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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

WA state continues efforts focused on indicators leading to improved outcomes for students with disabilities in post-secondary education, employment, and independent living, and incorporate activities that address the following six priority areas:  
1. Leadership to support students with disabilities (including increased collaboration and ownership regarding students with disabilities of school administrators and staff) and coordinated efforts with community organizations to improve results and reduce disproportionality  
2. Growth mindset and increasing expectations of students with disabilities (e.g., standards, instruction, graduation, assessments, and IEP-related decisions)  
3. Evidence-based instruction/interventions/practices within a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework leading to increased access and progress in Washington grade-level learning standards  
4. Common professional development (PD) for general educators, special educators, paraeducators, administrators, and parents/families (e.g., IEP team members) addressing all of the above  
5. Resource allocation (braiding, consolidated application, reducing costs for administrative tasks, increasing direct support to students, data-based decision-making)  
6. Teacher recruitment and retention (including teacher preparation programs for administrators, general educators, special educators, and related service providers) around instruction and support for students with disabilities, including all of the above  
Stakeholders are ready and supportive of the system-wide changes, and have focused on inclusionary practices over the past two years, with visible changes. Washington State's approved ESSA Plan specifically addresses the performance of students with disabilities and results in the majority of identified schools due to the instruction provided to, and outcomes resulting from, students with disabilities. As a result, coordinated efforts across OSPI divisions continue to actively analyze the root cause of the current data as well as resulting impacts on other student groups, and create a comprehensive plan that is specifically targeting improvement efforts regarding the outcomes of students with disabilities.  
  
Washington State is committing more resources to address areas in which there was slippage or targets were not met, including the reduction of drop outs, disproportionate discipline, least restrictive environment for ages 3-5 (Indicator 6), early childhood outcomes (Indicator B7), and rates of students with disabilities enrolled in higher education (Indicator B14A). This also aligns with the new graduation pathways in the state, which just became effective in 2020.  
  
The June 25, 2020 Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Determination Letter, which is publicly available, states that Washington State needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), for more than two years, and directs Washington State to report with this FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission on two elements - Technical Assistance (TA) sources accessed and actions taken as a result.   
Washington continues to work with multiple national TA Centers, including the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII), and Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), the Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID), the IDEA Data Center (IDC) (to support data integration, analysis, and accuracy efforts across the agency), and the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR) (to ensure IDEA funds are used efficiently, appropriately, and in collaboration with other improvement efforts, when appropriate). Additionally, our OSEP-assigned TA has provided frequent technical assistance, resulting in practice and policy shifts.  
  
As a result of the TA received, Washington State was able to complete an in-depth analysis of data specific to students with disabilities, review research and policy, and begin efforts to identify root causes of the current outcomes, as well as implement the SSIP. These efforts are continuing and ramping up with additional resources dedicated to these areas during FFY 2019.

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

283

**General Supervision System**

**The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.**

Washington State has intentionally integrated each of its systems designed to drive improved developmental, functional, and academic outcomes for students with disabilities while simultaneously ensuring that the requirements of IDEA Part B are met. The State’s comprehensive General Supervisory System includes several key components implemented across three primary work groups. The Operations (i.e., Data and Fiscal Management) Work Group has responsibilities for data collection and analysis, Safety Net, and all aspects of fiscal oversight including allocation and regulation of federal funding. The Integrated Program Improvement Work Group is responsible for implementation of the Washington Integrated System of Monitoring (WISM), an outcome-based, data-driven monitoring framework which has significantly increased the potential for improving student outcomes with emphasis on consistency between a sufficient evaluation, an appropriate Individualized Education Program (IEP), and the delivery of specially designed instruction (SDI) for each eligible student. The Dispute Resolution Work Group has responsibility for dispute resolution, including activities such as IEP facilitation, citizen complaint investigations, resolution sessions, mediations, and oversight of due process hearings. Planning and provision of universal professional development, technical assistance, and early childhood oversight are integrated across all aspects of the General Supervisory System. There has been a continued focus on engaging stakeholders involved in, or affected by, special education services and outcomes for students with disabilities to review, analyze, and plan for system improvements and celebrate successes.  
  
Additional information and data may be located at https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education.

**Technical Assistance System**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.**

The data included in this report, as well as other available data, have been analyzed at the state level, and analyses with school district staff are held at least annually as part of comprehensive improvement efforts, including those under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Washington continues to see progress in the graduation rates of students with disabilities, increasing rates of time spent with general education peers for students ages 6-21 (as appropriate), percentage of parents who report that the school facilitated their involvement, and substantial rates of compliance.  
  
The State has several mechanisms in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and professional development support as part of its formal Technical Assistance System. Facilitation for direct school district access to technical assistance and professional development resources designed to improve educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities has continued to be enhanced during FFY 2019. As noted in last year's submission, an online Resource Library was developed and added to the OSPI special education website that includes research-based and evidence-based practices related to increasing and sustaining educational results for all students (http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/ResourceLibrary/default.aspx). The State continues to add to the Resource Library website as new resources are identified that delineate the role of school leaders (principals, vice-principals, administrators, etc.) for ensuring the provision of the free, appropriate public education (FAPE) for students with disabilities. The online Resource Library is an example of the State's facilitation of special education improvement efforts to expand dissemination of evidence-based and promising practices for the development of academic, health, and post-school outcomes for students eligible under IDEA Part B. In addition to the online Resource Library, the State Needs Project eLearning for Educators   
(http://www.evergreen.edu/elearningforeducators) continues to expand the online course catalog with technical assistance and professional development opportunities for all educators from paraeducators through master educators.  
  
