

State Systems of Technical Assistance Delivery in
Special Education: Key Questionnaire Findings
August 2005
DRAFT



Division of State Services and Technical Assistance at CCSSO in Partnership with the Access Center at the American Institutes for Research with support from the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs

Document written as part of the cooperative agreement between the Access Center and CCSSO

The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of Education or The Access Center: Improving Outcomes for All Students K-8 at the American Institutes for Research (AIR), and the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs. The opinions expressed in this document are those of the lead author, Elaine Bonner-Tompkins.

Council of Chief State School Officers

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is a bipartisan, nationwide, nonprofit organization of public officials who head departments of elementary and secondary education in the states, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense Education Activity, and five U.S. extra-state jurisdictions. CCSSO provides leadership, advocacy, and technical assistance on major educational issues. The Council seeks member consensus on major educational issues and expresses their views to civic and professional organizations, federal agencies, Congress, and the public.

Division of State Services and Technical Assistance

The Division of State Services and Technical Assistance supports state education agencies in developing standards-based systems that enable all children to succeed. Initiatives of the division support improved methods for collecting, analyzing and using information for decision-making; development of assessment resources; creation of high-quality professional preparation programs; emphasis on instruction suited for diverse learners; and the removal of barriers to academic success. The division combines existing activities in the former Resource Center on Educational Equity, the State Education Assessment Center, and the State Leadership Center.

School Improvement Initiative

The School Improvement Initiative, launched in 1995 as the Initiative to Improve Achievement in High Poverty Schools, focuses on increasing the capacity of state educational agencies to work with local districts toward improving student performance in high poverty schools through the effective implementation of ESEA, Title I, and other federal and state programs. The Initiative, whose goal is to ensure that students in high poverty schools gain the knowledge and skills necessary for sustained success, encompasses a wide set of activities and products to reach this objective. These include special education, school readiness, and high school redesign and extended learning initiatives; the Limited English Proficient Students Project; the Native American Student Education project; and the State Support Team Network.

Council of Chief State School Officers

Valerie Woodruff (Delaware), President

Elizabeth Burmaster (Wisconsin), President-Elect

David P. Driscoll (Massachusetts), Past-President

G. Thomas Houlihan, Executive Director

Julia Lara, Deputy Executive Director, Division of State Services and Technical Assistance

Elaine Bonner-Tompkins, Director of Special Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) thanks The Access Center: Improving Outcomes for All Students K-8 at the American Institutes for Research (AIR) for their support of this study. This report was completed as part of the subcontract that CCSSO has with the Access Center as part of their cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs to build the capacity of technical assistance systems, states, districts and schools to help students with disabilities learn from the general education curriculum. In particular, CCSSO recognizes Susan Skipper, research analyst, and Judy Shanley, co-project director from the Access Center for their leadership and assistance in completing this study and guiding the work of the State to State Information Sharing Community. CCSSO also extends a special acknowledgement to the state directors of special education and their staffs who took the time to respond to this survey in a timely and effective manner.

CCSSO thanks the Education Information Management Advisory Consortium and their Special Education Subcommittee for endorsing this survey and study. This report offers an update to a prior study conducted by CCSSO with the then Elementary and Middle Schools Technical Assistance Center at AIR. CCSSO was fortunate to have Gitanjali Pande, CCSSO consultant, who developed the initial report to co-author this updated report under the supervision of Elaine Bonner-Tompkins, CCSSO director of special education programs. We would also acknowledge the support that Margaret McLeod and Mary Kelly offered in collecting the data and completing the initial drafts of this report during their tenure at CCSSO; and to Stephanie Yun, CCSSO project associate, for the editorial assistance, fact checking and updating the tables. However, the contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of Education or of the organizations cited above. The opinions expressed in this document are those of the lead author, Elaine Bonner-Tompkins.

ABSTRACT

This report highlights the key findings from a questionnaire undertaken in August 2005 by CCSSO as part of its partnership work with the Access Center. The questionnaire asked state respondents questions pertaining to their state systems of technical assistance delivery in special education. This report presents the methodology used to undertake this study, the key findings from the 2005 questionnaire and comparisons between state patterns of delivering TA in special education between the 2001 and 2005 questionnaires.

OVERVIEW

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and The Access Center: Improving Outcomes for All Students K-8 at the American Institutes for Research have been working in partnership since 2002 to address challenges and consider opportunities to increasing collaboration in an effort to expand access to the general education curriculum among states, districts, and schools. The Access Center is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs as part of a network of technical assistance centers that are authorized under Part D of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

The mission of the Access Center is to improve educational outcomes for elementary and middle school students with disabilities. To achieve this mission, the center goals are threefold: increase awareness of research-based programs, practices, and tools; strengthen the ability of educators to be informed consumers of programs, practices, and tools; and assist educators to implement and evaluate programs, practices, and tools. The Access Center advances this work through three vehicles: direct assistance to states and districts; information sharing communities with states and district teams that are co-facilitated in part with CCSSO; and web-based services. The center ultimately works to build the capacity of technical assistance systems, states, districts, and schools to help students with disabilities learn from the general education curriculum.

Access to the general education curriculum is dependent on the capacity of educators and schools to provide differentiated instruction based on what works for making subject matter content accessible to all learners. States, regional districts, intermediate units, and local school districts share responsibility in enhancing the capacity of teachers and schools to deliver differentiated instruction that enables access to the general education curriculum. States, in part, meet their responsibility by structuring, funding, and directly providing technical assistance services to districts and schools aimed toward scaling up research based practices. Understanding how states structure their technical assistance delivery systems, particularly toward improving the performance of students of disabilities, is a critical component in the overarching effort to scale up best practices aimed at expanding access to the general education curriculum.

CCSSO's work with the Access Center is part of a larger portfolio work with state education agencies aimed at closing the achievement gap. The School Improvement Initiative at CCSSO, launched in 1995 as the Initiative to Improve Achievement in High Poverty Schools, has been involved in efforts to increase the capacity of state education agencies to work with local districts toward improving student performance in high-poverty schools and, in the context of its partnership with the Access Center, to improve the performance of students with disabilities. As part of this collaborative effort, CCSSO conducted the first study on this topic in partnership with the Elementary and Middle Schools Technical Assistance Center at AIR in 2001. The purpose of the 2005 questionnaire has a similar goal: gathering relevant information on state systems of technical assistance in special education to share it in such a way that it would foster

cross-state information sharing, identify challenges and opportunities to expanding access to the general education curriculum, and encourage next steps to advance collaboration toward this end.

