

the CSEF resource

Center for Special Education Finance

Summer 2000

Nine States Expand Participation in SEEP This Year

Other States Invited to Join in 2000-01

by Thomas B. Parrish

Although districts from all 50 states are included in the Special Education Expenditure Project (SEEP), the national sample does not include enough districts in any one state to produce information representative of that state. Consequently, last year we invited all states to extend their sample of SEEP districts. In response, nearly 20 states expressed interest, and the following nine states ultimately signed contracts: Alabama, Delaware, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Rhode Island.

This article describes the context and rationale for these studies from the states' perspective. We interviewed key officials from all nine states to find out what factors affected their decision to engage in a state-level SEEP, the questions they expect the study to answer, and their degree of interest in developing state and district capacity to generate special education expenditure data over time.

This article also launches a new offer to the remaining 41 states, and also to school districts, to conduct a SEEP during the 2000-01 school year. Interested states and districts would benefit from an additional year of experience in data collection and refined methodology, as well as advances made in state and local capacity building during this first year of study. The fact that the primary database—nearly 500 districts nationwide in this year's SEEP—will be a year old should not substantially diminish its power for comparison purposes.

study also provides a broad base for comparing expenditure patterns across similar districts and states. The ability to make valid comparisons across districts and states is especially strong because the SEEP approach is largely independent of local accounting conventions that tend to vary considerably in definition and practice.

Other Perceived Benefits

In addition, interviews with administrators from the nine SEEP contract states revealed a variety of perceived benefits from expanded participation in SEEP:

■ *Response to public scrutiny*—Nearly all states agreed that special education spending is an area of constant public scrutiny. One director said, "The funding of special education is continually an issue in the state."

■ *Relationship between spending and revenues*—Nearly all of the states want to gain a better understanding of special education spending in relation to revenues. For example, for the New Jersey

(continued on page 6) ►

Benefits

The benefits to states and districts for an expanded SEEP are many. First, it is an opportunity to obtain detailed information on state and local special education expenditures. Because the development cost for the national SEEP has already been absorbed through our federal contract with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), the cost to a state or district for an expanded study is reduced by about one-half. Coupling the effort with the national

In this issue:

Nine States Expand Participation in SEEP This year.....	1
SEEP: Unprecedented Challenges and Opportunities.....	2
Knowledge and Capacity Building through SEEP.....	3
Resources and Publications.....	4
State Funding Survey.....	5
Perspective: CSEF Gets Wired.....	8

About CSEF

The Center for Special Education Finance (CSEF) was established in 1992 to address fiscal policy questions related to the delivery and support of special education services throughout the United States. CSEF has been refunded to continue to meet these information needs and to conduct the first comprehensive, nationally representative study of special education spending in more than 15 years.

SEEP: Unprecedented Challenges and Opportunities

by Rafi Youatt and Leslie Brock

The Special Education Expenditure Project (SEEP), a national effort to collect comprehensive and up-to-date information about special education expenditures, is now in its final stage of collecting data from states, districts, and schools. Under the aegis of CSEF, this study has asked an extraordinary number of educators and administrators from around the country to provide in-depth information on various facets of the special education services they provide. Information sought by SEEP ranges from data on special education revenues and expenditures, to how special education funds are allocated and used, to modes of service delivery. Along the way, SEEP has faced a variety of challenges and opportunities.

Enlisting Support

Perhaps the most significant challenge for SEEP has been working to ensure the cooperation and participation of all 50 states, over 400 districts, 1,600 school administrators, and some 15,000 teachers. CSEF recognizes the various responsibilities and burdens that individuals at each of these levels face in their daily work. In response, we have tried to take a flexible and innovative approach to collecting data for SEEP.

During the fall of 1999—months before the data collection began—CSEF staff contacted the offices of special education in all 50 states and the District of Columbia to ask the directors of special education to support SEEP. This appeal led to the vast majority of states sending out letters of support for SEEP to sampled districts. States almost universally recognized the importance of SEEP as a tool for understanding special education expenditures and improving policymaking decisions, and their continued support throughout the

data collection has been crucial to the success of the study.

