teaching social skills (including pro-social behaviors to replace current challenging behaviors), and providing specific feedback to encourage prosocial behavior and social–emotional well-being, are essential to successful school and postsecondary outcomes for students with disabilities.

Recommendations

- CEC recommends a stronger emphasis on preventative and proactive use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, evidence-based mental health services, and similar strategies to (a) increase the likelihood of delivering a FAPE in the LRE to students who exhibit challenging behavior, (b) improve a student's social, emotional, and behavioral development, and (c) decrease the likelihood of using exclusionary disciplinary practices with students with disabilities who exhibit challenging behaviors.
CEC further recommends that this information be included in § 601 "Findings" of the law.6

- CEC recommends that the term functional performance, used throughout the statute, be further defined to specifically include behavior. CEC further recommends that this be included in § 602 "Definitions" of the law.

- CEC recommends that FBAs be included in the assessment section of IDEA which describes the requirements that the local educational agency must follow when determining the content of a student's IEP.7 Like other assessments used to inform instruction, CEC recommends that the process of gathering informal data about the function of a student's behavior be clearly distinguished from a formal evaluation requiring parental consent. However, in the event of a formal FBA (i.e., records review, interviews with family members and educators, systematic direct observations) and/or functional analysis (e.g., experimental manipulation of environmental conditions to determine function), CEC recommends obtaining parental consent. Note that parental consent to conduct a formal FBA may be obtained as part of the consent process for an initial evaluation or reevaluation.

- CEC further recommends that the following language be included: "A functional behavioral assessment should be conducted with students whose behavior impedes their learning or the learning of others, to guide development and implementation of positive behavioral interventions and supports."

- CEC recommends that the words "consider the use of" in the language used in the IEP section of IDEA—"(i) in the case of a child whose behavior impedes the child's learning or that of others, consider the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and other strategies, to address that behavior in the student’s IEP”—be changed to "develop and implement,” so that this section would read: "(i) in the case of a child whose behavior impedes the child’s learning or that of others, develop and implement positive behavioral interventions and supports, and other strategies, to address that behavior in the student's IEP.”

---

Postsecondary and Career-Ready Alignment

Principle

CEC supports the alignment of educational programs with postsecondary education and career-ready outcomes.

Rationale

The successful transition of students with disabilities served under IDEA to graduation and postschool environments remains a critical outcome of education for these students. Desired postschool environments are those available to all students, such as jobs and apprenticeship programs, as well as 2-year college and other training programs, and 4-year college programs (including those designed for students with intellectual disability). Independent living is the ultimate outcome for all students, including those with disabilities. With the current emphasis on ensuring that students leave school ready for a global economy, and the need for all students to be “college- and career-ready” (as defined broadly), it is especially important that secondary education success and readiness for employment, training, or further education is planned and realized for all students with disabilities regardless of race, ethnicity, economic disadvantage, or English learner status.

For this to happen, students with disabilities must be enrolled in educational programs with these end points in view. In addition, students with disabilities need services and supports targeted toward successful transition to these evolving postsecondary environments starting as early as possible. Tracking students into programs limited to attaining certain postschool goals is inappropriate; specific postschool goals should be refined each year with the input of families as the student approaches transition to postsecondary environments.

Recommendations

- CEC recommends that evidence-based transition services be provided to students with disabilities starting at age 14, at the latest, through a transition plan.
- CEC recommends that the transition plan include an updated list of components.
- CEC recommends that the statute’s language about transition be revised and simplified to indicate that the individualized education program (IEP) must include appropriate, measurable academic and functional goals with documented alignment to postsecondary training; education; and, when appropriate, independent living skills.
- CEC recommends the establishment of opportunities for students with disabilities to participate in college programming in institutions of higher education during and after
their secondary school years, including programs specifically for students with intellectual disability.

- CEC recommends that there be continued emphasis on access to the general education curriculum for all students with disabilities.

- CEC recommends that there be clarification to the effect that all educational programs in which students with disabilities participate are to be aligned to the goals of inclusion in postsecondary education and readiness for employment after transition from educational programs.

