



September 2008

Financial Responsibility for Students with Disabilities: A Special Case

by **Chandra Keller-Allen, Ed.D.**

INTRODUCTION

Schools are required to provide a “free appropriate public education” (FAPE) to students found eligible for special education and related services in accordance with federal and state regulations implementing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act [20 U.S.C. §1401(9)]. Defining FAPE for particular students may be challenging and disagreements can arise between districts and parents. However, determining which public agency is financially responsible for FAPE when students with disabilities are also identified as members of other state systems, such as corrections or foster care, can pose an even greater challenge to local education agencies (LEAs). Research has demonstrated that educational needs are not typically considered in determining foster care placements (Fletcher et al., 1990; Knapp et al., 1985; Montoya, 2000; Parrish et al., 2001, 2003), which may lead to few opportunities for interagency collaboration and disputes over financial responsibility for services. State education agencies (SEAs) have a role in assisting LEAs with these decisions through policy, technical assistance or interagency agreements that clearly designate which entity is responsible for specific services under specific conditions or provide for a process by which entities can make such decisions.

This policy analysis addresses situations when students with disabilities are placed by a noneducational agency outside the boundaries of their district of residence. Examples of such placements include foster or group homes, correctional facilities or residential treatment programs. For a typical student with a disability residing with his or her parents or legal guardians, educational placement decisions, including residential placements, are made by the individualized education program (IEP) team. However, there are instances when students with disabilities may be placed in a facility or home outside the district of residence by a noneducational agency—department of social services, department of corrections or the court system—for reasons other than an educational program without consultation or even notification of the IEP team. Financial responsibility for these students’ special education and related services may be unclear.

This document was prepared by Project Forum at the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) as part of its cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

States use varying language to describe the entities and situations discussed in this paper. The following terms are defined for the purposes of this brief in order to maintain consistency:

Noneducational agency—Any public agency that is not an LEA or SEA that may refer or place students outside the home including, but not limited to, the departments of corrections, child and family services and the court system.

District of residence—The LEA where the student originated and where his or her legal parents or guardians continue to reside.

District of location—The LEA in which a foster home, group home, residential facility, correctional facility or other out-of-home placement is located.

METHODOLOGY

Project Forum surveyed all state and nonstate jurisdiction education agencies (SEAs) in May and June of 2008 to collect information on how states determine which entity is financially responsible for a special education student’s FAPE when that student is placed outside of his or her district of residence by a noneducational agency. The survey was distributed to state directors of special education with the option to respond via an online survey site, email attachment, or fax. Surveys were completed by state directors of special education or their designee. Thirty-nine out of sixty possible SEAs (65%) responded to the survey. The survey questions are displayed in Appendix A. The result of analysis of the survey responses and materials provided by the states are provided in the following sections.

FINDINGS

Extent of Problem

A clear majority of responding states (84%) report that their LEAs experience some level of difficulty with this issue. Only six of those responding report that this issue has not been a problem at all.

Table 1 Number and percent of states reporting degree of problem with this issue (n=38)

	Number of States	Percent of States
Significant problem	10	26
Somewhat of a problem	13	34
Minimal problem	9	24
Not a problem at all	6	16
	38	100

Some states report problems stemming from the complicated nature of this issue. *Minnesota* policy is not specific regarding education responsibility to provide for transportation costs to and from an institution when education services are not being provided. The statute as written in *Nebraska* is complex and many LEAs have problems interpreting the law to determine financial responsibility for such students. *Wyoming* reports

problems due to the complicated nature of sorting out financial responsibility in cases where three or more state agencies and the courts are involved; the respondent indicated there have been instances where residential facilities have been operating without payment for months. *South Dakota* reports that this issue is a significant problem for LEAs when the student is not in the custody of the state.

Another type of problem some states report is agencies, both public and private, not following the policies put in place by the state. *Iowa* reports that problems arise when agencies do not follow the procedures for informing the districts of residence and location of placements made for noneducational reasons. In *Nevada*, state law holds the placing noneducational agency fully financially responsible for special education and related services, but often these agencies will attempt to bill the district of residence and the SEA anyway. *Maryland* reports that at times agencies do not follow the set procedures for using the Local Coordinating Councils to make placement decisions.