PURPOSE AND INTENDED AUDIENCE

Providing a snapshot of how state education agencies provide technical assistance in special education and describing the progress that several states have made in aligning their general and special education systems of support serves as the purpose of this report. As such, there are some key constituencies that might be interested in using this document. For example, state and district school improvement teams could use the findings to assess where additional input is required to improve the methods of TA delivery in specific subject areas, to increase alignment, or expand the target audience that receives TA in special education; external and regional TA providers can look at states that might benefit from additional methods of TA delivery or from different TA activities; regional resource centers can examine where states need TA and work towards meeting those resource needs; education researchers working on special education issues can use findings on alignment or on different subject areas to conduct a more detailed study of a state's TA system to identify gaps and how these can be addressed; policymakers at both the state and federal levels can use the findings to assess progress being made by states in meeting with compliance procedures and identify states that might need additional funds for TA support with compliance issues; PTA members/community representatives/stakeholders can see what their state is offering in terms of TA service delivery in special education and they can try and provide leverage for change/improvement/action in specific TA areas that states might be lacking.

STUDY METHODOLOGY

CCSSO undertook this research study to analyze existing technical assistance systems in special education. In particular, we were interested in the level of coordination between the delivery of technical assistance in general and special education. We began this study by updating our 2001 Special Education Technical Assistance System questionnaire. The 2005 questionnaire included less than 20 combined open- and close-ended questions around three topics: organizational structures for technical assistance, the process of who offers and who receives technical assistance services, and in what areas and with what means are technical assistance opportunities provided. In particular, the new questionnaire included the following prompts:

- Do you have a formal definition for technical assistance in your state?
- In what subject areas does your state provide technical assistance in special education?
- How are technical assistance efforts in special education aligned with state education agency (SEA) efforts to assist low performing schools?
- Which SEA offices/departments are responsible for coordinating and delivering technical assistance to schools and districts to improve special education?
- To whom is technical assistance delivered; that is, who is your target audience? And who delivers technical assistance to support improved learning among students with disabilities?

Next, we shared it with the Education Information Advisory Committee (EIMAC) to ensure that the survey did not place an unnecessary data burden on state respondents. On May 4, 2005, the survey was approved by the Special Education Subcommittee of EIMAC. CCSSO then distributed the online survey to state directors of special education in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Twenty-six of 51 state respondents returned the completed questionnaire—a 51 percent response rate. All the state responses were compiled into a matrix that describes the principal components of special education technical assistance by state. These responses are references in detail in Appendix III. Below is the list of states that submitted responses to CCSSO.

List of States that Responded to the Special Education TA Questionnaire, June 2005
Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Wisconsin, and Wyoming

Together, we think these questionnaire responses provide a detailed snapshot of how states both organize and deliver technical assistance services in special education. We recognize, however, that this since this study relies on self-reports, they must be taken at face value with the understanding that verifying or validating the responses to the questionnaire is beyond the scope of this study. Additionally, while comparisons between the 2001 and 2005 studies are offered, this study cannot make any longitudinal assessment of any “process” change in the technical assistance systems for special education. Lastly, because the inclusion of qualitative questions was beyond the scope of this study, this study does not include a detailed discussion regarding the substance of its findings. This would have been informative, especially around issues of alignment of activities with general education and level of coordination between the delivery of technical assistance in general and special education.

STUDY FINDINGS

Each state respondent’s answers to the 2005 questionnaire were summarized into a matrix that is presented in Appendix III. The matrix details a selection of questionnaire questions by state, based on what were seen as key questions addressing service delivery systems in special education. The table below summarizes some of the key responses by states that relates to their systems of technical assistance in special education. In particular, like the 2001 study, it describes distinct patterns of technical assistance delivery in special education across states. Yet, in some cases, there is considerable consistency in technical assistance systems across states as well. For example, most state respondents acknowledged that the primary purpose of their state technical assistance system was to provide resources on specific topics and issues of importance to that state. A discussion of these results by questionnaire topic follows below.

Table 1. Summary of Select Responses: Questionnaire on Delivering Technical Assistance in Special Education, 2005	
Select Questions	Percentage of State Respondents N=Number of Respondents
Formal Definition of TA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No 	40 (n=8) 60 (n=16)
Formal Statewide System of TA in Special Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No 	70 (n=19) 30 (n=8)
Primary Purpose of state TA system*	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide resources on specific topics/issues • Assist districts in policy and program implementation • Support school/district improvement plans • Provide support to low performing schools & districts • Prepare district for state compliance reviews 	91 (n=20) 86 (n=19) 77 (n=17) 77 (n=17) 73 (n=16)
Subject Areas of Assistance*	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistive technology • Determining eligibility for special education • Transitions, Early Childhood, & Inclusion • Behavior management/Behavior support • Low incidence disabilities • Accommodations & Assessments • Disproportionate representation • English language learners with disabilities 	96 (n=26) 93 (n=25) 89 (n=24) 89 (n=24) 89 (n=24) 86 (n=23) 86 (n=23) 52 (n=14)
Providers of Assistance*	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEA teams • Regional service providers & External TA providers • Exemplary teachers/principals 	78 (n=21) 67 (n=18) 38 (n=13)

Source: State responses to a Questionnaire on Delivering TA in Special Education, 2005.

*Total percentage for each question adds up to more than 100 because many state respondents shared the same answers to the question.

Table 1. (contd.)	Percentage of State Respondents
Select Questions	N= Number of Respondents
TA Audience*	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principals • Teachers • Local special education directors • Parents • Paraprofessionals 	<p>96 (n=26)</p> <p>93 (n=25)</p> <p>93 (n=25)</p> <p>89 (n=24)</p> <p>85 (n=23)</p>
Types of Activity*	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistance with compliance procedures • Identifying, selecting & designing solutions/approaches • Working with stakeholders and related groups/agencies • Analyzing & diagnosing problems • Resolving conflicts • Designing program evaluation 	<p>85 (n=23)</p> <p>85 (n=23)</p> <p>78 (n=21)</p> <p>74 (n=20)</p> <p>74 (n=20)</p> <p>67 (n=18)</p>
Methods of TA Delivery*	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-site visits • Meetings/workshops • Training of Trainers • Development & dissemination of publications • Telephone • Statewide conferences • Internet bulletin boards/list serves • Video conferencing • Web-based communication 	<p>95 (n=18)</p> <p>95 (n=18)</p> <p>95 (n=18)</p> <p>95 (n=18)</p> <p>95 (n=18)</p> <p>90 (n=17)</p> <p>79 (n=15)</p> <p>74 (n=14)</p> <p>74 (n=14)</p>
Most commonly cited areas of Alignment of Special Education TA efforts with General Education (see text for more detail)	All but 4 states mentioned alignment (y/n) and/or gave examples
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behavior management/behavior support/discipline • Reading initiatives • School improvement process • Assessments • Assisting low performing schools 	<p>6 states</p> <p>5 states</p> <p>5 states</p> <p>4 states</p> <p>2 states</p>

Source: State responses to a Questionnaire on Delivering TA in Special Education, 2005.