- CEC recommends that all academic and functional goals (e.g., behavioral, social–emotional) included in IEPs must be consistent with college and career readiness.

- CEC recommends that students be prepared for transition to the world of work through work experiences which may include apprenticeships and other initial positions that could be preparation for sustained, self-supporting employment.

- CEC recommends that students with disabilities receive direct and substantial social skills training that will enable the learner to be successful in postsecondary work, training, and study environments.

- CEC recommends that students with disabilities receive training on needed social skills and self-advocacy skills for postsecondary apprenticeship, work, training, and postsecondary environments.
Principle

CEC supports the provision of three procedural safeguards that protect the rights of children and families and support local flexibility while facilitating partnerships in making individual-child decisions that ensure effective evidence-based instruction in safe and positive environments.

The safeguards are Independent Educational Evaluations (IEEs), Definition of Serious Bodily Injury, and Credentials for Advocates. Rational and recommendations are presented in each of the three categories, below.

Rationale

Independent Educational Evaluations

The IDEA statute includes the term *independent educational evaluation*, but does not provide specific guidance to parents or the public agency. Federal regulations\(^8\) require the public agency to file due process to show its evaluation is appropriate, or ensure that an IEE is provided at public expense. The requirement that a due process hearing is the only process that the public agency may use to establish the appropriateness of the evaluation conducted by school experts creates a financial burden and an adversarial relationship with parents. Determining the appropriateness of the evaluation should be reviewed using a collaborative process at the local level with the parents and the public agency. The recommendation for statutory language would provide clarification and establish reasonable parameters around requests for IEEs.

Definition of Serious Bodily Injury

School districts have a legal and moral responsibility to ensure that children and the staff are safe from serious injury while at school or school functions. The current statute uses the definition of *serious bodily injury* from § 1365(h)(3) of Title 18, United States Code, which is a threshold that is too high to be used in any educational setting. Local school districts must respond to concerns about student behavior in a proactive and preventive manner. Local school districts are required to address student behavior that impedes their behavior or that of others, and requires that the individualized education program (IEP) team consider the use of possible behavioral interventions and supports and strategies to address that behavior. This proposed change would be consistent with expanded provisions in the IEP designed to prevent the likelihood of serious bodily injury.

\(^8\) 34 U.S.C. § 300.502(b)(2).
**Credentials for Advocates**

State education agencies (SEAs), local education agencies (LEAs), and parents have expressed concerns about the qualifications of individuals that advertise and provide advocacy services. Currently there is no mechanism to ensure these individuals are qualified to represent parents and work collaboratively with the LEA when advocating for students with disabilities.

**Recommendations**

**Independent Educational Evaluations**

- CEC recommends that the provisions for IEEs⁹ be expanded as follows: An opportunity for the parents of a child with a disability to examine all records relating to such child and to participate in meetings with respect to the identification, evaluation, and educational placement of the child, and the provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to such child, and to obtain an IEE of the child as described below:
  - The parents of a child with a disability have the right under this part to obtain an independent educational evaluation of the child at public expense subject to paragraphs (a)-(g) of this section.
  - A parent has the right to an IEE at public expense if the parent disagrees with an evaluation obtained by the public agency and informs the public agency in writing of the reasons for disagreeing with the public agency’s evaluation.
  - Prior to obtaining an IEE, the parent, in collaboration with the public agency, must consider the administration of additional assessments conducted by the public agency.
  - A resolution session must be held to enable the public agency an opportunity to demonstrate the appropriateness of the evaluation.
  - Upon determination that an IEE should be obtained as an outcome of the resolution session, the evaluation must be conducted by a qualified examiner who is not employed by the public agency responsible for the education of the child in question nor employed by a private service agency that the child may attend, and the public agency must provide a list of qualified providers.
  - The public agency must provide the criteria and cost limitations that apply to IEEs.
  - A parent is entitled to only one IEE, which could include multiple components at public expense each time the public agency conducts an evaluation with which the parent disagrees.