In some instances, the SEAs appear to dedicate significant resources to addressing this issue. *Wisconsin* notes that the SEA receives questions on this issue on a weekly basis. *Arizona* recognizes that there is an ongoing need for training at the local level due to the complexity of this issue. *Massachusetts* employs a full-time staff person to make determinations of LEA financial responsibility when there is a dispute or confusion.

States also note difficulties faced by particular LEAs overburdened with out-of-home placement facilities. *Arizona* and *Indiana* note that LEAs with many group or foster homes face particular challenges. Rural LEAs in *Kentucky* are overburdened financially when multiple homes that serve students requiring intensive and costly services operate within their boundaries.

The *Bureau of Indian Education* (BIE) indicates several problems that may be unique to its structure including jurisdictional issues (dealing with multiple tribes and states), the wide geographic area that the *Bureau* covers (BIE has 184 schools in 23 states), and when noneducational agencies place students into facilities without notifying the *Bureau*. Determining financial responsibility for students within the BIE system who are placed out-of-home by a noneducational agency can be exceptionally difficult given the multitude of entities and varying state laws with which they must contend.

Rules Vary Depending on Specific Circumstances

Review of survey responses and analysis of states' policies leads to the general conclusion that the answer to the primary question investigated in this brief—what agency is financially responsible for special education and related services for students who are placed outside of their district of residence by a noneducational agency—is: *it depends*. More respondents answered "other" than any other choice when asked what agency holds financial responsibility for educational services for a student with a disability placed outside of his or her district of residence by a noneducational facility (See Table 2). However, the response of "other" did not typically indicate that there was an unlisted entity responsible; rather, "other" indicated that the district of residence, district of location, or SEA could each be financially responsible within the same state depending on the specific situation.

Table 2 Number and percent of states reporting which agency is financially responsible for students with disabilities' educational services when placed outside of district of residence by a noneducational agency (n=39)

	Number of States	Percent of States
District of residence	7	18
District of location	7	18
Noneducational agency that placed the student	2	5
State education agency	4	10
Other	19	49
	39	100

Responsibility for noneducational costs, such as room and board, is less complicated. A clear majority of respondents (95%) report that the noneducational agency placing the student outside of his or her home district is financially responsible for the child's noneducational needs. The two remaining states (*Alaska* and *Ohio*) selected "other." *Alaska* indicates that Medicaid typically pays for noneducational costs when children are eligible. The facility that receives the student is responsible for bearing the noneducational costs in *Ohio*; responsibility for paying the facility will vary depending on who placed the child in the facility.

More than one-half of responding states (67%) report having some kind of policy, written procedures, guidance or interagency agreement(s) pertaining to financial responsibility for out-of-district placements of special education students made by noneducational agencies. The regulations and interagency agreements provided offer varied approaches to assigning financial responsibility for educational costs. Two themes emerged from analysis of states' policies and survey responses pertaining to this issue: a) states assign financial responsibility to different agencies depending on the specific circumstances; and b) a number of states have procedures in place to resolve disputes over which agency bears financial responsibility in these situations.

Many of the responding states report different rules of financial responsibility depending on the specific agencies, facilities and procedures involved in a noneducational placement decision. The following are some specific examples of how the states handle this issue.

- *Arizona*: The district of location is financially responsible for FAPE for students with disabilities in foster care if the child is a ward of the state. If the foster child is not a ward of the state, the district of location can apply for reimbursement from the SEA. The SEA is financially responsible for FAPE for students with disabilities in residential facilities. The correctional facilities are considered their own LEAs and therefore are responsible for the costs and provision of FAPE. Financial responsibility for FAPE for students with disabilities in county jails varies by county.
- *Arkansas*: The district of location is financially responsible for FAPE for students with disabilities in foster care. The district of residence is financially responsible for FAPE for students with disabilities in residential facilities but the LEA can apply to be reimbursed by the SEA. Correctional facilities split the costs of FAPE with the district of location; the SEA requires a memorandum of understanding between each LEA and juvenile detention

facility within its boundaries that addresses the responsibilities for provision of services and costs.