Technical assistance resources continue to be allocated through Coordinated Service Agreements (CSAs) with the nine regional Educational Service Districts (ESDs) and through State Needs Projects. The ESDs provide extensive technical assistance directly aligned with each of the indicators in the State Performance Plan based on regional performance profiles routinely updated in accordance with the APR cycles. The State Needs Projects collectively assist with statewide capacity for enhancing student outcomes through professional development opportunities, targeted and intensive technical assistance, and consultation and training for parents, families, and educators. Areas of expertise include, but are not limited to, sensory disabilities, secondary transition, assistive technology, and specially designed instruction provided within a continuum of placement options. More information may be located at https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education.

**Professional Development System**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.**

Professional Development Systems are in place to ensure service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities. Professional development systems, including regional and Local Education Agencies (LEAs), are designed to address state and local needs as determined by data analyses, stakeholder input, and state and local priorities. Professional Development activities are designed to support professional learning that will engage leaders in the work of developing effective system processes and support structures to create a culture of collaboration that will positively impact teacher knowledge and skills to improve student learning. Examples of recommendations consistent with special education priorities and needs identified include:  
  
• Use of evidence-based approaches to making decisions about the design of professional learning opportunities;  
• System-wide use of the Standards for Professional Learning as a means to communicate priorities and distributive leadership;   
• Increase data literacy at all levels;  
• Seek to understand and recognize the pressures associated with standardized assessment and leverage test results as a useful tool for examining data on student learning and progress;  
• Link professional learning activities directly to teachers' content knowledge and support teachers as they teach that content to students;   
• Scale-up support systems state-wide in order to build high quality professional learning; and  
• Explore strategies to address the specific elements identified by ESSA in its definition of professional development which emphasizes the importance of "...sustainability (not stand-alone, 1-day, and short-term workshops), intensity, collaboration, job-embedded, data-driven, and classroom focused..." characteristics.  
  
The State Needs Projects contribute significantly to the professional development systems in the State of Washington and Educational Service Districts also provide professional development services to member districts based on locally-identified needs. A primary focus includes the provision of workshops and coursework for educators designed specifically to improve academic results for students with disabilities. Topical examples include universal design for learning (UDL), literacy, math, science, early childhood, provision of specially designed instruction, migrant and bilingual, as well as curriculum selection and adoption.

**Stakeholder Involvement**

**The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.**

Washington State continues to benefit from broad and extensive stakeholder input on all aspects of its State Performance Plan, including the setting of, and if needed, the revision of performance targets. The overarching external stakeholder group is the Washington State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC). This stakeholder group typically includes a roster of members from IDEA-required multi-disciplinary fields including K-12 education, mental health, parent advocacy, early childhood, secondary transition, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile justice, and higher education.  
  
Washington State engaged in several comprehensive planning and development activities which continued throughout FFY 2019 to review trend data for both compliance and results indicators and to study the impact of improvement activities implemented as a result of the previous State Performance Plan cycle. Both internal and external stakeholders representing parents, local districts, regional educational agencies, vocational and rehabilitation providers, early childhood professionals, and community partners were actively involved in these ongoing planning and development activities. Input and feedback mechanisms included video conferencing, Zoom webinars, Regional LEA Director Meetings, community/agency calls, and individualized conference calls.  
  
As a direct result of the stakeholder recommendations solicited during the planning and development activities, targets were set for the results indicators and data trends were reviewed for compliance indicators. OSPI is strategically positioned to leverage resources, reduce duplication of efforts, and maximize efforts to increase educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities as we continue to solicit input and implement respective recommendations from key stakeholders, including stakeholder input currently embedded in Washington State's ESSA Plan.

**Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

NO

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.**

The State continued to publicly post and report on both SEA and LEA performance on the original FFY 2012 (and adjusted) SPP targets. The FFY 2018 data were posted (https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection) in February 2020. Complete copies of the Washington SPP and APR are located at on the same web page.  
  
The APR is disseminated throughout the state via OSPI’s website (https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection) and the agency's social media accounts (Twitter, RSS feeds, Facebook). This information was also distributed in the February 2020 special education monthly update, through the Partnerships for Action Voices for Empowerment (PAVE – parent training and information center), to stakeholder committees who gave substantial input and feedback to the development of this document, and to the SEAC. This information will also be presented at regional ESD meetings and various conferences throughout the state.  
  
Data showing the performance of each LEA in the state on the SPP and APR indicators are posted on the data profiles at https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection (Indicators 1 through 14, and timely reporting status). Districts enter their unique county-district number on the data profile, and their district’s performance data can be compared to statewide data at a glance. Districts also use these data to complete their LEA federal fund applications.  
  
While there were no statewide assessments conducted in this reporting period, the data for prior years are still available in the following locations.  
  
Accommodations Data for State and District: https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/state-special-education-data-collection-summaries then scroll down the page to "Part B Assessments".  
  
Statewide Smarter Balanced Assessment: https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard, choose "I Want to See Data for Washington State", choose Diversity Report, then choose Student Performance by Student Program and Characteristic.  
  