---

• If a parent obtains an IEE at public expense or shares with the public agency an evaluation obtained at private expense, the public agency must consider the evaluation in any decision made with respect to the provision of FAPE to the child.

**Definition of Serious Bodily Injury**

• CEC recommends revising the definition for Serious Bodily Injury for IDEA purposes as provided below:
  • "Serious bodily injury" means a significant physical injury that:
    Requires the attention of a healthcare professional and absence from school (e.g., broken bones, unconsciousness, need for stitches, or where an ambulance must be called to care for any person); or
    Causes an absence from school or work pursuant to doctors’ orders; or
    Requires an overnight stay in a hospital; or
    Is a compensable injury under the applicable workers' compensation statute.

**Credentials for Advocates**

• CEC recommends adding a definition for advocate to Section 602.
• CEC recommends adding a requirement to Section 612 that the SEA may establish a credential for those that provide advocacy services for parents in special education meetings. The credential will be developed through collaboration with appropriate stakeholders including the State Advisory Panel, Community Parent Resource Center, and/or the Parent Training and Information Centers.
Principle

CEC supports the provision of individualized appropriate evidence-based practices designed to improve child outcomes for all children with disabilities and their families, birth through 5 years.

Rationale

All states participate in the IDEA Part C Infant and Toddler and Part B Preschool Grants Programs. This commitment on the part of states and communities ensures that children from birth until age 3 with disabilities and their families have available individualized early intervention services. Further, it means that children 3 to 5 years of age with disabilities have available special education and related services designed to meet their individual needs. It is important to note, however, that states and communities have met this important obligation without adequate federal fiscal contributions.

Despite widespread acceptance of the importance of an early start for a child’s successful development, these IDEA federal programs have received only slight increases in the last several years. Part B § 611 funding may be used for preschoolers, 3 to 5 years, with disabilities. However, there is no obligation to use these funds for preschoolers, and in fact many states and school districts do not. Only the Part B § 619 funds are required to be used for preschoolers. As opportunities continue to increase for all young children to have early learning experiences in community settings with their peers, it is more important than ever to ensure adequate Part C and § 619 Preschool resources to support children with disabilities to be successful in those settings.

CEC is committed to efforts directed to

- The achievement of favorable developmental outcomes for all young children with disabilities.

- Assisting families in enhancing the development of their infants and toddlers with disabilities by strengthening early learning opportunities through the family’s daily activities and routines.

- The clarification that a natural environment is more than a place; it reflects the provision of appropriate evidence-based practices individualized to the needs of the child.

- A strengthened emphasis on providing evidence-based practices that support each child’s development within the context of his or her daily activities.

- Supporting the key role of families in the decision-making process.
• Maximizing all available public and private resources to ensure their most effective and efficient use

Recommendations

Funding

• CEC recommends permanently authorizing IDEA Part C.
• CEC recommends creating incentives in the Part C funding formula to assist states in increasing the number of Part C-eligible children served who receive needed early intervention services. There exists a great variability in the percentages of children served across states, with a range of 1% to about 7%. States should be encouraged to serve all children in need of early intervention to increase the likelihood of children’s success later in school. In any formula change, hold-harmless provisions should be instituted to ensure states do not lose funds, and increases to the small state allocation should be considered.
• CEC recommends the statute clarify that early intervening services (EIS) funds can be used for preschoolers.

Natural Environments

• CEC recommends that the term natural environment be defined and used throughout the statute to reflect not only location but also the provision of evidence-based practices within the context of the family’s routines and activities. The following are recommended uses of the term in the statute:
  • CEC recommends that the natural environments policy be revised to incorporate language related to the achievement of the child’s outcomes as follows:
    (1) To the maximum extent appropriate, early intervention services are provided within the context of the families' routines and activities, and (2) The provision of early intervention for each eligible child occurs in a setting other than within the context of the family's routines and activities that are appropriate, as determined by the individual family service plan (IFSP) team, only when the child's outcome(s) cannot be achieved satisfactorily for the child within the family's routines and activities.
  • CEC recommends that language in the content of the IFSP be revised to include:
    a statement of the places and routines in which early intervention services will appropriately be provided, including a justification of the extent, if any, to which the services will not be provided in the places and during the routines and activities of the family.