- *Delaware*: The district of residence is financially responsible for FAPE for students with disabilities in foster homes or group homes for foster children. The noneducational agency making the placement decision is financially responsible for FAPE for students with disabilities placed in mental health or correctional facilities.
- *Idaho*: The district of location is financially responsible for FAPE for students with disabilities placed in facilities other than correctional facilities, but is provided with additional funding from the SEA. The district of location is responsible for FAPE when students are in the custody of city or county jails or juvenile detention centers. The Department of Corrections serves as an LEA and is responsible for FAPE when students are in the custody of the Department of Juvenile Corrections or the Department of Corrections.
- *Indiana*: The district of residence (“legal settlement”) is financially responsible for FAPE for students with disabilities placed in a state-licensed private or public health care facility or child care facility by or with consent of the Department of Child Services, by a court order or by a placing agency licensed by the Department of Child Services. The state board of education may resolve any disputes regarding determination of district of residence and the amount of transfer tuition granted.
- *Maryland*: Placement decisions and assignment of financial responsibility are determined on a case-by-case basis by the Local Coordinating Council (LCC).
- *Minnesota*: The district of location is financially responsible for FAPE for students with disabilities in residential facilities. The Department of Corrections is considered its own LEA and therefore is responsible for the costs and provision of FAPE for students in its custody.
- *Nebraska*: FAPE and transportation are provided by the district of location if the student with a disability is a ward of the state or court and is placed in an *unlicensed* foster family home or institution that operates a special education program approved by the SEA; however, the district of location can be reimbursed by the state for these costs. The district of location is financially responsible for students with disabilities who are wards of the state or court placed in *licensed* foster homes. The district of location can enter into a contract for financial reimbursement from the district of residence for the provision of FAPE for students with disabilities in a licensed foster home who are not wards of the state or court. The SEA is financially responsible for FAPE if a ward of the state or court is placed in a county detention home.
- *North Dakota*: The district of residence is financially responsible for FAPE for students with disabilities placed out-of-home by noneducational agencies with the following exception: the SEA is financially responsible for FAPE when parental rights have been terminated or the parents have moved out of state. Placement (and therefore financial responsibility) is reported annually and cannot be changed until the next annual notification.
- *South Carolina*: The district of location is financially responsible for FAPE for students with disabilities in foster care, group homes, orphanages or state health facility. The

district of residence is financially responsible if the residential treatment facility is considered its own LEA.

- *South Dakota:* The district of location is financially responsible for FAPE for students with disabilities placed by the Department of Corrections or the Department of Social Services. The district of residence is responsible for children placed in group homes or private residential child care centers but only if the placement is made with the knowledge of the district of residence. The Department of Social Services is financially responsible for FAPE for students in the care and custody of the state who are placed in licensed residential treatment facilities or licensed group care centers.
- *Wisconsin:* The district of location is financially responsible for FAPE for students with disabilities placed in foster homes, group homes or county-operated correctional facilities. The district of residence (or previous responsible district) is financially responsible for FAPE for students with disabilities placed in residential care centers. If a student is placed in a residential care center by the Departments of Corrections or Health and Family Services the district of location is financially responsible for ensuring FAPE, but the placing state agency is responsible for all of the residential care center related education costs. The Department of Corrections and the Department of Health and Family Services are financially responsible for FAPE for students with disabilities residing in their state-operated facilities.

Resolving Disputes Over Financial Responsibility

Several states, recognizing the complexity and possibly contentious nature of determining financial responsibility for students with disabilities who are placed outside of their home for noneducational reasons, have provisions in their policy, interagency agreements or memoranda of understanding that outline procedures for settling disputes over financial responsibility. Disputes arise between districts of location and residence in situations where the district of location is providing FAPE, but billing the district of residence for costs or between agencies at the state level. Examples of provisions addressing the resolution of disputes include:

- *Arkansas:* For cases where a juvenile detention facility and the district of location cannot agree on an amount for reimbursement, either entity may appeal to the SEA for a final decision [Arkansas Department of Education Regulations §18.07.4.4].
- *Delaware:* A multi-agency interagency agreement outlines procedures to resolve programmatic and fiscal disputes. If disputes cannot be resolved at the local level, they can be referred to the state directors of the lead agencies in the interagency agreement. If the dispute cannot be resolved at the state director level, it can be referred to the cabinet secretary level. Any party to the interagency agreement can appeal decisions to the cabinet level.
- *Massachusetts:* The SEA has designated a full-time employee to make LEA assignments of financial responsibility when there are disputes or confusion and the regulations explain the procedures and criteria for such a determination to occur. LEAs are able to appeal SEA decisions.
- *Nebraska:* The SEA will determine financial costs if the districts of location and residence cannot agree and will base such a decision on “the needs of the student, approved

special education rates, the department's general experience with special education budgets and the cost per student in the district [of location]" [Subsection (8) of Nebraska statute §79-215 R.R.S.]. The LEAs involved in the dispute have a right to appeal the SEA's decision to the State Board of Education.

- *Pennsylvania*: The district of residence can appeal bills received from the district of location to the secretary of education according to procedures outlined in Basic Education Circular 24 P.S. 13-1306.
- *South Carolina*: State law [S.C. Code Ann. §20-7-5210] provides for the Children's Case Resolution System to arbitrate cases in which the involved public agencies are not in agreement on who is financially responsible for educational and noneducational services for students with disabilities placed in group homes, foster homes, residential treatment facilities or other placements.
- *Tennessee*: An interagency agreement addressing this issue provides for interagency dispute resolution procedures according to specific timelines. An interagency dispute can be referred to the Resolution Committee, comprised of representatives from each of the agencies party to the agreement, by any of the agencies involved in the dispute. If the dispute cannot be resolved at the informal Resolution Committee level, the aggrieved agency can write a complaint to the Assistant Commissioner of the Division of Special Education. The Assistant Commissioner forwards the complaint to the Commissioners Task Force, which cannot include any of the same representatives that were on the Resolution Committee. The final determination of the Commissioners Task Force is binding on all participating agencies involved in the specific complaint.
- *Texas*: Procedures for resolving local disputes and state agency disputes are provided in a multi-agency memorandum of understanding (MOU) concerning the provision of FAPE to students with disabilities in residential facilities. Local disputes can be referred to the SEA for assistance with negotiations. Disputes between state agencies over implementation of the MOU are addressed first at the staff level and move up a chain of command. If no agreement can be reached, mediation, then arbitration can be used to resolve the dispute.

Strategies Used to Address a Complex Policy Issue

Several states are using many strategies to alleviate the complexity and potentially contentious nature of determining financial responsibility for the provision of FAPE for students with disabilities who are placed out-of-home by a noneducational agency. Some states have attempted to clarify specific situations of financial responsibility by codifying state statute or regulations. States also use interagency agreements (*Connecticut, Delaware, Tennessee, West Virginia*), memoranda of understanding (*Texas*) or general guidance documents (*Wisconsin*). Some states are in the process of creating or revising their written guidance (*Bureau of Indian Education, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, Wyoming*).

A few specific strategies to alleviate confusion, disputes, cost and other possible problems stood out as potentially promising approaches, with some caveats, to address this complex issue.