Statewide Alternate Assessment:  
https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard, choose "I Want to See Data for Washington State", scroll down the page, then choose "Assessment" in the Student Performance Section, and then choose "Details".  
  
District Smarter Balanced Example: https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Spokane School District" and click "GO", choose Diversity Report, then choose Student Performance by Student Program and Characteristic.  
  
District Alternate Assessment Example:  
https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Seattle School District" and click "GO", scroll down the page, then choose "Assessment" in the Student Performance Section, and then choose "Details".  
  
School Level Smarter Balanced Example: https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Ballard High School" and click "GO", choose “Diversity Report”, then choose “Student Performance by Student Program and Characteristic”.  
  
School Alternate Assessment Example: https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Maya Angelou Elementary School, Pasco School District" and click "GO", scroll down the page, then choose "Assessment" in the Student Performance Section, and then choose "Details".

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP’s coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State’s capacity to improve its SiMR data.  
  
The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.  
The State must report, with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

Washington continues to make progress with regard to its SSIP. OSPI will include all of the information described above (numbers (1) through (4)) with its FFY 2019 SSIP to be submitted by April 1, 2021.  
  
The June 25, 2020 Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Determination Letter states that Washington State needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), for more than two years, and directs Washington State to report with this FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission on two elements: (a) Technical Assistance (TA) sources from which the State received assistance, and (b) the actions the State took as a result of that TA.   
  
Washington continues to work with multiple national TA Centers, including the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII), and Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) (to support the Indicator B17 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) efforts as well as the implementation of inclusionary practices), the Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID), the IDEA Data Center (IDC) (to support data integration, analysis, and accuracy efforts across the agency), and the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR) (to ensure IDEA funds are used efficiently, appropriately, and in collaboration with other improvement efforts, when appropriate). Additionally, our OSEP-assigned TA has provided frequent technical assistance, resulting in practice and policy shifts.  
  
As a result of the TA received, Washington State was able to continue in-depth analyses of data specific to students with disabilities, review research and policy, and continue efforts to identify and address root causes of the current outcomes, as well as continue to implement the SSIP.  
  
Additional actions taken as a result of the TA received will be described in the FFY 2019 SSIP, to be submitted by April 1, 2021.

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2019 and 2020 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 25, 2020 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

## Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.  
  
OSEP notes that one or more of the attachments included in the State’s FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education’s IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

**Measurement**

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2017 | 54.90% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 54.90% | 58.10% |
| Data | 55.84% | 57.97% | 58.74% | 59.41% | 69.86% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 61.30% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Washington State continues to benefit from broad and extensive stakeholder input on all aspects of its State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, including the setting of, and if needed, the revision of performance targets. The overarching external stakeholder group is the Washington State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC). This stakeholder group typically includes a roster of members from IDEA-required multi-disciplinary fields including K-12 education, mental health, parent advocacy, early childhood, secondary transition, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile justice, and higher education.  
  
The State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) approved updated targets at the October 2020 meeting. Information regarding the stakeholders included and minutes of the meeting are posted at Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (https://www.k12.wa.us/aboutospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisorycouncil-seac). The FFY 2019 target is an increase on baseline year data.  
  
Targets for this indicator are set in Washington's Consolidated Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Plan, most recent version dated January 2018.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma | \*[[1]](#footnote-2) |
| SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696) | 07/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate | 10,456 |
| SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695) | 07/27/2020 | Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table | 62.2%[[2]](#footnote-3) |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma** | **Number of youth with IEPs in the current year’s adjusted cohort eligible to graduate** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| \*1 | 10,456 | 69.86% | 61.30% | 62.2%2 | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:**

4-year ACGR

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain*.***

Washington State Requirements for the Class of 2019: Total credits required: 24  
  
Subject, number of credits required and additional information:   
• English (4)  
• Math (3), Algebra 1 or Integrated Math 1, Geometry or Integrated Math 2 Algebra 2 or Integrated, Math 3, or a 3rd credit of math\*  
• Science (3):, At least two lab, A 3rd credit of science\*  
• Social Studies (3):, 1.0 U.S. History and Government, .5 Contemporary World History, Geography, and Problems, .5 credits of Civics , 1.0 credits of Social Studies Elective (may include .5 credits of a second semester of Contemporary World History or the equivalent)  
• Arts (2):, Performing or visual arts, 1 credit may be a Personalized Pathway Requirements\*\*  
• World Language (2):, Both credits may be a Personalized Pathway Requirements\*\*  
• Health and Fitness (2):, .5 credits of Health, 1.5 credits of Fitness, Students must earn credit for physical education unless excused per RCW 28A.230.050  
• Career and Technical Education (1)), May be an Occupational Education course that meets the definition of an exploratory course as described in the CTE program standards  
• Electives (4)  
  
\*The 3rd credit of science and the 3rd credit of math are chosen by the student based on the student's interest and High School and Beyond Plan, and approved by the parent or guardian, or if the parent or guardian is unavailable or does not indicate a preference, the school counselor or principal (WAC 180-51-068).  
\*\*Personalized Pathway Requirement are related courses that lead to a specific post high school career or educational outcome chosen by the student based on the student’s interests and High School and Beyond Plan, that may include Career and Technical Education, and are intended to provide a focus for the student’s learning.  
  
