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**California Department of Education**

 **Report to the California State Legislature and the Department of Finance: Special Education Dispute Prevention and Dispute Resolution Apportionment**

## Executive Summary

This report is a requirement of Assembly Bill (AB) 130 (Ch. 44, Stats. 2021), Section 160. AB 130 is the Education Finance: Education Omnibus budget trailer bill. This bill provided provisions and funding for different educational areas in response to difficulties arising from the 2020 Coronavirus pandemic.

AB 130 Section 160 provided $100 million for the Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPAs) for dispute prevention and dispute resolution (DPDR) in special education. The SELPAs received these funds in October 2021 based on a per pupil calculation. Eighty percent of the funds were required to be distributed to member local educational agencies (LEAs), and all LEAs had until September 30, 2023, to fully encumber funds. All of the SELPAs were required to submit a final report detailing the proposed usage of funds to the California Department of Education (CDE) as well as demographic and narrative data of the programs and activities that were funded. The average amount of funding received per SELPA was $737,790. Of the $100 million allocated, the SELPAs reported spending an average of 75 percent of funds on activities to promote dispute resolution and prevention in special education.

A main goal of DPDR was ensuring that the needs of students with disabilities are met effectively while minimizing conflicts and disputes within the special education process and decreasing the number of due process filings and Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) cases. The SELPA data showed that throughout California, there were over 9,138 disputes handled, and 7,898 cases were fully resolved within the active dispute resolution and dispute prevention activities. Proponents of DPDR funds note that efforts to mitigate escalation can prevent costly legal fees and undue media attention from a hearing or trial. There are no known oppositions to these funds. Participation in the DPDR activities does not mean that parents, guardians, or LEAs are exempt from any law or regulations in place regarding the Individualized Education Program (IEP) process.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact John Burch, Education Administrator I, Special Education Division, at 916-445-4891 or JBurch@cde.ca.gov.

You will find this report on the CDE Special Education Laws, Regulations, and Policies web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/lr/>. If you need a copy of this report, please contact Samantha Roan, Education Programs Consultant, Special Education Division, at 916-327-3674 or SRoan@cde.ca.gov.

### Background

AB 130 (Ch. 44, Stats. 2021), Section 160 provided $100 million from the General Fund to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for the SELPAs to support their member LEAs in resolving special education disputes caused by COVID-19 disruptions between March 13, 2020, and September 1, 2021. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction distributed these funds equally per pupil with exceptional needs amongst the SELPAs. To receive these funds, the SELPAs submitted plans to the CDE by October 1, 2021, detailing how they would support LEAs in dispute prevention and resolution, which included proposed expenditures and allocation information. The funds were distributed as an additional apportionment in October of 2021.

The funds provided under this legislation were to be used for several key purposes:

1. Early Intervention: This involves promoting collaboration and positive relationships between families and schools, preventing disputes through proactive communication, collaborative problem-solving, parent education regarding special education processes and rights, and support for families with language barriers.

2. Voluntary Alternative Dispute Resolution: This includes offering alternative dispute resolution for issues not resolved through the IEP process. It emphasizes that the process is voluntary and the staff involved must act as neutral parties. The goal is to reach agreements quickly and at no cost to parents to support learning recovery.

3. Partnership with Family Support Organizations: LEAs are encouraged to partner with family empowerment centers (FECs) and similar organizations to prevent and resolve disputes in a pupil-centered, collaborative, and equitable manner.

4. Identifying and Assisting Families with Barriers: Agencies should develop plans to identify and reach out to families facing language barriers and other challenges in participating in the special education process. These families have experienced significant disruptions to their education due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

This legislation was intended to offer needed financial assistance to SELPAs and LEAs and enable them to collaborate with local stakeholders in resolving special education disputes arising from the COVID-19 pandemic before resorting to expensive and time-consuming due process hearings or OAH filings.