*Total percentage for each question adds up to more than 100 because many state respondents shared the same answers to the question.

As part of the study, states were asked if they had a formal statewide definition of technical assistance (TA) and system of technical assistance in place. Only one-third of states reported a formal definition of technical assistance compared to almost all the respondents reporting formal systems of technical assistance for special education in place within their state. The six states that reported not having a “formal” statewide system of technical assistance for special education were Colorado, Delaware, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. However, most of these states have state and/or regional teams that deliver a variety of technical assistance activities to a host of TA audiences via several methods of delivery.

Regarding the primary purpose of technical assistance in special education, most state respondents indicated that it was to provide resources on specific topics and challenges related to serving students with disabilities. The second most prevalent response was assisting districts with policy planning and program implementation in special education. About three-quarters of state respondents also indicated that the purpose of TA was to support schools/districts with school improvement plans, assist districts with state compliance reviews, and provide support to low performing schools and districts.

With regard to subject areas for providing technical assistance, nearly every state respondent mentioned the following: transition to post secondary education, inclusion, early childhood, and assistive technology. Most state respondents also reported providing technical assistance on accommodations for special education, assessments, low incidence disabilities, and determining special education eligibility. Other areas of assistance reported by a considerable number of respondents included behavior management/positive behavior support, disproportionate representation, prevention, and early intervention. A little over three-quarters of respondents mentioned coordinated services and literacy as subject areas for TA service provision. Of those states that did not mention both services, Colorado and Delaware had literacy but no coordinated services, Nebraska and Nevada offered coordinated services but not literacy, and Mississippi and Missouri had neither subject area. Only half of the total number of respondents said that they provide services to English language learners with disabilities. These states include Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Florida, and Ohio.

With respect to what agency/office provides services in special education, all but three state respondents indicated that their office/bureau of special education was responsible for providing these services. Among the three states that offered these services through another office, Delaware provides TA through the department of education; Georgia has all departments providing TA; and North Dakota did not have any specific office/bureau providing TA in special education at the time of the questionnaire. Over 78 percent of states that responded have regional centers or other intermediary organizations that provide technical assistance, up from only about half of the respondents in 2001–2002. A few states cited contracting with institutes of higher education (IHE) to assist schools and districts with issues related to TA delivery in special education. Regarding the level of coordination between TA activities in special education with those in general education, twenty states (77 percent) indicated that the department responsible for delivering TA in special education also delivers TA in general education.

The most frequently cited recipients for TA delivery in special education were principals and teachers, followed by local special education directors. Parents and district staff/administrators made up the other most frequently cited audience. This technical assistance is often tied to compliance issues. Eighty-four percent of state respondents said that their technical assistance efforts are targeted to low performing school

districts or those deemed out of compliance. Another three-quarters of respondents said TA is targeted to school districts scheduled for compliance reviews. The groups that most commonly deliver technical assistance are state education agency (SEA) teams, regional service providers, and external technical assistance providers (contracted providers, consultants, etc.). Almost half of the respondents said that exemplary teachers/principals also deliver assistance in special education. Some of these states were: Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Nevada, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Wyoming.

The most common type of activity/service included in the TA delivery system was assistance with compliance procedures. This was closely followed by activities involving analyzing and diagnosing problems, designing and implementing solutions to problems, resolving conflicts, and working with stakeholder groups. The methods of delivering TA most often cited included on-site visits, meetings and workshops, training of trainers, development and dissemination of publications, and communication by telephone.

Alignment with general education

In terms of the level and type of alignment between the delivery of technical assistance in special education and state initiatives in general education, all but four state respondents said “yes” to some level of alignment, and almost all of those that responded “yes” provided an example of one or more specific strategies or activities involving alignment. There is however, much variation across states as to the type of activities that are aligned and the extent of alignment.

Six states mentioned behavioral discipline and/or behavior management/behavioral supports as areas of alignment. For example, North Dakota has a statewide positive behavioral support collaborative that originated in the SEA special education unit but has extended broadly into general education. Georgia also has an Effective Behavioral and Instructional Support Initiative (EBIS) that aligns general and special education efforts.

Five states articulated reading initiatives as an important area of alignment. For example, California has a reading initiative aligned with English-Language Arts Content Standards or other content areas such as math and science. Alabama reports also aligning statewide reading initiatives—Reading First, Struggling Readers Strand I and Strand II, and the Nonreaders Initiatives. Two other states—Florida and New York—mentioned specific efforts to assist low-performing schools in meeting new learning standards and participating in statewide testing programs in both special and general education. Additionally, Iowa has teams that work with Schools In Need of Improvement and are composed of consultants from both general and special education.

Some alignment initiatives seem to be more comprehensive. For example, Kansas has developed district support teams comprised of members from Student Support Services, School Improvement & Accreditation, and State & Federal Programs. These teams are responsible for working with any district identified as 'on improvement' through Title I, the state accreditation system, or through the special education focused monitoring process. Ohio also has state supported TA activities aligned with statewide initiatives and with No Child Left Behind and accountability for results.

PROGRESS IN STATE TA SYSTEMS

To consider changes and indeed progress that states have made in delivering technical assistance in special education to support greater alignment with general education and school improvement outcomes, state responses to both the 2005 and 2001 questionnaires were analyzed by CCSSO. The 23 states that participated in both studies serve as a reference for the analysis described below.

States that Responded to the 2001 and 2005 Special Education TA Questionnaires (23 states)
Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Wisconsin, and Wyoming

Overall, there was not much variation in the responses across the two questionnaires. Almost all the state respondents for both questionnaires had the same subject areas in which TA was provided with the same target audience, similar providers of assistance in special education, and similar methods of delivering TA and types of TA activities. However, there were some state distinctions across the two questionnaires that are worth noting.

Regarding a statewide TA system, there were many more state respondents in 2005 than in 2001 who said that they have a statewide system for delivering technical assistance in special education. The states that mentioned a specific statewide TA system only in the second questionnaire were Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, and Tennessee. Some other findings regarding the comparative systems of TA are also worth mentioning. In South Carolina and Wisconsin there was no statewide system mentioned in either questionnaire; it appears that state- and district-level personnel provides TA as and when the need arises. In Wyoming, across both questionnaires, respondents said that the state provides quality customer service to all Department of Education personnel.