- *New Mexico, Ohio and California* have policies stating that if the district of residence is not included appropriately in the placement decision making, then they will not be financially responsible for the provision of FAPE.
- *California* uses a system where all LEAs are required to form geographical Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPA) of sufficient scope to provide for all the special education service needs of children residing within the SELPA boundaries, including students placed in the SELPA by a noneducational agency.
- *Michigan, Missouri and California* have mechanisms by which LEAs can be provided additional funding under specific circumstances for students with disabilities placed within their districts for noneducational reasons. *Michigan* statute provides "100% added cost funding" to school districts providing FAPE to wards of the state or court who are placed from outside of the district. *Missouri* LEAs can apply for funding for costs in excess of what they already receive from local, state and federal funds from the "public placement fund," which has a special appropriation from the state legislature; the procedures for accessing this fund have been in place for many years. The *California* SEA calculates and establishes a "bed allowance" and "facility severity rating," to determine a base rate of funding for each SELPA. In addition to this funding, SELPAs in *California* can also apply to receive emergency funding in cases where a new licensed children's institution, foster family home, residential medical facility, or other similar facility serving students with disabilities opens or an existing facility expands within their SELPA during the course of the school year which impacts the SELPA.
- *West Virginia* attempts to simplify this issue by avoiding determinations of financial responsibility at the local level. Per an interagency agreement, the SEA is billed directly for provision of FAPE to students with disabilities in such placements. The LEAs have no role in the placement and according to *West Virginia's* interagency agreement, no financial responsibility. However, the drawback to this strategy in *West Virginia* is that the interagency agreement requires the SEA to pay for placements whether they have been informed of or included in making the placement decision. The current agreement has led to increasing costs over which the SEA has no control. The involved agencies have plans to renegotiate the agreement in the coming months to address this issue.
- *Tennessee's* multi-agency interagency agreement also designates the SEA as the financially responsible party in these situations and may serve as a model for stating in clear language the responsibilities and expectations of interagency collaboration from multiple agencies covering the provision of education, welfare, health, mental health and human services to youth within the state. *Texas'* multi-agency memorandum of understanding may also serve as a model for providing clear guidelines for financial responsibility for FAPE and other services.
- *West Virginia, Tennessee, Texas, Kansas and the Virgin Islands* all reported that this issue has not been a problem at all for their states. There may be aspects of their policy and procedures that are beyond the scope of this brief that reduce the problems associating with determining financial responsibility. Readers are referred to Appendix B where web-based resources from each state are provided.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

SEAs and other lead state agencies can contribute greatly to the work of LEAs and other local and state agencies that serve students with disabilities by providing clear and simple guidelines for determining financial responsibility for educational services in complicated situations. However, merely having written policy does not necessarily mean that it is followed as intended. States' responses and research investigating educational services for students with disabilities in group homes (Parrish et al., 2001, 2003) reveal that there are many instances where the intended procedure can and does break down—notification requirements, sharing information between LEAs, or between an LEA and a group home, and actually providing the special education and related services indicated on a student's IEP. Assessing the efficacy of states' policies and procedures was beyond the scope of this brief policy analysis. However, the impact on students, including both educational and noneducational outcomes, should be examined when determining if current policy, procedures and practice is working within a particular state.

Several strategies reported by the responding state directors of special education or their designees may hold promise for clarifying a complex policy issue and allow for further study on their efficacy in terms of student outcomes.

- Three states reported that their rules do not hold the district of residence financially responsible for FAPE if they were not included in the placement decision making by the other agencies. This would appear to address the problems that arise when noneducational agencies make unilateral decisions based on noneducational needs of the student without considering the student's educational needs. It provides incentive to the noneducational agency to include the resident LEA in the placement process in order to avoid being solely financially responsible for educational and noneducational services.
- *California* organizes LEAs into regional groups (SELPAs) that are able to share the costs for cases such as these. Regionally grouping smaller districts distributes the cost in cases where a few students with disabilities requiring intensive and costly services could drain the financial resources of a small and/or rural district.
- States that have a mechanism by which additional funds can be accessed by LEAs that cannot cover the costs of students with disabilities placed within their boundaries by noneducational agencies may alleviate the cost placed on districts of location.
- *West Virginia* eliminates the problem of financial responsibility for LEAs by dealing with it completely at the state level. This approach cuts out the processes of having to determine district of residence; involving staff from district of residence, district of location, and the facility in the transfer of IEP responsibilities; the billing for reimbursement for services from the district of residence; and potential disputes that may arise. Eliminating these time consuming and financially draining procedures may save the SEA and LEAs money in the long run.
- *Tennessee's* interagency agreement and *Texas's* memorandum of understanding serve as examples of clearly written, thorough, and extensive rules and procedures that address this complex issue in one place, rather than scattered throughout various provisions in state code (e.g., such as the case for *Arizona, California, Maryland, Minnesota* and *South Dakota*). These documents may serve as guides for states revising or creating such agreements among state agencies.