Services
• CEC recommends that clarifying language be added to the definition of *early intervention services*, stating that services are designed to address the family-identified resources, priorities, and concerns, as determined by the IFSP team, which relate to enhancing their child's development.

• CEC recommends Other Services language in the IFSP be clarified to ensure that the IFSP includes, to the extent appropriate, medical, child care, and other services necessary to meet the resources, priorities, and concerns of the child and family, but that are not required under Part C.

• CEC recommends that the term "notify" be changed to "refer" in the context of the Part C responsibility to send notification information on a child who may be eligible for special education and related services.

**Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)**

• CEC recommends that the LRE language for preschools be revised to be consistent with the preschool age as follows:

To the maximum extent appropriate, preschool children with disabilities are educated with nondisabled peers, and education separate from children without disabilities occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability of a child is such that education in settings with preschool children without disabilities, with the use of supplementary aids and services, cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

• CEC recommends that the individualized education program (IEP) content be revised for preschool-aged children to include "an explanation of the extent, if any, to which the child will not participate in educational settings with children without disabilities, such as Head Start, child care and Pre-K programs and in the daily activities and routines of the child."

**Transition**

• CEC recommends that language be added that requires LEAs to ensure that eligible children participating in preschool special education shall experience a smooth and effective transition to kindergarten or other school-aged programs.

**Suspension and Expulsion**

• CEC recommends that the practice of suspension and exclusion be prohibited for children from birth through third grade.
Principle

CEC advocates full funding for IDEA while supporting cost efficiencies and innovations to maintain or increase efforts to maintain free and appropriate public education (FAPE).

Rationale

The requirement for full funding for IDEA originates from the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142), signed into law in 1975, which authorized the federal government to pay 40% of each state’s “excess cost” of educating children with disabilities. That amount—commonly referred to as the “IDEA full funding” amount—is calculated by taking 40% of the national average per-pupil expenditure (APPE), multiplied by the number of children with disabilities served under IDEA in each state.

To ensure implementing IDEA was not burdensome for states and local entities and to assure that full funding was reached in a fiscally responsible manner, Congress adopted a full-funding formula that phased in funding increases for IDEA Part B over a period of 5 years—intending to reach full funding by fiscal year 1981. During the phase-in time, Congress expected local communities and states to provide the balance of funding. Over the years, however—although the law itself continues to work and children with disabilities are being educated and served—the intended federal/state/local cost-sharing partnership has not been realized because Congress never fulfilled its financial obligation. As a result, states and local agencies have had to bear increasing costs to ensure IDEA is fully implemented.

The requirements for maintaining effort at the local level need to be revised to reflect the weight on local tax dollars and to meet the changing economic conditions that local educational agencies (LEAs) are faced with annually due to the declining federal support.

Many CEC members have expressed concern over funding coordinated early intervening services (CEIS) solely with IDEA funds. There has been no evaluation to date that CEIS is working, and it is considered by many as only one methodology to address disproportionality; therefore, CEC recommends a new approach to CEIS.

Recommendations

Maintenance of Effort (MOE)\(^\text{10}\)

- CEC recommends additional allowable exceptions that include the following:

\(^{10}\) Section 613. Local Educational Eligibility
• Improved efficiencies that do not result in a reduction in special education services; or

• Reduction of expenditures for employment-related benefits provided to special education personnel (e.g., pay, retirement contributions, sick leave, health and life insurance), provided that such reduction of expenditures is made for all instructional personnel, and these reductions do not result in a reduction in special education services.

• LEA reduction of expenditures may be related to:
  - Re-enrollment of students upon exiting an LEA-contracted placement due to availability of appropriate program in the LEA,
  - Development of specialized programming within the LEA that was previously contracted for with other agency, or
  - Reduction of assistive technology costs due to price reduction of technology based on market price.