Interestingly, 17 of 23 state respondents in 2005 indicated that disproportionate representation was a subject area in which TA was being provided. These same states did not mention this subject area in 2001. Surprisingly, in a state as ethnically and racially diverse as New York, disproportionate representation was not mentioned as a subject area for assistance by respondents in either of the two questionnaires. However, New York's Office of Vocational and Educational Services for Individuals with Disabilities (VESID) indeed provides technical assistance to districts to address disproportionate representation via its implementation of state law (Chapter 405 of the

Laws of 1999) designed to address and improve results in a number of problem areas including “significant disproportion based on race and ethnicity, in identification and placement in particular settings of students with disabilities.”¹ In particular, VESID works in concert with Office of Elementary, Middle, Secondary and Continuing Education to provide coordinated professional development to technical assistance providers throughout the state to improve their understanding of factors that contribute to the achievement gap and disproportionate representation in special education. This gap between what New York provides in terms of technical assistance and what they indicated on the questionnaire demonstrates a significant limitation of this study or may suggest issues related to coordination and communication within the state regarding technical assistance.

With respect to alignment of TA activities in special education with general education, among state respondents who elaborated on state alignment activities, there seems to be an increase in alignment among these states from 2001 to 2005. For example, Idaho has moved toward increasingly coordinated cross-bureau planning and implementation of state goals. Another example is Iowa, which in 2001 indicated aligned TA activities in school improvement and local accreditation and in 2005 described aligned statewide reading team initiatives for Reading First, Struggling Readers, and its Nonreaders Initiatives. North Dakota’s responses also indicate progress: in the 2001 study, state respondents noted alignment among compliance improvement strategies with general education school improvement planning, and in 2005 they described a statewide Positive Behavioral Support Collaborative in the SEA special education unit that extended to general education.

Even though most methods of TA delivery were the same for 2001 and 2005 among state questionnaire respondents, there was some variation between the two questionnaire results. In particular, respondents to the 2005 study mentioned the use of the internet, videoconferencing, and web-based communication more often. For example, the 2005 respondents for Colorado, Connecticut, and South Carolina mentioned the use of the internet as an additional method of delivering assistance. Connecticut’s response also mentioned statewide conferences, on-site visits, and listservs in 2005 questionnaire. Similarly, the 2005 Delaware response mentioned videoconferencing, web-based communication, and chat rooms as methods of TA delivery. One other noteworthy difference is that compared to 2001, the three state respondents for Mississippi, Missouri, and Nebraska in 2005 did not have “external TA providers” listed as providers of assistance.

The table on the next page provides detailed information, by state, for the results of the questionnaire on delivering TA in special education. The crosses in each box mark the questionnaire respondents’ answers to the questions (the questionnaire instrument itself is in Appendix I).

¹ Chapter 405 (<http://vesid.nysed.gov/specialed/chapter405/home.html>)

**Table 2 DELIVERING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN SPECIAL EDUCATION—SUMMARY FINDINGS BY STATE
JUNE 2005**

State	Statewide TA System	Subject Areas for Providing TA			Target Audience		Providers of Assistance			Types of TA Activity		Alignment Provide examples	Methods of TA Delivery	
		S1 <10	S2 <10-14	S3 15+	T1	T2	P1	P2	P3	A1 <10	A2 10-15		M1 <10	M2 10+
AL	Yes			X	X			X			X	Accessing the general education curriculum, state intervention efforts; accountability program; Reading Initiative; assessments; dropout prevention; state standards & curriculum; behavioral interventions		X
AZ	Yes			X	X			X	X	X		Discipline and positive behavioral supports; Reading improvement	X	
CA	Yes			X	X			X			X	Reading Initiative aligned with state English-language arts content standards; positive behavioral supports for safe & health schools; teacher & principal PD in science, English-language arts, and math		X
CO	No			X	X		X			X				X
CT	Yes			X	X		X		X	X			X	
DE	No		X		X		X			X				X

Source: From the Questionnaire on State Systems of Technical Assistance Delivery in Special Education, 2005.

KEY:
S1= (<10 subject areas); **S2**=(10-14 subject areas) excluded ELLs
S3=(15+ subject areas) Transition, Early childhood, Inclusion, Literacy, Prevention & Early Intervention, Determining eligibility for Special Education, Behavior management, Coordinated services, Low incidence disability, Accommodations and Assessments, Assistive Technology, Disability specific information, Response to Intervention strategies, English Language Learners (ELLs), Disproportionate representation
T1 = Teachers, Paraprofessionals, Parents, Principals, Local special education directors, District Staff, Other administrators; **T2** = T1 + State variation
P1 = SEA teams, Regional service providers and/or External service providers; **P2** = P1 + Exemplary teachers/principals on assignment; **P3** = Additional providers
A1 = <10 types of TA activities; **A2** = 10-15 types of TA activities
M1 = <10 methods of TA delivery; **M2** = 10+ methods of TA delivery

Table 2 (continued)

State	Statewide TA System	Subject Areas for Providing TA			Target Audience		Providers of Assistance			Types of TA Activity		Alignment Provide examples	Methods of TA Delivery	
		S1 <10	S2 <10-14	S3 15+	T1	T2	P1	P2	P3	A1 <10	A2 10-15		M1 <10	M2 10+
FL	Yes			X		X	X			X		SPED department staff are members of school assistance teams facilitated by the Bureau of School Improvement to provide TA to Schools in need of improvement (SINI) & failing schools		X
GA	Yes			X	X		X			X		Reading first; school improvement; effective behavioral and instructional support; LRE	X	
ID	Yes			X	X		X			X		Reading and Math; moving towards more coordinated cross-bureau planning and implementation of all state goals		X
IN	Yes			X	X			X		X		Reading and assessment activities	X	
IA	Yes			X	X			X		X		Statewide reading team initiative; teams working with SINI are composed of consultants from both general and SPED	X	

Source: From the Questionnaire on State Systems of Technical Assistance Delivery in Special Education, 2005.