In addition to state support, sampled school districts were asked to convey their support for SEEP to sampled schools within their districts. SEEP's success has been dependent on cooperation at all levels, which has surely been a reflection of the importance of this study.

Tailoring the Data Collection

A further challenge has been tailoring the SEEP research design and data collection methods to sort through the complex tangle of administrative structures employed to run special education programs in different states—particularly cooperative arrangements among districts. One of the purposes of SEEP is to determine exactly what these structures are and how they operate so that accurate costs of special education may be obtained. As data collection has progressed, we have encountered a complex variety of arrangements for distributing special education resources. While sorting through these structures has been a challenge, it has been a great opportunity to further understand the mechanisms behind the distribution of special education resources and the provision of services to students. We anticipate that the information gathered through SEEP will help illuminate these systems and ultimately improve the quality of special education services and the distribution of resources.

Creating Unique Opportunities

SEEP is also designed to provide opportunities for all parties involved. First and foremost, SEEP will provide

national special education expenditure data that have not been updated for over 15 years. These data will inform Congress and the U.S. Department of Education, as well as state and local jurisdictions. To make this study as useful as possible, we will provide data back to participating districts so they may compare their resource allocations for special education to other comparable districts across the nation. We are also establishing focus groups for local administrators to share their ideas on how SEEP data may be best used to improve their understanding of the mix of special education services they provide (see article on knowledge and capacity building on the following page).

Recognizing the need for a thorough and complete analysis of special education that is representative of their

"To make this study as useful as possible, we will provide data back to participating districts so they may compare their resource allocations for special education to other comparable districts across the nation."

state, nine states have opted for extended participation in SEEP. CSEF has contracted with each of these states to extend their sample of districts and schools to provide a more complete picture of special education funding and services. This has more than doubled the number of districts and schools from which data are being collected. Additionally, several large districts across the country have contacted CSEF about the possibility of conducting extended and in-depth data collection and analysis of special education (see cover story). Recognizing SEEP as a rare opportunity to obtain vitally important data, we are continuing the offer to

(continued on next page) ►

Challenges and Opportunities (continued from previous page)

over-sample districts and states across the nation, with data collection occurring in the 2000-01 school year.

Lastly, SEEP has stepped into the new millennium by using the latest data collection technology available to conduct surveys: we are offering teachers in the study sample the opportunity to complete questionnaires online, saving them the time and effort of filling out paper surveys and returning them by mail. The online teacher surveys also create new opportunities for us to automatically incorporate survey information into our database, which lessens potential errors caused by manual data entry (see article on SEEP Online on page 4).

Anticipating the Future

As the SEEP data collection comes to a close and data collectors make their final follow-up calls, the primary focus shifts towards data processing and analysis. With preliminary data tabulations due to both the U.S. Department of Education and contracted states in the fall, the exciting pace that SEEP has held for the past months is sure to remain steady. And, as we begin to utilize the SEEP data for in-depth policy analysis, and to collect additional SEEP data next year, additional challenges and opportunities are surely on the horizon. ■

Center for Special Education Finance

American Institutes for Research
1791 Arastradero Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1337

CSEF Phone (650) 843-8136
AIR Phone (650) 493-3550
TTY (650) 493-2209
FAX (650) 858-0958
e-mail csef@air.org
Web <http://csef.air.org>

Knowledge and Capacity Building through SEEP

To make the Special Education Expenditure Project (SEEP) as beneficial as possible to all involved, the SEEP research team is committed to providing useful information back to participating states and school districts. We are also interested in exploring ways to build participants' capacity to use special education expenditure and program information for more effective policymaking at the state and local levels.