#### SELPA Background

In 1977, all school districts and county school offices were mandated to form consortiums in geographical regions of sufficient size and scope to provide for all special education service needs of children residing within the region’s boundaries. Each region, or SELPA, developed a local plan describing how it would provide special education services. The SELPA collaborates with county agencies and school districts to develop and maintain healthy and enriching environments in which special needs students and families can live and succeed.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-112), amended in 1992, includes Section 504, which affirms the right of any student or adult who has a mental or physical impairment that inhibits a major life activity (including learning), has a history of such an impairment, or is considered by a team of knowledgeable individuals to have such an impairment from being discriminated against program or activity receiving federal financial assistance. The act also requires that students be given a free, appropriate public education in regular education classes with necessary supplementary aids and services if they are determined by a school team to be disabled under Section 504 or the Americans with Disabilities Act. Such eligibility may exist without concurrent eligibility for special education under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

The Rehabilitation Act was followed in 1975 by the passage of Public Law 94-142, the Education of Handicapped Act, which was changed in 1990 to the IDEA. This is the legislation that provides that all students who are eligible for special education must be provided with a free, appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. The California Legislature implements the provisions of IDEA through the California Master Plan for Special Education. This plan was first implemented statewide in 1980 with the passage of Senate Bill 1870 (Ch. 797, Stats. 1980).

This required the sharing of program resources, including transportation, through regional cooperation among public and non-public schools and non-educational agencies. The services are provided through the SELPAs. The Local Plan developed and maintained in each community by the people who live there is the basis of these improvements and the foundation of services. (Text excerpted from the CDE California SELPAs web page at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/se/as/caselpas.asp>.)

#### Alternate Dispute Resolution Background

Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) is a process in which a neutral third party—a mediator or arbitrator—helps parties who are embroiled in a dispute come to an agreement. Mediation and arbitration are types of alternative dispute resolution because they offer an alternative to litigation. The foundation for the ADR in special education is the IDEA. The IDEA provides several ADR options for resolving disputes between parents and school districts, including:

* Mediation: Mediation is a voluntary process where an impartial third party (mediator) helps parents and school districts resolve disputes. The goal is to reach a mutually agreeable solution. Mediation is available at no cost to the parties involved.
* Due Process Hearings: When mediation does not lead to an agreement, parents and school districts can request a due process hearing. This is a formal legal procedure where an impartial hearing officer reviews the evidence and decides the dispute.
* State Complaints: Parents can file complaints with their state education agency if they believe a school district has violated the IDEA. The state agency investigates the complaint and takes appropriate action.
* Resolution Sessions: Before a due process hearing, the IDEA requires a resolution session to be held. This is an opportunity for the parents and the school district to resolve the dispute. If an agreement is not reached, the due process hearing proceeds.

There are many benefits to ADR, including:

* Faster Resolution: ADR processes are often faster than going to court, which allows disputes to be resolved more quickly.
* Cost-Effective: Mediation is typically free, and due process hearings may involve fewer legal fees compared to a full-fledged lawsuit.
* Preservation of Relationships: ADR encourages collaboration and can help maintain a positive working relationship between parents and school districts, which is essential for the child’s education.
* Legal Safeguards: The IDEA provides legal safeguards to ensure that the rights of both parents and children with disabilities are protected during the ADR processes. These safeguards include the right to legal representation, the opportunity to present evidence, and the right to a written decision.
* Continual Evolvement: ADR practices in special education continue to evolve, with some states experimenting with innovative approaches to dispute resolution to better serve the needs of students with disabilities and their families.

The CDE distributes an annual ADR grant of $1,950,000 funded through the IDEA to be distributed to the SELPAs for dispute resolution activities. All SELPAs are eligible for this funding based on a completed application. The average annual amount per SELPA is $14,500 with a 27-month federal grant period in which to expend the funds. SELPAs typically use these funds to develop and test procedures, materials, and training for ADR in special education. Selected SELPAs train and implement an ADR process to respond to and resolve local complaints and concerns regarding the implementation of IDEA Part B and relevant state laws.

AB 130 (Ch. 44, Stats. 2021) provided SELPAs with a much larger pool of funds to assist with dispute prevention and resolution services. The SELPAs were asked to report back to the CDE on several key data factors to evaluate the effectiveness of the funds.

California education entities, including SELPAs, reported a spike in need for ADR funds as a result of the pandemic. This legislation aimed to provide needed financial support to SELPAs and LEAs to help them work with LEAs in resolving disputes related to special education. In a letter to SELPAs, LEAs, and other school program administrators from the CDE, ADR was suggested as a process “less formal than a due process hearing” and intended to maintain positive relationships between families and LEA staff by working collaboratively toward solutions. Also, ADR is a voluntary method of resolving disputes and may not be used to delay the right to a due process hearing.