KEY:
S1= (<10 subject areas); **S2** =(10-14 subject areas) excluded ELLs
S3=(15+ subject areas) Transition, Early childhood, Inclusion, Literacy, Prevention & Early Intervention, Determining eligibility for Special Education, Behavior management, Coordinated services, Low incidence disability, Accommodations and Assessments, Assistive Technology, Disability specific information, Response to Intervention strategies, English Language Learners (ELLs), Disproportionate representation
T1 = Teachers, Paraprofessionals, Parents, Principals, Local special education directors, District Staff, Other administrators; **T2** = T1 + State variation
P1 = SEA teams, Regional service providers and/or External service providers; **P2** = P1 + Exemplary teachers/principals on assignment; **P3** = Additional providers
A1 = <10 types of TA activities; **A2** = 10-15 types of TA activities
M1 = <10 methods of TA delivery; **M2** = 10+ methods of TA delivery

Table 2 Continued

State	Statewide TA System	Subject Areas for Providing TA			Target Audience		Providers of Assistance			Types of TA Activity		Alignment Provide examples	Methods of TA Delivery	
		S1 <10	S2 <10-14	S3 15+	T1	T2	P1	P2	P3	A1 <10	A2 10-15		M1 <10	M2 10+
KS	Yes		X		X		X		X			District support teams comprise members from Student Support Services, School Improvement & accreditation and state & federal programs; DSTs are responsible for working with any district identified as "on improvement" through Title I, the State accreditation system or through the special education focused monitoring process		X
MA	No			X	X		X	X	X		X	TA associated with the states general education curriculum frameworks may be specialized when delivered to audiences working in special education.		X
MO	Yes		X		X		X			X		Alternate assessments	X	

Source: From the Questionnaire on State Systems of Technical Assistance Delivery in Special Education, 2005.

KEY:
S1= (<10 subject areas); **S2**=(10-14 subject areas) excluded ELLs
S3=(15+ subject areas) Transition, Early childhood, Inclusion, Literacy, Prevention & Early Intervention, Determining eligibility for Special Education, Behavior management, Coordinated services, Low incidence disability, Accommodations and Assessments, Assistive Technology, Disability specific information, Response to Intervention strategies, English Language Learners (ELLs), Disproportionate representation
T1 = Teachers, Paraprofessionals, Parents, Principals, Local special education directors, District Staff, Other administrators; **T2** = T1 + State variation
P1 = SEA teams, Regional service providers and/or External service providers; **P2** = P1 + Exemplary teachers/principals on assignment; **P3** = Additional providers
A1 = <10 types of TA activities; **A2** = 10-15 types of TA activities
M1 = <10 methods of TA delivery; **M2** = 10+ methods of TA delivery

Table 2 Continued

State	Statewide TA System	Subject Areas for Providing TA			Target Audience		Providers of Assistance			Types of TA Activity		Alignment Provide examples	Methods of TA Delivery	
		S1 <10	S2 <10-14	S3 15+	T1	T2	P1	P2	P3	A1 <10	A2 10-15		M1 <10	M2 10+
NV	Yes		X		X			X			X	District and school improvement planning, assessment, participation, and performance including data collection; academic and behavioral intervention system development and maintenance; professional learning communities development and maintenance		X
NY	Yes		X			X	X				X	“Closing the Gap” initiative for low-performing schools addresses both special and general education; Meeting new learning standards and participating in statewide testing programs in both special and general education		X
ND	Yes		X		X		X			X		Statewide Positive Behavioral Support Collaborative		X
OH	Yes			X	X			X			X	TA activities aligned with state initiatives & with NCLB accountability for results		X

Source: From the Questionnaire on State Systems of Technical Assistance Delivery in Special Education, 2005.

KEY:
S1= (<10 subject areas); **S2**=(10-14 subject areas) excluded ELLs
S3=(15+ subject areas) Transition, Early childhood, Inclusion, Literacy, Prevention & Early Intervention, Determining eligibility for Special Education, Behavior management, Coordinated services, Low incidence disability, Accommodations and Assessments, Assistive Technology, Disability specific information, Response to Intervention strategies, English Language Learners (ELLs), Disproportionate representation
T1 = Teachers, Paraprofessionals, Parents, Principals, Local special education directors, District Staff, Other administrators; **T2** = T1 + State variation
P1 = SEA teams, Regional service providers and/or External service providers; **P2** = P1 + Exemplary teachers/principals on assignment; **P3** = Additional providers
A1 = <10 types of TA activities; **A2** = 10-15 types of TA activities
M1 = <10 methods of TA delivery; **M2** = 10+ methods of TA delivery

Table 2 Continued

State	Statewide TA System	Subject Areas for Providing TA			Target Audience		Providers of Assistance			Types of TA Activity		Alignment Provide examples	Methods of TA Delivery	
		S1 <10	S2 <10-14	S3 15+	T1	T2	P1	P2	P3	A1 <10	A2 10-15		M1 <10	M2 10+
OK	No			X	X			X		X		Highly qualified teachers; collaborative teaching models		X
PA	Yes		X			X		X		X		Joint work in supporting tutoring and a statewide benchmarking activity, and PA Value Added Assessment system (PVAAS)	X	
SC	No		X		X		X		X	X				X
TN	No			X	X			X		X				X
TX	Yes			X		X		X		X		Reading and Behavioral discipline		X
WI	No			X	X		X			X				X
WY	No	X			X			X		X		SPED department aligned with school improvement activities	X	

Source: From the Questionnaire on State Systems of Technical Assistance Delivery in Special Education, 2005.

KEY:
S1= (<10 subject areas); **S2**=(10-14 subject areas) excluded ELLs
S3=(15+ subject areas) Transition, Early childhood, Inclusion, Literacy, Prevention & Early Intervention, Determining eligibility for Special Education, Behavior management, Coordinated services, Low incidence disability, Accommodations and Assessments, Assistive Technology, Disability specific information, Response to Intervention strategies, English Language Learners (ELLs), Disproportionate representation
T1 = Teachers, Paraprofessionals, Parents, Principals, Local special education directors, District Staff, Other administrators; **T2** = T1 + State variation
P1 = SEA teams, Regional service providers and/or External service providers; **P2** = P1 + Exemplary teachers/principals on assignment; **P3** = Additional providers
A1 = <10 types of TA activities; **A2** = 10-15 types of TA activities
M1 = <10 methods of TA delivery; **M2** = 10+ methods of TA delivery

SE TA Report Conclusion

As revealed by this study's findings, most state education agencies have developed systems of technical assistance to improve the quality and quantity of special education services provided by districts and schools. States rely on a number of means, including the expertise of state staff and contracts with institutions of higher education and regional technical assistance providers to sponsor conferences and workshops and to provide individualized assistance to districts and schools on what works for meeting the needs of students with disabilities. Clearly states are moving beyond their monitoring and compliance roles with districts and schools toward improving their capacities to serve all learners. When data from the 2005 and 2001 questionnaires are compared, it is apparent that states' offices of special education appear more likely to coordinate with state offices of curriculum, school improvement, and the like to align and support state general education reform initiatives as well. With the twin challenges of serving students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment to the maximum extent and closing the achievement gap between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers, this trend is reassuring. As districts and schools attempt to scale up effective practices for improving the performance of all learners in low-performing schools and rely on early intervening services and response to education approaches to improve instructional opportunities for struggling learners, greater coordination and collaboration among state systems of technical assistance in special education and general education will be needed.

QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUMENT
The Council of Chief State School Officers
One Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20001
Fax Number: 202-789-5305

Peggy McLeod, 202-336-7072; email: peggym@ccsso.org
Elaine Bonner-Tompkins, 202-326-8692; email: elainebt@ccsso.org

2005 Special Education Technical Assistance Questionnaire
Questionnaire Due By: June 30, 2005

Please give your state and contact information as outlined below:

State: _____

Name: First _____ Last _____

Title: _____

Address: _____

Phone number: _____ Fax number: _____

Email address: _____

For questions with multiple responses, please tick off the appropriate box(es). If you responded to the questionnaire in 2001 and the answer is the same, please check that box.

1. Do you have a definition for technical assistance (TA) in your state? If Yes, please state/describe it briefly.

2. Do you have a formal statewide TA system for special education? Yes ___ No ___ (if No, SKIP to Question 4).
If Yes, what is the name of the System/Program in place?

3. What is the primary purpose(s) of your state TA system?

- To provide information and resources on specific topics or issues
- To assist schools and districts with implementing policies and practices
- To support existing school/district improvement plans
- To prepare schools and districts for state compliance reviews
- To provide support and resources to low performing districts and schools
- Other (describe briefly)

4. In what subject areas does your state provide TA in special education?

- Transition
- Early childhood
- Inclusion
- Literacy
- Prevention and early intervention
- Determining eligibility for special education
- Behavior management
- Coordinated services
- Interventions for English Language Learners with disabilities
- Low-incidence disabilities
- Assistive technology
- Assessments
- Accommodations
- Disability-related diagnostic and service information
- Response to intervention strategies
- Prereferral strategies
- Disproportionate representation
- Other topics: _____

5. Which state education agency (SEA) offices/departments are responsible for coordinating and delivering TA to schools to improve special education? OR, what department in your state administers this program?

6. Is the department/office (mentioned above) responsible for delivering TA to improve general education outcomes as well?

Yes__ No __

7. To whom is TA delivered? That is, who is the target audience?
 - Teachers
 - Para-professionals
 - Parents
 - Principals
 - Local special education directors
 - Other district level staff
 - Other administrators
 - Other: _____

8. Who delivers TA to support improved learning among students with disabilities?
 - SEA Teams
 - Regional service providers
 - Retired teachers
 - Exemplary teachers or principals on assignment
 - External technical assistance providers (i.e., university staff, staff from Regional Resource Centers, other)
 - Other: _____

9. What types of TA activities are included in your delivery system?
 - Analyzing issues and diagnosing problems
 - Designing program evaluations
 - Identifying, selecting, designing solutions/approaches
 - Assisting with grant applications & securing funding
 - Installing and implementing products, programs & technologies
 - Resolving conflicts
 - Working with stakeholders and related groups/agencies
 - Counseling/moral support
 - Advising on legal issues in the field
 - Assisting with compliance procedures
 - Other activities: _____

10. Are state supported TA activities in special education aligned with statewide initiatives in general education? Please give examples.

11. Does the state work with or through intermediate units/regional offices to provide TA for programs serving students with disabilities?
Yes ____ No ____ (If No, SKIP to Question 13.) If Yes, please elaborate briefly.

12. Do the intermediate units/regional offices supporting special education also provide services to other educational programs? That is, are the units one and the same?

Yes ____ No ____

13. How do you decide what the needs are of your constituents/clients? In other words, how do you decide with whom to work?

- Anyone can request assistance
- SEA targets low-performing schools and districts.
- SEA targets schools/districts with large numbers of new staff.
- SEA targets schools/districts scheduled for compliance reviews.
- SEA targets schools/districts deemed out-of-compliance.
- Constituents/clients must meet other specific criteria (i.e., state mandate, willing to invest time, identified need, lack of resources).

Please describe the criteria briefly.

14. What are the methods for delivering TA?

- Statewide conferences
- Video conferencing
- On-site visits
- Meetings/workshops
- Training of trainers
- Web-based communication - chat rooms, discussion forums
- Development and dissemination of publications
- Internet: bulletin boards, listservs
- Telephone
- Facilitating peer-to-peer exchange/consultations
- Mentoring/coaching
- Other methods: _____

15. What services does a typical school or district receive in the course of a year?

- Assistance in conducting school-based needs assessment
- Assistance in developing school improvement plans
- Assistance in implementing a school improvement plan
- Training to review/analyze student achievement and outcome data
- Assistance with curriculum alignment/adoptions and adaptations
- Professional development for teachers and para-professionals
- Training on referrals and early interventions
- Training on new instructional practices
- Training on new assessment practices
- Training to support least restrictive placements/environments
- Programs and training to address disproportionate representation
- Programs and training to address English language learners with disabilities
- Behavioral interventions - discipline programs; social skills
- Assistance with autism program options
- Assistance with low-incidence disabilities
- Other services: _____

16. How many staff in your SEA (in full time equivalents) or under-contract with your SEA provide TA to districts and schools in special education?

17. Can you provide two examples of *recent* requests for TA?

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.

If your state has a separate description of its delivery of technical assistance in special education, please attach and submit with this questionnaire.

Please send this questionnaire and any attachments to:

Peggy McLeod, CCSSO

One Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20001

Phone: 202-336-7072; Fax: 202-789-5305; Email: peggym@ccsso.org

Thanks again!