At the conclusion of SEEP, participating states and districts will receive descriptions of the mix of services they provide to students with disabilities and the resources associated with them. Similar data from like districts will allow them to compare how they allocate funds to provide these services. Comparative data of this type may be helpful in considering the efficiency of current allocation decisions. For example, if a district spent less than average on mediation but much more on litigation, added mediation services might heighten overall efficiency. Or, a district may find that it spent more than the average on special education, but much less on preferred alternatives. We are anticipating the following approaches to providing this information:

- A report to individual states and districts showing detailed special education expenditures compared with similar jurisdictions across the nation
- A Web-based interactive database of SEEP results
- Dissemination of a broad range of information related to special education finance and policy issues

We are planning to hold focus groups of special education administrators in participating states and districts to help us design information from SEEP that will be most useful to their needs. To share your ideas about what you believe SEEP could do for your district, please call us at (650) 843-8136 or send e-mail to csef@air.org. ■

CSEF Staff

Director of CSEF
Thomas Parrish

Director of SEEP
Jay Chambers

Director of Dissemination
Jean Wolman

Editor and Policy Analyst
Leslie Brock

Graphic Design & Production
John DuBois

Jennifer Anthony
Amynah Dhanani
Diana Doyal
Phil Esra

Senior Advisor to CSEF
Margaret McLaughlin
*Institute for the Study of
Exceptional Children and Youth,
University of Maryland*

Senior Advisor to SEEP
Margaret Goertz
*Consortium for Public Policy
Research in Education,
University of Pennsylvania*

Technical Work Group

Stephen Chaikind
*School of Management,
Gallaudet University*

Douglas Gill
*Washington State
Department of Education*

Diane Gillespie
*Administration and
Supervision of Special
Education, Virginia Tech*

Charlene Green
*Special Student Services,
Clark County, Nevada*

William Hartman
*Pennsylvania State
University*

John Herner
*Division of Special
Education, Ohio
Department of Education*

Donald Kates
*Child Development Center,
Georgetown University*

Jim Viola
*New York State Education
Department*

SEEP Online: the Paperless Survey

The daunting task of surveying over 20,000 teachers and aides... The scores of boxes full of surveys to be mailed across the United States...

With these challenges in mind, CSEF staff envisioned a simpler way to approach the massive SEEP data collection—by allowing school-level surveys to be completed and submitted online.

As the technologies supported by Internet browsers have evolved, the utility of the World Wide Web has grown beyond the simple presentation of text and images. More versatile, advanced programming and scripting languages have enabled Web users to perform a wide variety of tasks. Recent years have also

brought a huge increase in access to the Internet, notably in schools. SEEP has taken advantage of this increase by exploring the uses of the Web for data collection.

“SEEP online” represents a bold effort to use modern techniques to simplify data collection and reduce burden on participants. Respondents can complete the survey on their own schedules. They can complete part of the survey, log out, and return to the same section of the survey at a later time when they log back in. They can return the survey with a click of the mouse, instead of having to return it by mail.

Electronic surveys also incorporate such features as skip patterns

that automatically take respondents to the next question, as well as “on the fly” validity checking that ensures that the data ultimately submitted are complete. A password protection feature ensures that only those included in the study sample and assigned a password may submit a survey. And, importantly, the survey responses are automatically incorporated in the SEEP database, without the burden and risk of error involved in separate data entry.

The online survey was developed by SEEP staff in HTML format, with error-check programming in JavaScript scripting language. Surveys are passed to and processed by a Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) Web server administered by SEEP staff. ■

New CSEF State Analysis Series Paper

We are pleased to announce the publication of a new CSEF State Analysis Series paper, *Adjusting Special Education Aid for Severity: The Case of Census-Based Funding in California*. This paper is based on a larger study in California,¹ which was conducted in response to the state’s recent adoption of a census-based special education funding system. The census-based approach in California distributes funds to special education local planning areas (SELPAs) based on the average daily attendance of all students in member districts, with the underlying assumption that the incidence rates for students with disabilities are approximately equal across SELPAs. This study found that the incidence rates for “severe and/or high cost” students are *not* equal across SELPAs. Consequently, the research team created a “severity service multiplier” to adjust the census-based funding accordingly. These findings for California are relevant to all jurisdictions that already have in place, or are considering, census-based approaches to special education funding. This paper can be accessed online at our Web site (<http://csef.air.org/papers/statadj.pdf>).