### SELPA Data Results

At the conclusion of the legislated apportionment period, SELPAs were asked to include data on the activities completed within their LEAs and on all students with disabilities served in their regions, including the number of students served, disability types, English Learner (EL) status, socioeconomic status, and parent primary language. A comprehensive data chart with statewide totals is available in Appendix A. A majority of the SELPAs were able to provide the information as instructed for all students with disabilities in their regions. However, some of the SELPAs were underreported while others were overreported. If SELPAs missed data points, it is noted in the charts.

#### SELPA Funds Distribution

| **Average Amount Awarded per SELPA** | **Average Percentage of Funds Used** |
| --- | --- |
| $737,790.00 | 75 |

Most notable was the number of ADR cases mediated and resolved. Almost all SELPAs reported a reduction in due process hearings and OAH filings over the timeline of this apportionment.

#### Total Number of Mediated Cases During Reporting Period

| **Total Number of Cases using DPDR Services** | **Resolved by Agreement** | **Refused/Requested Due Process** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 9,138 | 7,898 (86.4%) | 1,040 |

These numbers represent a potential of hundreds of thousands of dollars saved in attorney fees and settlements as well as relationships saved between the LEAs and families.

Other notable demographic information includes socioeconomic and EL student status.

#### Average Socioeconomic Status and EL Student Status of Students with Disabilities Served

| **Total Number of Students with Disabilities Served by all SELPAs****(129 of 135 SELPAs reporting)** | **Number of EL Students Classified as Students with Disabilities****(114 of 135 SELPAs Reporting)** | **Average Percentage of Families Identified as Socioeconomically Disadvantaged****(111 of 135 SELPAs Reporting)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 668,796 Students | 151,590 Students | 56.19 |

The funds especially impacted families whose primary language was not English. Of the 119 SELPAs that provided parent language information, the most common languages of families served were as follows:

#### Parent Primary Language

| **English** | **Spanish** | **Vietnamese** | **Mandarin** | **Arabic** | **Cantonese** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 365,303 families | 172,805 families | 5,413 families | 5,012 families | 2,142 families | 1,930 families |

Additional parent primary language data are available in Appendix A.

### Issues That Generate Requests for Dispute Prevention and Dispute Resolution Services

In addition to the previous data points, the SELPAs were asked to provide narrative data about activities performed with the funding. SELPAs were asked to provide a list of issues that generate the request for dispute resolution services through the DPDR apportionment. Below is a list of issues across the different SELPAs along with the number of times they were mentioned. Common themes and recurring issues included:

Placement Issues (70 mentions):

* Disagreement on placement for students
* Placement in the least restrictive environment
* Requests for private school placement
* Unilateral placement in non-public schools
* Change of school assignment
* Residential Treatment Center placement requests

Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) (60 Mentions):

* Agreement on what constitutes FAPE
* Denial of FAPE claims
* Offer of FAPE concerns
* Failure to provide last agreed-upon IEP services during COVID-19
* Declined offer of FAPE
* FAPE implementation during distance learning

Eligibility and Assessment Issues (47 Mentions)

* Disagreement with assessment results
* Eligibility disputes
* Child Find issues
* Request for Independent Educational Evaluations
* Delayed assessments
* Failure to assess in all areas

Service and Program Implementation (66 Mentions):

* Disagreement with IEP implementation
* Service delivery disputes
* Compensatory education requests
* Learning loss concerns due to COVID-19
* Lack of progress on IEP goals
* Lack of services provided consistent with the IEP
* Request for additional services not recommended by the IEP team

Behavior and Discipline Issues (26 Mentions):

* Student behavior concerns
* Disagreements with manifestation determination findings
* Discipline-related disputes

Communication and Parent Participation (16 Mentions):

* Parents not feeling included in the IEP process
* Lack of parent involvement
* Trust issues between school staff and families
* Disputes over communication between staff and parents

Special Services (27 Mentions):

* Requests for intensive individual services (1:1 aides)
* Requests for specialized academic instruction
* Request for additional speech and language services
* Occupational therapy and physical therapy concerns
* Requests for behavioral intervention services