In addition, the responses to the survey suggest more interagency training at the local level may help to increase awareness of state policies and procedures. The survey results suggest that many states continue to struggle with these issues, even when clear policies exist. If the policies are not clear, this leads to additional confusion. These survey results propose some practices that appear to ameliorate issues that arise when students with disabilities are placed outside their school district of residence by a noneducational agency.

One possible response to address state concerns with the complex issue of assigning financial responsibility for FAPE for students placed outside of the district of residence by a noneducational agency is to create additional federal guidance or regulations. However, each state's experience with and approach to this issue is highly unique and dependent upon the relationships that exist between lead state agencies, regional or district boundaries and interagency payment mechanisms that are already in place. What may be most helpful to states in addressing this issue is information sharing across states, templates or models of relevant interagency agreements and general technical assistance that addresses collaborative interagency relationships at the state level. This type of assistance would allow states to gather ideas from others and adjust them to suit their state's unique needs.

This report was supported by the U.S. Department of Education (Cooperative Agreement No. H326F050001). However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position of the U.S. Department of Education and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

Note: There are no copyright restrictions on this document; however, please credit the source and support of federal funds when copying all or part of this material.



This document, along with many other Forum publications, can be downloaded from the Project Forum at NASDSE:

<http://www.projectforum.org>

To order a hard copy of this document or any other Forum publications, please contact Nancy Tucker at NASDSE, 1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320, Alexandria, VA 22314
Ph: 703-519-3800 ext. 326 or Email: nancy.tucker@nasde.org

APPENDIX A Survey Questions

1. When a noneducational agency places a special education student outside of his or her district of residence (e.g., in a foster home, group home, residential facility, correctional facility), who is *financially* responsible for the child's *educational* services if the placement is predicted to be long-term?
 - District of residence
 - District of location
 - The noneducational public agency that placed the student
 - State education agency
 - Other (please explain)

2. When a noneducational agency places a special education student outside of his or her district of residence (e.g., in a foster home, group home, residential facility, correctional facility), who is *financially* responsible for the child's *noneducational* needs (e.g., room and board, transportation, medical care, mental health services) if the placement is predicted to be long-term?
 - District of residence
 - District of location
 - The noneducational public agency that placed the student
 - State education agency
 - Other (please explain)

3. What are the notification requirements when a noneducational agency places a special education student outside of his or her district of residence (e.g., in a foster home, group home, residential facility, correctional facility)? Check all that apply.
 - The noneducational agency making the placement must notify the district of residence of the placement outside of its district.
 - The noneducational agency making the placement must notify the district of location of the placement in its district.
 - The noneducational agency making the placement must notify the state education agency of such a placement.
 - There are no requirements for notification when a noneducational agency places a special education student outside of his/her district of residence.

4. Does your state have any policy, written procedures or guidance to LEAs and/or non-educational agencies regarding placements of special education students made by non-educational entities? If yes, please provide URL or citation or contact information for obtaining such documents.
 - Yes
 - No
 - Other

If you answered Yes or Other, please explain and/or provide URL or citation or contact information for obtaining state policy or written procedures.

5. To what degree has determining the financial responsibility for educational services and non-educational needs for special education students placed in foster homes or residential facilities by noneducational agencies been a problem or area of concern for LEAs in your state?

- Significant problem
- Somewhat of a problem
- Minimal problem
- Has not been a problem at all (skip to # 6)

Please describe your state's experiences with this issue.

6. Please describe any additional information or special circumstances in your state pertaining to determining financial responsibility for special education students placed outside of their district of residence by a noneducational agency.

APPENDIX B Related State Resources Provided Online

Arizona Revised Statutes Title 15

<http://www.azleg.gov/ArizonaRevisedStatutes.asp?Title=15>

See Chapter 8, Article 2, Section 15-825, Chapter 10, Article 6, and Chapter 10, Article 7.