Non-Credit Requirements  
• High School and Beyond Plan (https://www.sbe.wa.gov/faqs/high\_school\_beyond)  
• Washington State History  
  
Assessments  
(See OSPI testing webpage (https://k12.wa.us/student-success/testing/state-testing-overview). For more information on state-approved alternative assessments see OSPI graduation alternatives webpage (https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/graduation/graduation-alternatives/quick-links)).  
  
• High school English language arts Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC)\* (or state-approved alternative)  
• High school math Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC)\*  
(or state-approved alternative)  
• Students will take a high school science exam, the WCAS (Washington Comprehensive Assessment of Science) aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards, in 11th grade. It is not a graduation requirement and students will not need to pass the test to graduate.  
  
\* Students need to meet a graduation score (, set by the State Board of Education in August 2015, to meet graduation requirements. The graduation score is different from the college- and career-ready score (Level 3 on the Smarter Balanced assessments).  
  
Districts may have local requirements. Students and parents should check with school counselors for additional requirements for graduation. The requirements for the Class of 2019 are described in WAC 180-51-068 (https://www.sbe.wa.gov/sites/default/files/public/documents/BoardMeetings/2014/July/6552rulesAsAdopted.pdf).  
  
Districts may apply for a delay of up to two years in implementing the 24-credit graduation requirements. For districts that delay these requirements will be implemented for the Class of 2020 or Class of 2021. View a list of districts with extensions (https://www.sbe.wa.gov/our-work/waivers).

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Measurement**

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 6.70% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 5.65% | 5.60% | 5.55% | 5.50% | 5.45% |
| Data | 4.93% | 6.34% | 6.74% | 6.43% | 6.61% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 5.45% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Washington State continues to benefit from broad and extensive stakeholder input on all aspects of its State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, including the setting of, and if needed, the revision of performance targets. The overarching external stakeholder group is the Washington State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC). This stakeholder group typically includes a roster of members from IDEA-required multi-disciplinary fields including K-12 education, mental health, parent advocacy, early childhood, secondary transition, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile justice, and higher education.  
  
The State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) approved updated targets at the October 2020 meeting. Information regarding the stakeholders included and minutes of the meeting are posted at Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (https://www.k12.wa.us/aboutospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisorycouncil-seac). The FFY 2019 target is an improvement (i.e., decrease) on baseline year data.

**Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator**

Option 2

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 6,588 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b) | 0 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c) | 28 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d) | 3,042 |
| SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/27/2020 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e) | 35 |

**Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)**

NO

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

YES

**Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)**

NO

**Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)**

YES

**If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology**

The State of Washington continues to report using Option 2 of this indicator's Measurement Table.   
  
Explanation of the Calculations: Districts provide student information to OSPI through the Comprehensive Education Data and Reporting System (CEDARS). Any student identified as receiving special education services anytime during the 2018-19 school year is included in the numerator of this report. Students validated and certified on the federal child count are included in the denominator of this report. Districts had the opportunity to review and update the student-level data that was used in generating this report. The Cohort Graduation and User Guide provided instructions about how to review the data, and included a detailed overview of the methodologies and procedures used to calculate rates for schools and districts. An unduplicated summary for each student served, by building, was then created. Included in the student-level data is information regarding which students completed via graduation, transferred out of a school, or dropped out, as well as the reasons why the student(s) dropped out. Dropouts include those students who provide a reason for dropping out, those who leave school to attempt/obtain a GED, and those students who have an unconfirmed transfer or who were enrolled but stopped attending and no further information could be found for these students. The last two sets of students identified and summarized for the calculations and reporting are: 1) ‘continuing seniors’, those students identified as being in grade 12 with a current expected year of graduation who are still enrolled and not eligible to graduate; and, 2) completers or graduates, who fall into two sub-categories: those students identified as graduating in the year in which they were expected to graduate (on-time graduates), and those who are graduating past their expected year of graduation (extended graduates). There is no differentiation of the definition of dropout between general education students and students with disabilities. Annual dropout rates are calculated and reported for students ages 14-21 identified as being enrolled and served in grades 7 and 8 during the reporting year. Those students reported as being enrolled and served in grades 9 through 12 are included in the annual high school graduation and dropout calculations. A number of adjustments are made when calculating these rates. Totals for institutions, correctional facilities, unaffiliated or autonomous buildings, and schools where a majority of students come from another district are included in the state and county totals, but not in district totals.   
  
Students in juvenile detention centers are excluded from the calculations because the duration of their stay is very short (often just a few days) and they are served elsewhere after their release.  
[1] Students attending vocational schools or skill centers are counted in their home school, and students enrolled in a high school but who are coded as being in a grade other than 9–12 are excluded from the calculations.   
  
In addition, students who exited prior to August 15, 2018 or were age 21 prior to September 1, 2018 are not included in the 2018–19 calculations because they exited prior to the 2018–19 school year. Students who are coded as being “promoted” to the next grade by August 15 are counted as continuing students. The specific formula used to calculate dropout rates is # of students with a dropout, unknown, GED completer code divided by total # of students served (less transfer outs, juvenile detention, deceased).   
  