COVID-19 Related Issues (40 Mentions):

* Impact of COVID-19 on learning
* Lack of access to in-person services during school closures
* Transition to virtual learning
* Compensatory education for services missed
* Regression following distance learning

Other Issues (38 Mentions)

* Transportation disputes
* Trust in staff follow-through
* Lack of staffing in classrooms
* Concerns about staffing shortages
* Issues with psychoeducational reports
* Program issues and goal disagreements

These themes illustrate the complexities and challenges in the special education system, with various stakeholders striving to ensure the best outcomes for students with exceptional needs. These counts provide an overview of the frequency of each issue across the SELPA data. It is clear that Placement and FAPE disputes are the most frequently mentioned concerns, followed by issues related to service and program implementation and eligibility and assessment.

#### Outreach Activities and Family Empowerment Center Support

Next, the SELPAs were asked to address the outreach activities conducted pursuant to the DPDR apportionment. The SELPAs exhibited a wide range of strategies and initiatives aimed at addressing the needs and concerns of parents and families of students with special needs. These activities can be categorized by several key issues:

* Parent Engagement and Education: Multiple SELPAs emphasized the importance of parent engagement and education. This included conducting regular meetings, workshops, and training sessions to educate parents about the special education process, their rights, and procedural safeguards. Additionally, materials were often translated into multiple languages, such as Spanish and Vietnamese, to ensure accessibility for diverse communities.
* ADR: Many SELPAs invested in ADR programs and services, such as facilitated IEP meetings, mediation, and early resolution sessions. ADR was a common theme to prevent disputes between parents and school districts.
* Community Partnerships: SELPAs collaborated with community entities, such as Family Resource Centers and advocacy centers, to strengthen their outreach efforts. These partnerships facilitated the sharing of resources and support for families.
* Professional Development: Several SELPAs focused on providing professional development opportunities for both parents and staff. This included training sessions on various aspects of special education, conflict resolution, and IEP best practices.
* Communication and Information Dissemination: Many SELPAs emphasized effective communication by maintaining websites, distributing newsletters, and using social media to keep parents and educators informed. Additionally, SELPAs developed brochures and informational flyers to disseminate crucial information.
* Student Support: Some SELPAs allocated resources to directly benefit students through interventions, counseling services, academic support, and technology enhancements. These initiatives are intended to maximize student development and success.

Common themes across these outreach activities include a commitment to transparency, accessibility, and collaboration. SELPAs are actively working to empower parents with knowledge and resources while fostering a cooperative and supportive environment between parents and educational institutions. The focus on ADR as a dispute prevention strategy indicates a proactive approach to resolving potential conflicts and ensuring that the needs of students with disabilities are met effectively.

The activities conducted in partnership with family support organizations pursuant to this section can be summarized into several common themes:

* Collaboration with Community Organizations and Agencies: Many SELPAs collaborated with various community organizations and agencies, such as Family Empowerment/Resource Centers, Regional Centers, and educational institutions, to support families and students with special needs. These partnerships provide resources, training, and information to parents and caregivers about the special education process, IEPs, and available services.
* Community Advisory Committees: Several SELPAs mentioned active participation in Community Advisory Committee meetings, where parents, educators, and community members come together to discuss and address concerns related to special education. These meetings served as platforms for information sharing, parent education, and advocacy.
* Parent Trainings: SELPAs organized parent training sessions, workshops, and seminars to empower parents with knowledge about special education procedures, their rights, and how to navigate the IEP process effectively. Some trainings were conducted in collaboration with FECs.
* Information Sharing: Information dissemination was a common theme across the SELPAs. They created brochures, handbooks, and informational materials to provide parents with essential information about the special education system, resources, and procedural safeguards.
* Early Intervention and Support: Some SELPAs focused on early intervention and support, partnering with programs like Head Start preschool and collaborating with agencies that assist families during the early years of a child's education.
* Multilingual Support: Efforts were made to ensure that information and resources were accessible to parents from diverse linguistic backgrounds. Translation and interpretation services were mentioned to facilitate effective communication.
* Parent Advocacy: SELPAs engaged with parent advocacy groups and individuals to support parents in advocating for their children’s educational needs, thereby fostering collaboration between parents and schools.
* Resource Fairs and Conferences: Some SELPAs organized resource fairs and conferences, which brought together various stakeholders, including parents, educators, and community partners, to share information, resources, and best practices.
* Collaboration with Educational Institutions: SELPAs partnered with educational institutions such as colleges and universities to provide training and support to parents and educators on topics related to special education.
* Public Awareness: Efforts were made to raise public awareness about special education, disabilities, and available services through community events, outreach, and awareness campaigns.

