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CSA: A Very Short History

• Effective July 1, 1993
• Consolidated funding from seven funding streams and four agencies (DSS, DOE, DBHDS, DJJ) into a single “state pool”
• Funds from DOE included Private Tuition Assistance
• Established a state supervised, locally administered and operated system
• Created the structures and functions to operate the program (SEC, OCS, FAPT, CPMT, etc.)
Eligibility for CSA Funding
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CSA Funding: A Shared Responsibility

Source: 2017 Final Data: CSA Local Expenditure and Data Reimbursement System (LEDRS)
Eligibility for CSA Funding

- §2.2-5211.B.1 and §2.2-5212.A.3 – Children and youth placed for purposes of special education in approved private school educational programs, previously funded by the Department of Education through private tuition assistance.

- §2.2-5211.C – The General Assembly and the governing body of each county and city shall annually appropriate such sums of money as shall be sufficient to (i) provide special education services ... for children and youth identified in subdivisions B 1 ... and meet relevant federal mandates for provision of these services.
CSA Funding for Students with Disabilities

• Local school division identifies the student and develops an Individualized Education Program (IEP) specifying a private educational setting (day or residential) as the least restrictive environment following the requirements of the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and state special education regulations.
  – The student is referred to the local CSA program to arrange placement (if not already determined in the IEP) and funding.

• State share of cost is reimbursed through CSA.
• Source of local matching funds is at the discretion of the locality.
Youth Served: Private Special Education Services

Source: CSA Data Set (pre-2017) and Local Expenditure and Data Reimbursement System (LEDRS)
## DOE Data on Private Placements by Disability

### December 1 Placement Codes 3 and 5 by Disability Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Category</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>149%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disturbance</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>113%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Disability</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>121%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>122%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>123%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Totals</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>2482</td>
<td>2655</td>
<td>2802</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>125%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DOE Private Residential Placement Code 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Category</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>117%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disturbance</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Disability</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>114%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Totals</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** DOE December 1 Special Education Child Count
• While recent growth in CSA private educational programs is primarily due to increases in students with autism as their primary disability . . .

• Emotional disturbance (ED) is about equal in frequency in the overall private education census and . . .

• According to the DOE data, ED is the primary disability found among students placed in IEP-directed private residential placements.
## Gross CSA Expenditures – Private Education

| Source: CSA Data Set (pre-2017) and Local Expenditure and Data Reimbursement System (LEDRS) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Day</td>
<td>$ 124,290.761</td>
<td>$ 138,931,168</td>
<td>$ 156,792,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$ 15,873,686</td>
<td>$ 15,872,069</td>
<td>$ 18,181,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 140,164,447</td>
<td>$ 154,803,237</td>
<td>$ 174,973,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average Daily Cost – Private Day School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 13</td>
<td>$132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 14</td>
<td>$134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 15</td>
<td>$131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 16</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 17</td>
<td>$169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Costs of transportation are the responsibility of the local school division

**Source:** CSA Data Set (pre-2017) and Local Expenditure and Data Reimbursement System (LEDRS)
Average Annual Cost – Private Day School

Source: CSA Data Set (pre-2017) and Local Expenditure and Data Reimbursement System (LEDRS)
Special Education Wraparound Funding

- $2.2 million from the CSA state pool (Chapter 836, Item 285. L.) is set aside for serving students with educational disabilities in community-based (non-school) settings.

- Students are considered to be eligible under the special education mandate.

- Requires local matching funds.

- Localities are allocated funds by OCS, but may or may not utilize them and/or may request additional funds beyond the initial allocation, if such funds remain available.
CSA Census and Pool Fund Expenditures by Primary Mandate Type (PMT)

CSA Census by PMT

- Special Education Services: 32%
- Foster Care: 39%
- Foster care Prevention: 6%
- Wraparound - SPED: 3%
- Non-Mandated Only: 1%

CSA Expenditures by PMT

- Special Education Services: 45%
- Foster Care: 39%
- Foster care Prevention: 14%
- Wraparound - SPED: 1%
- Non-Mandated Only: 1%

Note: A child may have more than one PMT

Source: 2017 Final Data: CSA Local Expenditure and Data Reimbursement System (LEDRS)
CSA Expenditures by Category (FY2014 – 2017)

Source: CSA Data Set (pre-2017) and Local Expenditure and Data Reimbursement System (LEDRS)
Recent Efforts to Address the Issues

- Virginia Commission on Youth
  - Two year study (Final Report (HD14) issued November 2015)

- State Executive Council for Children’s Services (SEC)
  - Report (RD429, issued November 2016) provided a number of recommendations including:
    - Restructuring the Children’s Services Act and Virginia Department of Education funding of special education services, specifically private educational services.
    - Defining and measuring outcomes for students in private special education settings.
    - Increasing attention to the successful transition/reintegration of students with disabilities from private settings to public school settings.
    - Supporting and enhancing the ability of public schools to serve students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment.
  - The input gathered by the SEC work group reflected the great complexity of the issues contributing to this situation, distinct perspectives of different constituencies, and the many challenges in arriving at possible solutions.
Recent Efforts to Address the Issues

• The 2017 General Assembly directed the staff of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance committees (Appropriation Act, Chapter 836, Item T. 5. (b – d)) and this subcommittee to further study this issue and to make recommendations.