Data for this indicator are the same data as used for reporting to the U.S. Department of Education under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). [1] This policy is used because students located in short-term correctional facilities often enter and exit the same day and have an “unknown” location after exiting. In addition, some of these individuals enter and exit multiple correctional facilities, so they would end up counting as dropouts multiple times as they enter and exit these facilities, even though they may have dropped out of their “home” school in a previous year and are no longer enrolled in school.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out | Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort | **FFY** **2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 3,042 | 44,661 | 6.61% | 5.45% | 6.81% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), in collaboration with stakeholders, the State Board of Education, and the Washington State Legislature, continues to examine and revise graduation requirements to equitably address the needs of all students. Washington state has increased the requirement for credits for graduation from 20 to 24 beginning for the Class of 2019 and beyond, including one additional credit for Science, one for Arts, and two for World Language or Personalized Pathway Requirement. Up to two of these 24 credits may be waived locally based on a student's unusual circumstances. Some local school districts have additional credit requirements, as well.   
  
Districts and IEP teams cannot lower the number of credits required for graduation beyond the unusual circumstances waiver that is applicable to all students. We believe this increase in the number and type of credits required to graduate has contributed to the slippage for this indicator.   
  
Comprehensive Technical Assistance (TA) and Professional Development (PD) are being provided to school district staff and leadership regarding equity, planning for graduation, and aligning IEP transition plans with state-required High School and Beyond Plans. IEP teams are being supported with additional TA and PD, including an increased emphasis on accessing Career and Technical Education (CTE) pathways and coursework for students with disabilities. This is a multi-year plan that coincides with substantial changes to the state graduation requirements.

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth**

Dropouts are defined as any student who leaves school for any reason, except death, before completing school with a high school diploma or transferring to another school with a known exit reason. A student is considered a dropout regardless of when dropping out occurs (i.e., during or between regular school terms). A student who leaves during the year but returns during the reporting period is not considered a dropout.  
  
Dropouts include those students who provide a reason for dropping out, those who leave school to attempt/obtain a GED, and those students who have an unconfirmed transfer or who were enrolled but stopped attending and no further information could be found for these students.  
  
There is no differentiation of the definition of dropout between students with or without disabilities.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

**Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3-5 | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **B** | Grade 6-8 |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| **C** | HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Grade 3-5 | 2009 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **A** | Grade 3-5 | 97.53% | Actual | 93.02% | 93.10% | 93.06% | 94.26% | 94.95% |
| **B** | Grade 6-8 | 2009 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **B** | Grade 6-8 | 96.36% | Actual | 91.12% | 91.90% | 92.46% | 93.00% | 93.70% |
| **C** | HS | 2009 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **C** | HS | 85.42% | Actual | 45.49% | 58.65% | 53.66% | 87.23% | 88.38% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Grade 3-5 | 2009 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **A** | Grade 3-5 | 97.42% | Actual | 92.47% | 92.81% | 92.76% | 94.01% | 94.79% |
| **B** | Grade 6-8 | 2009 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **B** | Grade 6-8 | 96.33% | Actual | 90.39% | 91.29% | 91.89% | 92.47% | 93.26% |
| **C** | HS | 2009 | Target >= | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| **C** | HS | 87.19% | Actual | 40.33% | 51.70% | 50.56% | 84.37% | 86.63% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 3-5 | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 6-8 | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | HS | 95.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 3-5 | 95.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 6-8 | 95.00% |
| Math | C >= | HS | 95.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3-5 |  |  | 94.95% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 6-8 |  |  | 93.70% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | HS |  |  | 88.38% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3-5 |  |  | 94.79% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 6-8 |  |  | 93.26% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | HS |  |  | 86.63% | 95.00% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

This indicator is not required for the FFY 2019 submission.

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

## 3B - Required Actions

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Indicator 3A – Reserved

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Reporting Group Selection**

**Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Grade 3** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 5** | **Grade 6** | **Grade 7** | **Grade 8** | **Grade 9** | **Grade 10** | **Grade 11** | **Grade 12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3-5 | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **B** | Grade 6-8 |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| **C** | Grade HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |

**Historical Data: Reading**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Grade 3-5 | 2015 | Target >= | 100.00% | 17.50% | 24.10% | 30.70% | 37.30% |
| **A** | Grade 3-5 | 25.99% | Actual | 23.85% | 25.99% | 24.76% | 26.97% | 27.69% |
| **B** | Grade 6-8 | 2015 | Target >= | 100.00% | 17.50% | 24.10% | 30.70% | 37.30% |
| **B** | Grade 6-8 | 17.14% | Actual | 14.35% | 17.14% | 17.47% | 19.03% | 19.81% |
| **C** | Grade HS | 2017 | Target >= | 100.00% | 17.50% | 24.10% | 30.70% | 37.30% |
| **C** | Grade HS | 52.44% | Actual | 13.88% | 52.44% | 37.73% | 24.26% | 25.59% |

**Historical Data: Math**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| **A** | Grade 3-5 | 2015 | Target >= | 100.00% | 13.80% | 20.70% | 27.60% | 34.50% |
| **A** | Grade 3-5 | 26.20% | Actual | 24.65% | 26.20% | 25.43% | 25.97% | 26.29% |
| **B** | Grade 6-8 | 2015 | Target >= | 100.00% | 13.80% | 20.70% | 27.60% | 34.50% |
| **B** | Grade 6-8 | 14.02% | Actual | 11.52% | 14.02% | 14.43% | 15.03% | 14.55% |
| **C** | Grade HS | 2017 | Target >= | 100.00% | 13.80% | 20.70% | 27.60% | 34.50% |
| **C** | Grade HS | 21.29% | Actual | 7.29% | 21.29% | 13.76% | 11.29% | 11.05% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2019** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 3-5 | 43.90% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 6-8 | 43.90% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | 52.54% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 3-5 | 41.40% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 6-8 | 41.40% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 41.40% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

**FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)**

YES

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

**Reading Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Data Source:**

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

**Math Proficiency Data by Grade**

| **Grade** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **HS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3-5 |  |  | 27.69% | 43.90% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 6-8 |  |  | 19.81% | 43.90% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS |  |  | 25.59% | 52.54% |  | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned** | **Number of Children with IEPs Proficient** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 3-5 |  |  | 26.29% | 41.40% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 6-8 |  |  | 14.55% | 41.40% |  | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS |  |  | 11.05% | 41.40% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

This indicator is not required for the FFY 2019 submission.