• CEC recommends a waiver process that would allow the state educational agency (SEA) to grant a waiver to the LEA as follows:

  • Waivers for exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances: The SEA may waive the requirements of maintenance of effort for a LEA, for one fiscal year at a time, if—
    - The SEA determines that the LEA has not reduced the level of expenditures for the education of children with disabilities for such fiscal year disproportionately to other expenditures; and
    - The SEA determines that granting a waiver would be equitable due to exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances such as a natural disaster or a precipitous and unforeseen decline in the financial resources of the LEA; or
    - The LEA provides clear and convincing evidence to the SEA that all children with disabilities have available to them FAPE, and the SEA concurs with the evidence provided by the LEA.

• CEC recommends that monitoring requirements regarding significant disproportionality\(^{11}\) be revised to ensure accountability and provide local flexibility with early intervening funds, as follows:

  • CEC recommends that the section that requires an LEA to reserve the maximum amount of funds under Section 613(f) to provide comprehensive coordinated early intervening services to children in the LEA, particularly children in those groups that were significantly overidentified, be removed.

---

\(^{11}\) Section 618(d)(2)(A–C)
Principle

CEC supports the continuation and enhancement of investments in initiatives authorized by IDEA Part D to stimulate and drive progress in special education and early intervention policy and practice at the federal, state, and local levels in order to improve developmental, educational, and transition outcomes for children and youth with disabilities.

Rationale

The U.S. Congress has long recognized the ongoing obligation of the federal government to support activities that contribute to positive results for children and youth with disabilities. The activities authorized by Part D have evolved over time as cost-effective responses to the shared needs and challenges facing state and local education agencies, parents, and others to continuously improve services, systems, and results. Starting in the 1960s with federally funded research, media, materials centers, and personnel training programs, the activities the federal government supports today through IDEA Part D form the vital national support infrastructure that efficiently and economically addresses the shared needs of agencies, organizations, and individuals across the nation. Each IDEA reauthorization presents the opportunity to refine and update Part D so that it continues to be responsive to current needs in policy and practice as these emerge at the state and local levels. Through the activities it supports, Part D plays an essential role in the federal–state partnership Congress has long envisioned for the effective implementation of IDEA.

Preparing and Supporting a Highly Effective Workforce

The identification, cultivation, and continued support of a highly effective workforce is critical in the implementation of IDEA and in ongoing efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities. A highly effective workforce includes personnel who have responsibility for the developmental, academic, and behavioral growth of children and youth in special education (e.g., special, gifted, and general education teachers, paraprofessionals, early childhood interventionists, and specialized instructional support personnel) as well as leadership personnel who develop, direct, and evaluate programs at the state and local levels and conduct research on persistent problems, test solutions, and design systemic improvements in policy and in the services and programs children receive. The Part D program’s main investments in workforce development are through grants for initial personnel preparation and state personnel development grants that provide resources to states that can be used to address their specific personnel needs. Part D

---

12 Section. 650(1) of IDEA Amendments of 2004
technical assistance centers also provide support to state and local staff to implement advances in policy and practice in high priority areas, such as assessment, intensive intervention, and dispute resolution. The Part D personnel development initiatives represent an important component in the shared efforts by states, local agencies, universities, and the federal government to ensure that programs serving children with disabilities are designed, staffed, and administered by a highly effective workforce.

**Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices**

Part D authorizes a range of activities that have been instrumental in bringing evidence of effective policy and practice to the attention of stakeholders; testing research findings in different settings; demonstrating how they can be adapted; and working in concert with state and local agencies to plan and support systemic changes that promote improved early intervention, educational, and transitional results for children with disabilities. Before evidence-based practices can be implemented, disseminated, and scaled up with support of Part D’s technical assistance and dissemination network, model demonstrations are critical. These projects implement a model of existing evidence-based intervention practices and strategies in typical settings, evaluate it in different settings, with different participants and resources, and further define it in terms of what it takes to implement and sustain it over time with fidelity and integrity.

As a critical strategy for moving policy and research into practice to support implementation of IDEA, model demonstration projects have played a significant role for more than 30 years in improving practice and securing better student outcomes. Among this program’s notable achievements have been its contributions to the development of the Part C program for infants and toddlers and the Part B preschool program, as well as for the development of assessments for progress monitoring and a model for schoolwide positive behavior support.