These themes reflect the diverse range of activities and initiatives undertaken by SELPAs in collaboration with family support organizations to improve the educational experiences and outcomes for students with special needs and their families.

#### Continued Support

While most SELPAs were able to complete all of their proposed activities, several common themes emerged from the activities that various SELPAs were unable to complete, as detailed in their DPDR plans:

* Staff Shortages: Many SELPAs reported difficulties in completing activities due to staffing shortages. This includes challenges in filling special education positions, such as Bilingual Teacher on Special Assignment roles, as well as classified support positions. In some cases, funds initially allocated for hiring staff were redirected to provide additional ADR training to existing staff. Staff shortages were exacerbated in small and rural areas where LEAs saw severe staffing shortages, which may have been increased, in part, by the pandemic.
* Illness and Presenter Availability: Some SELPAs were unable to complete planned trainings and activities due to presenter illnesses. This impacted the scheduled activities and led to lower attendance than anticipated.
* Data and Leadership Transition: Challenges related to data collection and leadership transitions were reported by some SELPAs. For instance, one SELPA mentioned being unable to pull any data on parents’ primary language. Additionally, transitions in leadership made it difficult to ascertain which activities were completed or not.
* Virtual Engagement: The transition to virtual engagement had varying impacts. While some SELPAs noted increased participation in virtual meetings and events, others reported that exhaustion and lack of substitutes at the LEA level influenced attendance.
* Collaboration Challenges: Collaboration with local FECs and external organizations was a recurring challenge for some SELPAs. Developing and maintaining relationships with these entities for collaborative work with parents proved to be an ongoing challenge.
* Training and Professional Development: Limited resources, including a consistent decreased availability of substitute teachers and ADR professionals, affected training and professional development activities. Some teachers were not willing to attend beyond the school day due to burnout, and there were instances where parents were turned away from training events due to high demand.

In addition, the SELPAs were asked which activities they would continue to use to prevent and resolve future due process disputes or to continue educating/informing educational partners. The SELPAs responded as follows:

* Facilitated IEP Meetings: Many SELPAs find facilitated IEP meetings to be effective in resolving disagreements and maintaining a focus on student progress.
* Parent Training: Several SELPAs emphasize the importance of providing training to parents on the IEP process, their rights, and ADR strategies.
* Professional Development: Staff training and professional development in areas such as conflict resolution, communication, and legal compliance are deemed essential in preventing disputes.
* Collaboration with Family Resource Centers: Collaborative efforts with FECs and community organizations to provide resources, support, and training for parents are widely acknowledged as effective.
* Use of ADR Specialists: Contracting ADR specialists or facilitators to assist with dispute resolution is seen as beneficial.
* Continued Outreach and Communication: Maintaining regular communication with parents and educational partners through newsletters, email updates, and other platforms ensures transparency and information-sharing.
* Parent Ambassador Programs: Programs like Parent Ambassador Programs, which involve parents in the educational process and provide parent engagement training, are considered effective.
* Building Relationships: Focus will continue on building and maintaining positive relationships with parents and families to establish trust and open communication.
* ADR Continuum: The use of a continuum of ADR options, including facilitated IEPs, mediation, and early dispute resolution programs, is highlighted.
* Translation and Interpretation Services: Providing translation and interpretation services to parents for meetings and materials ensures inclusivity.
* Community Collaboration: Collaborating with community partner agencies and organizations provides additional support and resources for students with disabilities and their families.
* Continued Training: Teams should focus on continued training for educators and staff on special education processes, conflict management, and ADR strategies.
* Website and Resource Development: Updating and enhancing websites, handouts, brochures, and other resources improve accessibility and information dissemination.
* Data Collection and Analysis: Collecting and analyzing data related to ADR activities and disputes identify trends and gaps for further improvement.
* Participation in Conferences: Increased participation in ADR conferences and workshops helped SELPAs stay informed about best practices and new developments in dispute resolution.