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3C - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

## 3C - Required Actions

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 2.51% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target <= | 7.00% | 6.50% | 6.25% | 2.50% | 2.50% |
| Data | 3.70% | 3.33% | 2.51% | 0.72% | 1.79% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target <= | 2.25% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Washington State continues to benefit from broad and extensive stakeholder input on all aspects of its State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, including the setting of, and if needed, the revision of performance targets. The overarching external stakeholder group is the Washington State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC). This stakeholder group typically includes a roster of members from IDEA-required multi-disciplinary fields including K-12 education, mental health, parent advocacy, early childhood, secondary transition, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile justice, and higher education.  
  
The State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) approved updated targets at the October 2020 meeting. Information regarding the stakeholders included and minutes of the meeting are posted at Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (https://www.k12.wa.us/aboutospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisorycouncil-seac). The FFY 2019 target is an improvement (i.e., decrease) on baseline year data.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 9 | 282 | 1.79% | 2.25% | 3.19% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The state's overall discipline rates for students with disabilities continue to decrease, which affects the single state bar used for Indicator B-4. From 2017-18 to 2018-19, the single state bar decreased from 3.11% to 2.96%. A lower state bar is likely correlated with the increase in the number of districts who exceeded the bar.  
  
WA continues to address the the need for schools and districts to decrease the use of removal from school as a disciplinary consequence for all students. State laws, professional development, and district data are available here: https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/support-programs/student-discipline.

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))**

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

Washington will be comparing rates among districts within the State.  
  
Washington identifies districts with significant discrepancies in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for students with IEPs through the following steps:  
  
1. Calculate the State-level suspension/expulsion rate for students with IEPs for FFY 2019 (using 2018-19 data). The State suspension/expulsion rate is determined by calculating the statewide total number of students with IEPs identified as having been suspended for greater than 10 days statewide (EdFacts File Spec 006) divided by the number of students with IEPs enrolled statewide (EdFacts File Spec 002 and 089). The State's suspension/expulsion rate for FFY 2019 was 0.96%.  
  
2. The Single State Bar is defined as the State suspension/expulsion rate plus two percent. Therefore, the Single State Bar for FFY 2019 was 2.96%.  
  
3. Calculate each district’s rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for students with IEPs (total number of students with IEPs who were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in the district divided by the total number of students with IEPs in the district). This process will result in each district’s rate of suspensions/expulsions for students with IEPs.  
  
4. The rate of suspensions/expulsions of students with IEPs for each district is compared to the Single State Bar.   
  
5. Districts that are above the Single State Bar are identified as having a significant discrepancy.  
  
6. Districts with fewer than 30 total students with IEPs are not included in the analysis. A total of two districts were excluded from the FFY 2019 calculation as a result of not meeting this minimum n size requirement. Those districts were not included in the denominator of this calculation but were included in the calculation of the Single State Bar.  
  
7. The percentage of districts in Washington identified by OSPI as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with IEPs for greater than 10 days in a school year is calculated by dividing the total number of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy (9) by the total number of districts in Washington State who met the minimum "n" size requirement (282).  
  
8. This information is published in the district data profile on OSPI’s special education data webpage (www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection).  
  
All districts are required to report special education discipline data through the Education Data System Behavior and Weapons application. A copy of the data collection instructions is located at www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/federal-data-collection-forms. Built into this online application are checks and balances ensuring that the logic of the reported data is verified prior to a district finalizing the data submission to OSPI. These logic checks are the same as those used by the Data Accountability Center’s Data Transmission Sheets. The Behavior and Weapons application will not allow Districts to submit data with logic errors and will give the User an error message to correct the data. Errors must be fixed in order to allow the submission to be completed. Users will receive an immediate message informing them of a successful submission.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Based on the methodology described in the section titled "Definition of Significant Discrepancy and Methodology", nine districts were identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.  
  
For all nine of the districts that the State identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, OSPI reviewed and, if appropriate, required the affected district to revise the policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.  
  
All of the identified districts were required to complete a self-review of discipline and other related policies, procedures, and practices as part of the district's federal fund application. If revisions were made to policies, procedures, or practices as a result of this review, districts were required to describe those revisions in the self-review. Revisions to formal, written special education policies and procedures were also required to be submitted to OSPI.   
  
The self-review also included an analysis of potential causal factors for being over the state bar and the development of an action plan to address the significant discrepancy in the upcoming school year. In addition, data collections conducted through the general supervisory system were analyzed to verify district-reported results. The State also completed a comprehensive student record review from the discrepant cells in designated districts.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 1.66% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.37% | 0.37% | 1.66% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

32

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 34 | 0 | 252 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

Washington will be comparing rates among districts within the State.  
  