Despite its significant contributions in the past, the scope and impact of the model demonstration program has been significantly reduced in recent years, owing largely to what CEC characterizes as a “funding oversight” that needs to be corrected. IDEA 2004 moved most of the special education research authority from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to the Institute of Education Sciences (IES). However, it retained the model demonstration authority in Part D and combined it with the Technical Assistance and Dissemination (TA&D) program. The appropriation for research that had included funds for the model demonstration program before 2004 was moved in its entirety to IES, but Congress did not add funds to the TA&D budget to support model demonstration initiatives. In order to support model demonstration projects, OSEP has had to “borrow” funds from TA&D activities, effectively cutting support for those activities. OSEP has managed to direct a modest level of funding to model demonstration projects since 2004. However, investments have dropped—from $20-plus million a year before 2004 for new and continuing model projects to less than $4 million in fiscal year 2015. In fiscal year 2016, only three new projects were being funded, and in some recent years funding has been
insufficient to support any new projects. The funding situation has been further exacerbated in recent years by the erosion of funding for the TA&D line item, which has experienced a nearly 20% reduction since 2004. As a result, development and implementation of proven approaches, products, training, guidance, and technical support for making systemic changes to address children’s needs are not keeping up with demands.

Maximizing the Impact of Federal Special Education R&D Funds

CEC members in the R&D (research and development) community believe there is a need for enhanced and more transparent coordination between the National Center for Special Education Research (NCSER) and OSEP to better ensure the clear articulation of an R&D agenda that addresses high-priority problems of policy and practice related to achieving better results for children and youth with disabilities.

This perspective is based in part on an appreciation that both agencies are attempting to manage portfolios of programs and activities with dramatically fewer resources than a decade ago, which has in turn restricted the breadth and depth of their investments. In addition to the cuts described above in funding for the OSEP Part D model development program as well as in other Part D programs, NCSER’s special education research program has been cut by one third over the last decade. In light of severe budget reductions in both agencies, stakeholders believe that a portion of the resources appropriated to each of these two agencies needs to be strategically and cooperatively deployed to address persistent, high value issues and problems.

Part D of IDEA and the Education Sciences Reform Act (ESRA) direct their respective agencies (i.e., OSEP and NCSER) to develop plans for the activities they carry out. IDEA requires that OSEP develop a Comprehensive Plan for subparts 2 and 3 of Part D, including an opportunity for public input and consultation with NCSER. ESRA requires NCSER to develop a plan for special education research that is coordinated with the Part D Comprehensive Plan and developed in collaboration with the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. Neither law stipulates much in the way of how plans are to be developed nor what their contents should be. Although plans developed by each agency were published once prior to 2010, subsequent plans have not been publicly made available. Further, opportunities for broad public input, especially from national organizations and from administrators, practitioners, and parents have not been requested by either agency in recent years.

Recommendations

Preparing and Supporting a Highly Effective Workforce

In addition to recommendations listed under CEC IDEA Reauthorization Principle 2: Well Qualified and Supported Workforce that apply to the Part D State Personnel Development Grant Program and the Personnel Preparation Program,
• CEC recommends that Part D be amended to provide financial assistance for the
development, testing, evaluation, and dissemination of tools, systems, field experiences,
and other strategies to improve the effectiveness of preservice personnel preparation
programs in order to maximize the developmental, academic, and behavioral growth of
children and youth receiving special education services.

• CEC recommends that Part D place priority on and encourage state education agencies
to use a portion of the funds they receive under the State Professional Development
Grant Program (§ 651) to support the critical role that school leaders (e.g., principals,
other administrators) play in implementing and supporting systemic innovations and
changes that are directed at improving services and outcomes for children and youth
with disabilities.

• CEC recommends the continuation of the Part D § 662 program supporting high quality
programs for preservice preparation of special education teachers, early intervention
providers, and related service personnel and for the preparation of leadership personnel
in areas of priority need.