APPENDIX II

RESPONDENTS' CONTACT INFORMATION

Name and Address	Email	State	Designation
Mabrey Whetstone Alabama State Department of Education Special Education Services Gordon Persons Building P.O. Box 302101 Montgomery, AL 36130-2101 Ph: 334-242-8114 Fax: 334-242-9192	mabreyw@alsde.edu	AL	Director, Special Education Services
Joanne C. Phillips Arizona Department of Education Exceptional Student Services 1535 W. Jefferson Road, Bin 24 Phoenix, AZ 85007 Ph: 602-542-5446 Fax: 602-542-5404	jphilli@ade.az.gov	AZ	Deputy Associate Superintendent
Jill Larson 1430 N. Street, Suite 2401 Sacramento, CA 95814 Ph: 916-323-7192 Fax: 916-327-3730	jl Larson@cde.ca.gov	CA	Consultant
Lorrie Harkness 201 E. Colfax Avenue, #300 Denver, CO 80203 Ph: 303-866-6695 Fax: 303-866-6811	harkness_l@cde.state.co.us	CO	State Director
George Dowaliby 165 Capitol Ave. Hartford, CT 06106 Ph: 860-713-6912 Fax: 860-713-7026	george.dowaliby@po.state.ct.us	CT	Chief, Bureau of Special Education

Name and Address	Email	State	Designation
Martha Toomey Childhood Education Work Group Towensend Building Dover, DE 19903 Ph: 302-739-4667 Fax: 302-739-2388	mtoomey@doe.k12.de.us	DE	Director, Exceptional Children and Early
Bambi Lockman Florida Department of Education Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services 325 West Gaines Street Suite 614 Tallahassee Florida Ph: 850-245-0475 Fax: 850-245-0953	bambi.lockman@fldoe.org	FL	Chief, Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services
Marlene Bryar 1870 Twin Towers East Atlanta GA 30330 Ph: 404-656-3963 Ph: 404-651-6457	mbryar@doe.k12.ga.us	GA	Director
Mary T. Bostick Idaho State Department of Education P.O.Box 83720 650 W. State Street Boise, Idaho 83720-0027 Ph: 208-332-5910 Fax: 208-334-4664	mtbostick@sde.idaho.gov	ID	Special Education Supervisor
Robert Marra Indiana Dept of Education Room 229, State House 100 N. Capitol Street Indianapolis, IN 46204 Ph: 317 232-0570 Fax: 317-232-0589	rmarra@doe.state.in.us	IN	Associate Superintendent/Division of Exceptional Learners

Name and Address	Email	State	Designation
Toni Van Cleve Grimes State Office Building, E 14th and E Grand Avenue Des Moines, IA 50319 Ph: 515-242-6241 Fax: 515-242-6019	toni.vancleve@iowa.gov	IA	Administrative Consultant
T. ZoAnn Torrey 120 SE 10th Avenue Topeka, KS 66612 Ph: 785-291-3097 Fax: 785-296-6715	ztorrey@ksde.org	KS	State Director for Special Education
Marcia Mittnacht Massachusetts Department of Education 350 Main Street Malden, MA 02148 Ph: 781-338-3388	mmmittnacht@doe.mass.edu	MA	State Director for Special Education
Melody Bounds 359 North West Jackson Jackson, MS 39205 Ph: (601) 359-3498 Fax: (601) 359-1829	mboundews@mde.k12.ms.us	MS	State Director
Katherine Numerick Missouri Department of Elementary and Special Education 205 Jefferson Street Jefferson City, MO 65102 Ph: 573-751-0185 Fax: 573-526-4926	kate.numerick@dese.mo.gov	MO	Director, Effective Practices

Name and Address	Email	State	Designation
Gary M. Sherman Nebraska Department of Education P O Box 94987 Lincoln, NE 68509 Ph: 402-471-2471 Fax: 402-471-5022	gsherman@nde.state.ne.us	NE	Administrator, Special Populations Office
Rorie Fitzpatrick 700 East Fifth Street #113 Carson City, NV 89701 Ph: 775-687-9215 Fax: 775-687-9123	rfitzpatrick@doe.nv.gov	NV	Assistant Director for Special Education
Daniel J. Ryan NYS Education Department Office of Vocational and Educational Services for Individuals with Disabilities Lifelong Services Team One Commerce Plaza Room 1624 Albany, NY 12234 Ph: (518) 486-7462 Fax: (518) 402-3583	dryan@mail.nysed.gov	NY	Supervisor
Robert Rutten ND Department of Public Instruction 600 E. Boulevard Avenue, Dept. 201 Bismarck, ND 58505-0440 Ph: 701-328-2277 Fax: 701-328-4149	brutten@state.nd.us	ND	Director of Special Education
Philip Fraley Ohio Department of Education 25 S. Front Street Columbus, OH 43215-4183 Ph: 614-995-5499 Fax: 614-752-1429	philip.fraley@ode.state.oh.us	OH	Consultant, Office for Exceptional Children

Name and Address	Email	State	Designation
Misty Kimbrough 2500 North Lincoln Boulevard Suite 412 Oklahoma City, OK 73105 Ph: 405-521-4873 Fax: 405-522-2066	misty_kimbrough@sde.state.ok.us	OK	Assistant State Superintendent
Linda Rhen PA Department of Education Bureau of Special Education 333 Market Street, 7th Floor Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333 Ph: 717-783-2311 Fax: 717-783-6139	lrhen@state.pa.us	PA	Director, Bureau of Special Education
Susan D. DuRant SC Department of Education Suite 808 1429 Senate Street Columbia, South Carolina 29201 Ph: 803-734-8806 Fax: 803-734-4824	sdurant@sde.state.sc.us	SC	State Director/Office of Exceptional Children
Donna Parker Department of Education Division of Special Education, 7th Floor Andrew Johnson Tower 710 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, TN 37243-0380 Ph: 615-532-6194 Fax: 615-532-9412	donna.parker@state.tn.us	TN	Director of Staff Development

Name and Address	Email	State	Designation
Kathy Clayton Texas Education Agency Division of IDEA Coordination 1701 N. Congress Avenue Austin, Texas 78701 Ph: 512-463-9414 Fax: 512-463-9560	kathy.clayton@tea.state.tx.us	TX	Director
Stephanie J. Petska 125 South Webster Street P.O. Box 7841 Madison, WI 53707-7841 Ph: 608-266-1781 Fax: 608-267-3746	stephanie.petska@dpi.state.wi.us	WI	Director of Special Education
Nance Shelsta Wyoming Department of Education Hathaway Building 2 nd Floor 2300 Capitol Ave. Cheyenne, WY 82002 Ph: 307-777-2554 Fax: 307-777-2556	nshels@educ.state.wy.us	WY	State Director of Special Education

APPENDIX III

The seven tables are detailed responses from the questionnaire, *State Systems of Technical Assistance Delivery in Special Education, 2005*.

Table 1 Do you have a statewide technical assistance system for special education?

Table 2 In what subject areas does your state provide TA in special education?

Table 3 To whom is the technical assistance delivered (who is the target audience)?

Table 4 Who delivers TA to support improved learning among students with disabilities?

Table 5 What types of TA activities are included in your delivery system?

Table 6 What technical assistance activities in special education are aligned with state initiatives in general education?

Table 7 What are the methods for delivering technical assistance?