Washington identifies districts with significant discrepancies in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for students with IEPs through the following steps:  
  
1. Calculate the State-level suspension/expulsion rate for students with IEPs for FFY 2019 (using 2018-19 data). The State suspension/expulsion rate is determined by calculating the statewide total number of students with IEPs identified as having been suspended for greater than 10 days statewide (EdFacts File Spec 006) divided by the number of students with IEPs enrolled statewide (EdFacts File Spec 002 and 089). The State's suspension/expulsion rate for FFY 2019 was 0.96%.  
  
2. The Single State Bar is defined as the State suspension/expulsion rate plus two percent. Therefore, the Single State Bar for FFY 2019 was 2.96%.  
  
3. Calculate each district’s rates of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for each race/ethnicity group (total number of children with IEPs who were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days for each race/ethnicity divided by the total number of children with IEPs for that race/ethnicity in the district). This process will result in each district’s rates of suspensions/expulsions for each race and ethnicity group.  
  
4. The rates of suspensions/expulsions by race and ethnicity for each district are compared to the Single State Bar. Districts that are above the Single State Bar for any race or ethnicity group are identified as having a significant discrepancy.  
  
5. Districts with fewer than 30 children with IEPs in the identified race/ethnicity group are not included in the analysis. A total of 32 districts were excluded from the FFY 2019 calculation as a result of not meeting this minimum "n" size requirement. These districts were not included in the denominator of this calculation but were included in the calculation of the Single State Bar.  
  
6. The percentage of districts in Washington identified by OSPI as having a significant discrepancy, by race/ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs for greater than 10 days in a school year is calculated by dividing the total number of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy (34) by the total number of districts in Washington State who met the minimum "n" size requirement (252).  
  
7. This information is published in the district data profile on OSPI’s special education data webpage (www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection).  
  
8. All districts are required to report special education discipline data through the Education Data System Behavior and Weapons application. A copy of the data collection instructions is located at www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/federal-data-collection-forms. Built into this online application are checks and balances ensuring that the logic of the reported data is verified prior to a district finalizing the data submission to OSPI. These logic checks are the same as those used by the Data Accountability Center’s Data Transmission Sheets. The Behavior and Weapons application will not allow Districts to submit data with logic errors and will give the User an error message to correct the data. Errors must be fixed in order to allow the submission to be completed. Users will receive an immediate message informing them of a successful submission.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

Based on the methodology described in the section titled "Definition of Significant Discrepancy and Methodology", 34 districts were identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.  
  
For each of the 34 districts that the State identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, OSPI reviewed and, if appropriate, required the affected district to revise the policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.  
  
Each of the 34 identified districts was required to complete a self-review of discipline and other related policies, procedures, and practices as part of the district's federal fund application. If revisions were made to policies, procedures, or practices as a result of this review, districts were required to describe those revisions in the self-review. Revisions to formal, written special education policies and procedures were also required to be submitted to OSPI.   
  
The self-review also included an analysis of potential causal factors for being over the state bar and a description of the district's plan to address the significant disproportionality in the upcoming school year. In addition, data collections conducted through the general supervisory system were analyzed to verify district-reported results. The State also completed a comprehensive student record review from the discrepant cells in designated districts.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

## 4B- Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;

B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2005 | Target >= | 51.85% | 52.05% | 52.25% | 52.35% | 55.00% |
| A | 49.05% | Data | 53.49% | 54.35% | 55.21% | 56.01% | 56.63% |
| B | 2005 | Target <= | 13.36% | 13.26% | 13.16% | 13.06% | 12.96% |
| B | 14.11% | Data | 13.27% | 13.24% | 13.13% | 13.13% | 12.83% |
| C | 2005 | Target <= | 1.00% | 1.00% | 1.00% | 1.00% | 1.00% |
| C | 1.09% | Data | 0.84% | 0.83% | 0.86% | 0.86% | 0.89% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 57.00% |
| Target B <= | 12.75% |
| Target C <= | 1.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Washington State continues to benefit from broad and extensive stakeholder input on all aspects of its State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, including the setting of, and if needed, the revision of performance targets. The overarching external stakeholder group is the Washington State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC). This stakeholder group typically includes a roster of members from IDEA-required multi-disciplinary fields including K-12 education, mental health, parent advocacy, early childhood, secondary transition, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile justice, and higher education.  
  
The State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) approved updated targets at the October 2020 meeting. Information regarding the stakeholders included and minutes of the meeting are posted at Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (https://www.k12.wa.us/aboutospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisorycouncil-seac). The FFY 2019 target is an improvement on baseline year data (i.e., increase on 5A, decrease on 5B and 5C).

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 | 134,239 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 77,491 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 16,682 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools | 975 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities | 186 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/08/2020 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 119 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 77,491 | 134,239 | 56.63% | 57.00% | 57.73% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 16,682 | 134,239 | 12.83% | 12.75% | 12.43% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 1,280 | 134,239 | 0.89% | 1.00% | 0.95% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

No additional information to report.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2011 | Target >= | 28.60% | 28.75% | 28.90% | 29.05% | 29.20% |
| A | 27.80% | Data | 26.35% | 24.88% | 24.81% | 23.80% | 25.29% |
| B | 2011 | Target <= | 38.60% | 38.40% | 38.20% | 38.00% | 37.80% |
| B | 39.40% | Data | 40.05% | 40.51% | 40.96% | 41.85% | 40.71% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 29.20% |
| Target B <= | 37.80% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Washington State continues to benefit from broad and extensive stakeholder input on all aspects of its State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, including the setting of, and if needed, the revision of performance targets. The overarching external stakeholder group is the Washington State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC). This stakeholder group typically includes a roster of members from IDEA-required multi-disciplinary fields including K-12 education, mental health, parent advocacy, early childhood, secondary transition, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile justice, and higher education.  
  