• CEC recommends that IDEA continue to require recipients of grants under § 662 to
expend a significant portion of the funds they receive to provide scholarships\(^\text{13}\) to
students enrolled in the program supported by the grant. In addition, CEC recommends
that service obligation requirements specified in § 662(h) for students who receive
scholarship support be retained in the law. CEC recommends § 662(h) be amended to
clarify that scholarship recipients may satisfy their repayment obligation by working in a
wide range of settings, including inclusive settings such as preschool and alternative
programs that serve children with disabilities as well as students who are not identified
as having a disability.\(^\text{14}\) The scholarship and service obligation requirements together
have proven to be effective tools for recruiting and retaining well-trained personnel
working directly with or on behalf of children and youth with disabilities.

• CEC recommends that OSEP be required to provide recipients of funds under § 662 with
annual reports of selected data from the OSEP-sponsored Personnel Development
Program Data Collection System on the progress and employment after program
completion of individuals who received scholarships under this program and who are
repaying their scholarship through qualified work in the field (the \textit{service obligation}).
This feedback, to be provided during and after the grant period, yields useful
information to grantees for evaluating the impact of programs and for future program
planning. Grantee stakeholders and OSEP should work together to identify the specific
data that would be included in the annual reports. Tracking data reported to grantees
cannot contain personally identifiable information.

\(^{13}\) Sec. 662(g).
\(^{14}\) See Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services letter to Sen. Patty Murray, August 31/2016
Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- CEC recommends that the authorizing language for Part D be amended in the following ways to explicitly identify the types and range of activities to be undertaken under the Model Demonstration Program authority (§ 663):
  - Emphasize that the purpose of the model demonstration program is to improve student developmental, education, and behavioral and transition outcomes by validating solutions to persistent educational challenges including their sustainability over time.
  - Identify as a funding priority projects that address complex problems affecting children who require interagency/interdisciplinary/boundary crossing responses.
  - Encourage and permit cost-sharing with partnerships, where appropriate, with relevant activities conducted under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), and with public and private agencies at the federal, state, and local levels that play a role in school and community efforts to meet the educational and developmental needs of children with disabilities, including in areas such as mental health, juvenile justice, employment training, and so on.
  - Where research evidence is lacking in areas of need identified by OSEP through its results-driven accountability procedures and other sources, permit a limited amount of model demonstration funds to be used to conduct studies to expand the existing knowledge base.
  - CEC recommends significant reinvestment by Congress to support initiatives designed to assist states and local agencies to make the systemic changes necessary to improve results for children with disabilities, including significant re-funding for model demonstration projects.

Maximizing the Impact of Federal Special Education R&D Funds

- CEC recommends that OSEP and NCSER be required to develop and update their respective plans every 5 years.
- CEC recommends that both NCSER and OSEP be required to invite and consider public input in the development of their respective plans in addition to other strategies the agencies may use to secure needed information for formulating their plans.
- CEC recommends that, in order to maximize the impact of agency resources, OSEP and NCSER be required to identify some areas (a shared agenda) of high need in the field toward which each will invest a portion of its annual appropriations. The purpose of establishing a set of shared priorities is to intentionally direct federal funds, using each agency's program mechanisms, to areas that have been identified as in need of significant and sustained investment (from research to technical assistance) and where
such investments are expected to result in significant improvements. In identifying such areas for coordinated attention and investment, OSEP and NCSER should be required to refer to information they obtain from such sources as results-driven accountability procedures; state and local agencies; national organizations representing parents, practitioners and administrators, researchers, policy makers, and others, as appropriate.

Questions for the Representative Assembly

CEC will develop recommendations for reauthorization of the sections below in future drafts. Specific recommendations will be developed after there is additional opportunity for CEC member input. What are your recommendations?

Sec. 651: State Personnel Development Grant Program
Sec. 664: Studies and Evaluations
Sec. 665: Interim Alternative Educational Settings, Behavioral Supports, and Systemic School Interventions
Sec. 671-673: Parent Information Centers, Community Parent Centers and TA Center
Sec. 674: Technology Development, Demonstration, and Utilization; Media services; and Instructional Materials