Arizona Residential Voucher Procedural Manual

<http://www.ade.az.gov/ess/statefedinitiatives/vouchers/proceduremanual.pdf>

Arkansas Proposed Regulations Governing Residential Placement

http://arkedu.state.ar.us/commemos/static/fy0607/attachments/PROPOSED_RULE_GOVERNING_RESIDENTIAL_PLACEMENTS.pdf

California Education Code

http://www3.scoe.net/speced/laws_search/searchLaws.cfm

Search for sections 56115, 56115.5, 56115.7, 56156, 56156.4, 56157, 56159, 56162, 56163, 56164, 56165, 56166, and 56166.5.

California Government Code

http://www3.scoe.net/speced/laws_search/searchDetailsLaws.cfm?id=67&keywords=7579

Georgia

<http://www.gadoe.org/documents/doe/legalservices/160-4-7-.19.pdf>

Idaho State Special Education Manual

<http://www.sde.idaho.gov/specialeducation/docs/manual/chapter2.pdf>

Indiana Code

<http://www.in.gov/legislative/ic/code/title20/ar26/ch11.html>

Kansas Special Education Process Handbook, Chapter 5.

http://www.kansped.org/ksde/ph08/PH-ch5-Special_Education.pdf (See page 15.)

Annotated Code of Maryland

http://mlis.state.md.us/asp/web_statutes.asp?ged&4-122

http://mlis.state.md.us/asp/statutes_respond.asp?article=ged§ion=8-406&Extension=HTML

http://mlis.state.md.us/asp/statutes_respond.asp?article=ged§ion=8-415&Extension=HTML

Code of Maryland Regulations

<http://www.dsd.state.md.us/comar/14/14.31.01.05.htm>

Massachusetts Regulations

<http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr28.html?section=10#start>

Minnesota Statutes

<https://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/bin/getpub.php?type=s&num=125A.515&year=2007>

https://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/bin/getpub.php?pubtype=STAT_CHAP_SEC&year=2007§ion=125A.15

https://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/bin/getpub.php?pubtype=STAT_CHAP_SEC&year=2007§ion=125A.51

Minnesota Administrative Rules

<https://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/rules/?id=3525.2325>

Missouri Public Placement Fund Manual

<http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/Finance/PDF/PPFManual2007.pdf>

Montana Annotated Code

<http://data.opi.state.mt.us/bills/mca/20/7/20-7-420.htm>

Nebraska Statute

<http://www.nde.state.ne.us/LEGAL/clean19.pdf>

New Mexico Administrative Code

<http://www.nmcpr.state.nm.us/NMAC/parts/title06/06.031.0002.htm>

Ohio Laws and Rules

<http://codes.ohio.gov/orc/3323.13>

Oregon

<http://whiz.to/~papera/ORS/339.html>

See section titled Residency beginning with 339.133.

Pennsylvania Basic Education Circular

<http://www.pde.state.pa.us/k12/cwp/view.asp?A=11&Q=58789>

South Carolina State Code

<http://www.scstatehouse.gov/code/t59c033.doc>

See section 59-33-90.

South Dakota Codified Law

<http://legis.state.sd.us/statutes/DisplayStatute.aspx?Type=Statute&Statute=13-28-10>

<http://legis.state.sd.us/statutes/DisplayStatute.aspx?Type=Statute&Statute=13-28-11>

<http://legis.state.sd.us/statutes/DisplayStatute.aspx?Type=Statute&Statute=13-28-39>

South Dakota Administrative Rules

<http://legis.state.sd.us/rules/DisplayRule.aspx?Rule=24:05:34:02>

<http://legis.state.sd.us/rules/DisplayRule.aspx?Rule=24:05:34:02>

<http://legis.state.sd.us/rules/DisplayRule.aspx?Rule=24:17:01:05&Type=Rule>

Tennessee Interagency Agreement

<http://www.state.tn.us/education/finintagree.pdf>

Texas Administrative Code

<http://www.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter089/index.html>

Scroll down and click on "[Subchapter AA. Commissioner's Rules Concerning Special Education Services](#)." Division 3. Memoranda of Understanding Affecting Special Education Students."

Wisconsin Sharing Information Across Systems

<http://dpi.wi.gov/sspw/pdf/sharing.pdf>