¹ Available online at http://www/lao.ca.gov/special_education_0998/special_ed_incidence_by_air.pdf

Technical Work Group Convenes

You have seen their names listed in the CSEF *Resource*, but perhaps wondered what role Technical Work Group (TWG) members play for CSEF and SEEP. The TWG members represent a broad range of backgrounds and expertise from across the country, and provide us with advice and feedback on our varied activities. In March, the TWG convened in Washington, DC, to discuss the nationwide Special Education Expenditure Project (SEEP) that is currently underway. TWG members began the meeting with a discussion on the status of the SEEP data collection. They provided input on how the data furnished by SEEP might be analyzed and reported to the U.S. Department of Education and Congress to effectively address the key fiscal policy issues facing special education today. Finally, TWG members discussed what kinds of information would be useful for reports provided back to participating states and districts. CSEF hopes that these reports will help participating districts better understand the mix of services they are providing to their students with disabilities and how they might allocate funds to provide these services more efficiently and effectively. For further information about what CSEF intends to provide to states and districts, please see the article on page 3 (“Knowledge and Capacity Building through SEEP”). ■

States Respond to Special Education Funding Survey

CSEF last collected and reported information on state special education finance systems and state special education revenues and expenditures in its report, *State Special Education Finance Systems, 1994-95*. This report is often cited and used to guide policymakers in their decisions about allocating resources to serve the needs

of children with disabilities. The National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) is collaborating with the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) through the Policymaker Partnership (PMP) to update this information by conducting another survey for the 1998-1999 school year. NASDSE distrib-

uted the surveys in December 1999, and CSEF is currently working with them to ensure a 100% response rate. Like the earlier report, it will include tables characterizing each state's special education finance system, summary information about state policies in special education funding, and data on state special education expenditures and revenues to the extent that they are available.

Special Education Spending by Funding Source, 1998-99 States Responding to NASDSE/CSEF Survey to Date

State	Age Range	Number Served	Federal	State	Local	Degree of Confidence in Data
Alabama	6-21	92,314	\$50,899,540	\$292,147,092	\$18,638,198	<i>confident</i>
Alaska	3-21	17,705	\$10,545,070	n/a	n/a	<i>highly confident</i>
Arizona	0-22	88,690	\$51,033,049	\$15,654,499	\$270,234,773	<i>somewhat confident</i>
Arkansas	5-22	52,672	\$26,829,363	\$146,420,968	n/a	<i>highly confident</i>
California	0-22	646,191	\$463,863,992	\$2,389,822,676	\$2,009,423,513	<i>somewhat confident</i>
Colorado ²	0-21	71,000	\$30,529,711	\$74,530,025	\$237,449,452	<i>not confident</i>
Connecticut	3-22	76,740	\$40,577,113	\$306,813,775	\$480,270,304	<i>confident</i>
Delaware	3-21	13,502	\$9,942,582	\$96,754,009	\$41,466,003	<i>confident</i>
Florida	0-22	342,888	\$227,700,245	\$1,685,440,834 ¹	\$1,160,238,558 ¹	<i>not confident</i>
Idaho	3-22	27,269	\$16,554,756	\$81,116,871	\$16,614,299	<i>somewhat confident</i>
Illinois	3-21	280,660	\$188,429,267	\$867,014,100	n/a	<i>confident</i>
Indiana	5-22	142,818	\$89,431,754 ⁴	\$293,945,827 ⁴	n/a	<i>highly confident</i>
Iowa	5-22	70,429	\$35,850,998	\$267,353,126	\$71,068,553	<i>highly confident</i>
Kansas	3-22	58,433	\$39,671,138	\$213,842,549	\$164,835,313	<i>somewhat confident</i>
Louisiana	0-22	95,211	\$29,951,146	\$493,508,125 ³	Incl. in State	<i>highly confident</i>
Maryland ¹	0-22	108,107	\$75,231,963	\$260,918,640	\$648,641,778	<i>not confident</i>
Massachusetts	0-22	159,042	\$42,854,366	\$399,974,079	\$647,613,428	<i>not specified</i>
Montana	0-22	18,797	\$11,452,352	\$32,520,396	\$27,305,512	<i>highly confident</i>
Michigan	3-26	210,861	\$91,062,796 ¹	\$1,678,578,497	n/a	<i>not confident</i>
Minnesota	0-22	108,951	\$66,521,736	\$624,554,821	\$229,458,221	<i>confident</i>
Missouri	5-22	124,605	\$81,700,000	\$144,200,000	n/a	<i>highly confident</i>
Nevada	3-22	33,294	\$18,763,149 ⁴	\$56,347,359 ⁴	\$131,722,405 ⁴	<i>somewhat confident</i>
New Mexico	3-21	49,124 ²	n/a	n/a	n/a	<i>not specified</i>
New York ⁵	4-21	380,320 ²	\$276,089,287 ²	\$1,629,464,782 ²	\$2,617,342,958 ²	<i>highly confident</i>
New Jersey	0-21	210,114	\$102,733,119	\$645,852,757	\$959,124,496	<i>somewhat confident</i>
North Carolina	0-22	164,026	\$95,819,567	\$369,832,388	n/a	<i>highly confident</i>
North Dakota	3-22	13,181	\$7,035,827	\$20,623,626	\$45,716,675	<i>confident</i>
Rhode Island	3-21	27,161	\$8,913,476 ⁴	\$33,393,485 ⁴	n/a	<i>confident</i>
Tennessee	5-22	178,480 ¹	\$80,819,015 ⁴	\$381,223,712	\$39,529,521	<i>not confident</i>
Texas	3-22	486,749	\$274,752,624	\$2,089,258,639 ³	Incl. in State	<i>somewhat confident</i>
Virginia	0-22	153,407	\$83,755,340	\$255,982,173	\$620,000,218	<i>confident</i>
Washington ¹	0-21	110,989	\$61,721,535	\$381,041,249	\$142,331,511	<i>not confident</i>
Wisconsin	6-21	102,614	\$71,081,235	\$258,288,385	\$621,589,984	<i>somewhat confident</i>
Wyoming	5-22	11,991	\$8,188,737	\$77,375,519	\$0	<i>confident</i>