These activities promote collaborative problem-solving, maintain positive relationships between parents and educational partners, and ultimately prevent due process disputes while ensuring that the needs of students with disabilities are met effectively. However, many SELPAs noted that completing and continuing these activities would be difficult without additional continued funding.

Representatives from the Compton SELPA stated: “With these funds, we were able to establish an ADR system that will remain in place to be able to continue collaborating with our families. The positive effect of these funds allowed the SELPA to have a greater outcome of positive family participation in the IEP process and with their student’s education. Funds were also utilized to continue to partner with family support organizations in the community. We would like to continue to enhance our parent training with additional ADR funds to provide parents with knowledge of the IEP process. However, outside neutral IEP facilitators can be costly, and additional funds are needed to maintain and sustain this service [sic] which are beneficial in preventing disputes.”

### Conclusion

The AB 130 (Ch. 44, Stats. 2021) DPDR funds were universally favored by the SELPAs, with no major opposition to the funding. The DPDR activities promote collaborative problem-solving, maintain positive relationships between parents and educational partners, and ultimately prevent due process disputes and save LEAs time and money on attorney fees and settlement agreements. The emphasis of these funds was focused on ensuring that the needs of students with disabilities are met effectively while maximizing family and community engagement and minimizing conflicts and disputes within the special education process. SELPAs report that additional funding is necessary to continue the beneficial work in ADR practices at the local level. The commitment to ongoing training, community collaboration, and effective communication underscores the dedication of SELPAs and LEAs to support students with disabilities and their families.

### Appendix A: SELPA Data

$100 million was distributed through a per pupil formulation.

#### SELPA Funding Amounts

| **Average Amount Awarded per SELPA** | **Average Percentage of Funds Used** |
| --- | --- |
| $737,790.00 | 75 |

Other notable demographic information:

#### Average Socioeconomic Status and English Learner Status of Students with Disabilities

| **Total Number of Students with Disabilities Served by all SELPAs****(129 of 135 SELPAs reporting)** | **Number of English Learner Classified Students with Disabilities****(114 of 135 SELPAs Reporting)** | **Average Percentage of Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Students****(111 of 135 SELPAs Reporting)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 668,796 | 151,590  | 56.19 |

#### Primary Disability of Students by Type of all Students with Disabilities Served (128 of 135 SELPAs reporting)

| **Student Primary Disability Type** | **Number of Students** |
| --- | --- |
| Intellectual Disability (ID) | 34,515 |
| Visual Impairment (VI) | 1,900 |
| Speech or Language Impairment (SLI) | 142,045 |
| Autism (AUT) | 120,299 |
| Specific Learning Disability (SLD) | 215,445 |
| Deaf/Hard of Hearing (D/HOH) and Hearing Impaired (HI) Combined | 6,881 |
| Emotional Disturbance (ED) | 19,298 |
| Other Health Impairment (OHI) | 92,749 |
| Established Medical Disability (EMD) | 270 |
| Orthopedic Impairment (OI) | 5,779 |
| Deaf/Blind (D/B) | 67 |
| Multiple Disabilities (MD) | 6,699 |
| Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) | 915 |

These numbers may vary from overall state data due to the self-reporting of LEA and SELPA administrators.

#### Parent Primary Language of Families Served (119 of 135 SELPAs Reporting)

| **Parent Primary Language** | **Number of Families** |
| --- | --- |
| English | 365,303 |
| Spanish | 172,805 |
| Portuguese | 323 |
| French | 211 |
| Russian | 960 |
| Japanese | 366 |
| Punjabi | 1,752 |
| Tagalog | 1,036 |
| Hmong | 1,779 |
| Vietnamese | 5,413 |
| Farsi | 1,960 |
| Korean | 564 |
| Armenian | 617 |
| Pashto | 453 |
| Filipino | 434 |
| Telugu | 197 |
| Hebrew | 177 |
| American Sign Language (ASL) | 84 |
| Cantonese | 1,930 |
| Mandarin | 5,012 |
| Urdu | 504 |
| Arabic | 2,142 |

Thirty-two additional languages spoken ranging from one to 10 families each.