Table 1

Do you have a statewide technical assistance system for special education?

	Y/N	Statewide technical assistance system for technical education
AL	Yes	Special Education Services
AZ	Yes	Exceptional Student Services
CA	Yes	TA is part of the overall Quality Assurance Process (QAP) to ensure positive outcomes for SWDs. TA involves assistance and training activities related to specific issues of non-compliance that are identified locally, regionally or are a statewide concern.
CO	No	
CT	Yes	N/A
DE	No	
FL	Yes	Florida has in place a number of TA and resource networks and specialized projects to assist the local school districts in implementing state and national priorities in exceptional student education.
GA	Yes	Georgia Learning Resources System
ID	Yes	We have three Regional Special Education Offices in the State to deliver training and technical assistance to school districts. This is described in our State Plan.
IN	Yes	Indiana SEA has many TA projects and activities ranging from CODA projects (child count) to very special arts, to Juvenile Justice to the ISEAS project. There is not a singly system/program in place.
IA		Iowa has a three tiered system of technical assistance. Most issues or topics the SEA bring together: State AEA IHEs and LEAs. The SEA's professional development is provided primarily for AEA's and interested IHEs, who provide PD for LEAs. This TA is provided through a variety of methods Iowa's professional development model, Iowa's communication network (ICN), manuals, position papers and or listserves. PS and TA are provided by AEA to LEAs. Special education teams are in each building every week and provide TA around any issues. State wide reading teams are in all AEA's and LEAs.
KS	Yes	Kansas Statewide Technical Assistance Resource System (K-STARS), District Support Teams (DST)
MA	No	
MS	Yes	Regional technical assistance centers & SEA division of technical assistance
MO	Yes	We have no specific name - our TA is embedded in everything we do
NE	Yes	Improving Learning for Children with Disabilities (ILCD)
NV	Yes	We don't have a formal definition but we do have an operational definition we provide answers to questions via phone, fax, email. We develop and disseminate documents that provide an interpretation of state and federal statutes and regulations. We provide model forms and documents for stakeholders to use as they wish. We help stakeholders to analyze and make decisions based on numerous types of data and we provide subgrants to extend our technical assistance resources.
NY	Yes	TA is described in state plans and in performance reports.
ND	Yes	Our SEA special education staff is assigned by topical portfolio to provide technical assistance to regions within state.
OH	Yes	TA is provided for state funded initiatives in which staff and administrators in school districts are provided with information and professional development to meet their needs. TA is offered to school districts during the state's monitoring process and follow-up. TA is provided through the 16 Special Education Regional Resource Centers (SERRCs).
OK	No	
PA	Yes	Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network
SC	Yes	We provide training and technical assistance and seek it as needs arise We have as our goal to use evidence based practices, data based decisions and follow-up
TN	No	
TX	Yes	The Texas Education Agency (TEA) implements the TA system for special education primarily through our 20 Education Service Centers (ESCs).

Table 2
In what subject areas does your state provide TA in special education?

	Transition	Early Childhood	Inclusion	Literacy	Prevention & Early Intervention	Determining Eligibility for Special Education	Behavior Management	Coordinated services	Interventions for ELL/Disabilities	Low-incidence disabilities	Assistive Technology	Assessments	Accommodations	Disability-related diagnostic/Service Info	Response to Intervention Strategy	Disproportionate representation	Other
AL	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	LRE, Accessing the General Curriculum, Collaborative Instruction
AZ	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
CA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
CO	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
CT	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
DE	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
FL	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
GA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	Georgia Performance Standards
ID	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
IN	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	Pre referral strategies
IA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
KS	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	Recruitment & retention, data analysis & data-informed decision making
MA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
MS	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
MO	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	Pre-referral strategies. Response to intervention strategies to be done in FY06.
NE	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
NV	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	

Table 2 Continued

In what subject areas does your state provide TA in special education?

	Transition	Early Childhood	Inclusion	Literacy	Prevention & Early Intervention	Determining Eligibility for Special Education	Behavior Management	Coordinated services	Interventions for ELL/Disabilities	Low-incidence disabilities	Assistive Technology	Assessments	Accommodations	Disability-related diagnostic/Service Info	Response to Intervention Strategy	Disproportionate representation	Other
NY	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
ND	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•	•	•	•	•		
OH	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
OK	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
PA	•	•	•	•	•		•			•	•		•		•		
SC	•	•		•	•	•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	PBIS. Crisis Prevention, SIMS
TN	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
TX	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	Access to the general curriculum.
WI	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
WY			•			•		•		•	•		•		•	•	

Table 3

To whom is the technical assistance delivered (who is the target audience)?

	Teachers	Para-professionals	Parents	Principals	Local special education directors	Other district level staff	Other administrators	Other
AL	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	Other agency personnel
AZ	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
CA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
CO	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
CT	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
DE	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
FL	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	Community agencies serving at risk & identified as exceptional students
GA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
ID	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
IN	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
IA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
KS	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
MA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	Depends on technical assistance
MS	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
MO	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
NE	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
NV	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	State agencies, Teacher associations, Governing boards
NY	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	IHE faculty with teacher training programs
ND	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	Technical assistance determined on basis of topic & audience
OH	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
OK	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
PA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	Agencies, charter schools
SC	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
TN	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
TX	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	Institutions of higher education
WI	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
WY	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	

Table 4
Who delivers TA to support improved learning among students with disabilities?

	SEA Teams	Regional service providers	Retired teachers	Exemplary teachers or principals on assignment	External technical assistance providers [i.e., university staff, staff from Regional Resource Centers, other]	Other
AL	•	•		•		
AZ	•		•	•	•	Trained regional teams
CA	•	•	•	•	•	Assessment specialist from state diagnostic centers
CO	•	•			•	
CT	•				•	Staff from state education resource center
DE	•					DOE site visits, LEAs may have other ways
FL	•	•		•	•	
GA	•	•	•	•	•	
ID	•	•			•	
IN	•			•	•	
IA	•	•		•	•	
KS	•	•			•	Two levels of outside technical assistance teams are built into the state accreditation system for the building accreditation process—building selected teams and state-appointed teams.
MA	•	•	•	•	•	Could be all of the above.
MS	•	•				
MO	•	•				
NE	•	•				
NV	•	•		•	•	Only SEA staff members do so directly under the auspices of the Nevada Department of Education. We provide subgrants to a number of entities that also provide technical assistance.
NY	•	•			•	
ND	•				•	Who provides the TA is dependent on the topic.
OH	•	•		•	•	
OK	•			•	•	
PA		•		•	•	