¹97-98 data

²96-97 data

³state and local, combined

⁴figure represents revenues

⁵New York reports that more current data will be soon forthcoming.

n/a = not available

Preliminary Results

Of the 34 states responding to date, only 8 report that the formula in the 1994-95 report still presents an accurate description of their current approach to special education funding. In addition, 12 states have formally initiated procedures to consider or enact changes in special education funding for next year.

Although 25 of the responding states could provide estimates of total federal, state, and local revenues or expenditures, they express varying degrees of confidence in the accuracy of these data. The table shows these expenditures and notes those states that are unable to provide data in this format.

NASDSE, NCSL, PMP, and CSEF continue to work with the remaining 16 states that have yet to respond to this survey. As all states will be included in the final report, we are working hard to make sure that we have the most current and accurate information available. We appreciate the states responding to date, and urge the others to do so as soon as possible. All states can benefit from learning of the experiences of others. ■

Expanded SEEP

(continued from page 1)

study, we have added an extra data element to allow comparison of the cost of serving students in various funding categories in relation to revenues. New Jersey's new funding formula is based on excess costs. "However, we have always had trouble getting a sense of what the true excess costs are. This was the impetus for getting a study to try and flesh this out."

■ *Assessment of change in funding policies*—Several states said that recent changes in special education funding made this an opportune time to examine state special education spending in depth. New York, for example, recently added a new funding category for special education students who are largely included in the general education classroom. This change generated discussion as to an appropriate level of funding for such students. A funding amount was set and a decision was made to track expenditures on these students in relation to the funding they generate.

Four other states said that they were currently assessing or building a case for changing their funding systems. They hope that the spending information generated by SEEP will help guide their policy

"Because the development cost for SEEP has already been absorbed through our federal contract, the cost to the state for such a study is reduced by about one-half."

decisions. One director said, "We would like to be able to compare the amounts underlying our current funding categories to what is being spent for students in these categories in relation to their true need for services."

■ *Cost breakdowns by category*—States are also interested in understanding cost breakdowns by disability and type of placement. Some states described the relative ease of tracking costs for students served in traditional placements such as self-contained class, resource room, or related services. However, one state director commented: "To encourage flexibility, we have considerably loosened the linkage between funding, the exact type of service received, and the location in which it is provided. While this may have advantages from a program perspective, financially we have lost track of what is going on in special education. We need a study to gain a better handle on this." A number of state directors also expressed interest in comparing spending patterns by type of district—for example, urban versus rural, large versus small, and high versus low poverty.

■ *Spending on "mainstreamed" students*—One director commented that while their prior funding system provided fairly good data on what was being spent in different settings, it did not provide funding for special education students served in the regular class. While the new system is much more inclusive, it also makes special education spending much harder to track.

■ *Special education versus general education*—As described by one director, "Districts believe their costs are continually rising and be-

coming a larger share of the local budget." Another said, "School officials constantly express concern about how to fund general education services at needed levels while providing the entitled special edu-

"Our state policymaking is increasingly data driven and you have to have data to defend your policies."

cation services." A third reported, "Superintendents are saying that way too much is going to special education and that state revenues are insufficient, while advocates argue that special education is not getting enough."

A related question is the *relationship between special versus general education spending*. For example, what is being spent on student study teams, and how much of the teams' time is spent on general versus special education? Although general education perceives these activities to be part of the cost of special education, special educators see them as general education costs because they occur prior to referral.

■ *Relating special education spending to student outcomes*—Several directors expressed their ultimate desire to relate this spending information to student outcomes. One state that has recently allowed more flexibility in the use of resources expressed concern that without expenditure and outcome data, they do not know what is being achieved with this new

(continued on next page) ►

Expanded SEEP

(continued from page 6)

flexibility. It may be that rather than improving the cost-effectiveness of special education through added flexibility, local officials may not be using these released resources for special education services at all.

■ *General need for information*—Another commonly cited objective for expanded participation in SEEP was a general need for information on special education expenditures. As one director stated, “We need better information when we go before legislative committees.” Another said, “We get a lot of questions as to why certain kinds of numbers are going through the roof. We need to understand what these costs translate into in regard to actual services.”

■ *Capacity building*—Several directors also expressed interest in developing an ongoing capacity to

measure special education expenditures. A few mentioned the importance of developing baseline data to provide accurate measures of changing expenditures over time. Others talked about the need to develop an ongoing cost measurement system “so that we are not just left to do something intensive every 10 years.”

■ *Support for policymaking*—The ultimate rationale for participation in a state SEEP, cited by all interviewed states in one way or another, is the need for data to support better policymaking. One director said, “Facts are not always pretty, but at least they are facts and you can go from there. Our state policymaking is increasingly data driven. You have to have data to defend your policies.” Another director cited the relevance of these data to decisionmaking at the dis-

trict level where “the debate over the costs of special education can get nasty. Information could potentially help this.”

■ *Independent, unbiased perspective*—Several states expressed the need for an independent research team to provide a clearly unbiased examination to help clarify state policy questions. One director commented, “We want an honest accounting of what special education actually costs.”

The Challenge Ahead

Our biggest challenge is to assist local, state, and federal policymakers to realize the full potential of the SEEP data. This objective will guide our analysis and reporting, as well as our capacity building efforts with participating districts and states. ■

CSEF Gets Wired

(continued from back page)

increasingly broad audience of interested users.

Our Web sites, like millions of others, also link our customers—with the click of a mouse—to other useful organizations and resources that previously would have been a challenge to identify and access. You can now easily find the fiscal regulations of IDEA on our site, which hyperlinks to selected regulations indexed at www.ideapractices.org—a Web site run by two IDEA Partnership Projects, ILEAD and ASPIRE, at the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). Recently, we launched several online surveys—SEEP teacher surveys and a CSEF feedback form—making our Web sites more interactive and efficient than ever before.

...and soon to come...

We have only just begun to tap the potential of technology for CSEF’s dissemination and technical assistance activities in our new hyperlinked world. On the horizon are more interactive modes of disseminating products and delivering technical assistance. First, we need to reconceptualize our products from the start as Web-based rather than paper documents—facilitating useful linkages within and beyond each document to improve its usefulness and accessibility to users. We intend to create online, interactive databases that will make the results of SEEP accessible to users of all types. We hope to integrate more sophisticated search capabilities into our Web sites—particularly within our comprehensive online bibliography of special education finance. And, to respond more effectively to client needs, we envision an online chat

room on special education finance, or perhaps videoconferencing on topics of special interest.

The technology for these strategies exists *now*. But we can only imagine what lies ahead for enhancing our work as new technologies emerge. By the time you read this newsletter, I will have attended the 10th Annual Meeting of OSEP’s TA&D network in Washington, DC. A major theme of this year’s meeting, and many recent meetings, is technology for TA&D. I look forward to returning to CSEF with many new ideas to consider as we venture forward together to provide information and services to educators, parents, researchers, and policymakers who are committed to improving education for students with disabilities. ■

by Jean Wolman

“CSEF needs to go online...we need to join the special education listserv....we need to design a project Web site...and we need to do it soon.” This was the message I brought back to colleagues after returning from my first Technical Assistance and Dissemination (TA&D) network meeting in Washington—just 6 years ago!

What a long way we’ve come since then...and what an exciting road we have yet to travel....

Then...

In October 1992—less than 8 years ago—CSEF opened for business as part of the Office of Special Education Program’s (OSEP) emerging network of TA&D providers. Our mission was, and continues to include, the production and dissemination of a broad array of policy-relevant information related to special education finance.

At that time, we designed and began to produce our newsletter, *The CSEF Resource*, for a small—but soon to grow—audience of educators, policymakers, and researchers at the federal, state, and local levels. We used state-of-the-art desktop publishing to produce the *Resource*, then printed and mailed it using outside vendors to assist in the process. We used similarly labor-intensive techniques to produce our many policy papers and briefs, and collaborated with the Council of Administrators of Special Education (CASE) to disseminate the documents in a cost-effective and timely manner.

A cover letter describing our most recent products and providing instructions for ordering additional copies accompanied each mailing, along with an updated CSEF publications list. Our budget dictated that we be cautious about the number of documents to print and selective about the individuals and organizations who would receive them. After our limited printed copies were depleted, we resorted to copying, stapling, and sending additional copies on a request basis—surely, a costly and inefficient way of doing business.

Electronic communication was on the rise, but production and dissemination of our products were primitive by today’s standards. E-mail was rapidly replacing “snail-mail” as a way of communicating with colleagues within and beyond our own organization. Listserves such as “SpecialNet” were a convenient new tool for communicating with groups across common ground. But Web sites were still in their infancy, and distance learning and wired technical assistance were promises to come. Our proposals to the U.S. Department of Education acknowledged the need to integrate technology and its exciting capabilities into our project designs. However, we did not yet have interactive Web sites that met specific guidelines.

....Now...

As we usher in the 21st century, we can observe immense change in our dissemination and technical assistance activities. The Internet has become ubiquitous in our professional and personal lives. We use e-mail continuously to receive and send routine information, to review and revise CSEF products, and to respond to inquiries from our customers across the nation—indeed, throughout the world. We no longer need, nor choose, to disseminate primarily by mail. Instead, we use our CSEF and SEEP Web sites to convey a broad range of information and products to fellow researchers, policymakers, and practitioners interested in special education finance. We now spend time previously spent copying, stapling, and mailing out requested literature in more productive ways—developing and making new resources available online to an

We Need Your Feedback

To help CSEF meet your needs better, we need your feedback. We would like to know what you like about our current dissemination program, particularly with regard to our Web sites. Please take a few minutes to complete our online feedback form to let us know how we might better meet your information and data needs. You can find it at:

<http://csef.air.org/feedback.html>

Thank you in advance for your input.

(continued on page 7)



AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

Center for Special Education Finance (CSEF)

● 1791 Arastradero Road ● Palo Alto, CA 94304-1337 ●