The State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) approved updated targets at the October 2020 meeting. Information regarding the stakeholders included and minutes of the meeting are posted at Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (https://www.k12.wa.us/aboutospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisorycouncil-seac). The FFY 2019 target is an increase on baseline year data for 6A and a decrease on baseline data for 6B.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | 18,256 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 4,817 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 6,732 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b2. Number of children attending separate school | 390 |
| SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613) | 07/08/2020 | b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 3 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 4,817 | 18,256 | 25.29% | 29.20% | 26.39% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 7,125 | 18,256 | 40.71% | 37.80% | 39.03% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

**Summary Statement 1**: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2**: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A1 | 2008 | Target >= | 83.20% | 83.30% | 83.40% | 83.50% | 83.60% |
| A1 | 82.70% | Data | 91.29% | 90.17% | 91.19% | 90.79% | 91.00% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 50.40% | 50.60% | 50.80% | 51.00% | 51.20% |
| A2 | 49.40% | Data | 49.19% | 47.60% | 48.91% | 47.12% | 47.89% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 82.20% | 82.30% | 82.40% | 82.50% | 82.60% |
| B1 | 81.10% | Data | 89.11% | 88.78% | 89.93% | 88.46% | 88.97% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 51.40% | 51.60% | 51.80% | 52.00% | 52.20% |
| B2 | 50.20% | Data | 50.40% | 50.51% | 49.67% | 48.26% | 48.74% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 81.20% | 81.30% | 81.40% | 81.50% | 81.60% |
| C1 | 80.80% | Data | 89.58% | 89.56% | 91.20% | 89.61% | 89.50% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 65.40% | 65.60% | 65.80% | 66.00% | 66.20% |
| C2 | 64.30% | Data | 64.61% | 62.79% | 62.81% | 61.72% | 60.43% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A1 >= | 83.70% |
| Target A2 >= | 51.20% |
| Target B1 >= | 82.70% |
| Target B2 >= | 52.20% |
| Target C1 >= | 81.70% |
| Target C2 >= | 66.20% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Washington State continues to benefit from broad and extensive stakeholder input on all aspects of its State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, including the setting of, and if needed, the revision of performance targets. The overarching external stakeholder group is the Washington State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC). This stakeholder group typically includes a roster of members from IDEA-required multi-disciplinary fields including K-12 education, mental health, parent advocacy, early childhood, secondary transition, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile justice, and higher education.  
  
The State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) approved updated targets at the October 2020 meeting. Information regarding the stakeholders included and minutes of the meeting are posted at Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (https://www.k12.wa.us/aboutospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisorycouncil-seac). The FFY 2019 target is an increase on all baseline year data.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

5,749

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 74 | 1.29% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 462 | 8.04% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 2,659 | 46.25% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1,956 | 34.02% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 598 | 10.40% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 4,615 | 5,151 | 91.00% | 83.70% | 89.59% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 2,554 | 5,749 | 47.89% | 51.20% | 44.43% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 88 | 1.53% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 498 | 8.66% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 2,589 | 45.03% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2,044 | 35.55% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 530 | 9.22% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 4,633 | 5,219 | 88.97% | 82.70% | 88.77% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 2,574 | 5,749 | 48.74% | 52.20% | 44.77% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 84 | 1.46% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 446 | 7.76% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 2,072 | 36.04% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 2,176 | 37.85% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 971 | 16.89% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 4,248 | 4,778 | 89.50% | 81.70% | 88.91% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 3,147 | 5,749 | 60.43% | 66.20% | 54.74% | Did Not Meet Target | Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A2** | Given the significant slippage in the all three areas of the Child Outcome Summary (COS) report relating to the number of children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited program, a comprehensive review of data and stakeholder feedback has attributed the findings to the following key factors;  a. Stakeholders continue to investigate the potential correlation between increases in more inclusive environments (as reported in Indicator 6B) and access to individualized instruction to support, maintain, or improve functioning as the level comparable to same-aged peers. b. The spring 2020 school facility closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in a variety of county- and state-wide restrictions that impacted IEP teams’ ability to access children and families participating in district programs. Also significant to the contribution of slippage was the variability to which school districts were able to offer access via technology and in-person collaboration with embedded safety protocols, which contributed to limitations of teams coming together to complete a collaborative assessment of the child's progress. This was made even more challenging when taking into consideration the local districts’ equitable access to technology on the part of staff and families during the first few months of the school facility closures. |
| **B2** | See A2 above. |
| **C2** | See A2 above. |

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)**

YES

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

ECTACenter.org: The Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center: Improving Systems, Practices and Outcomes for Young Children with Disabilities and their Families  
  
Washington State adopted the instruments and instructions initially developed by the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center. The state continues to use the instrument (7-point scale) and training modules developed jointly by DaSy and the ECTA Center.  
  
The Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process is a team process for summarizing information on a child’s functioning in each of the three child outcome areas using a 7-point scale (http://dasyonline.org/olms2/COS\_Session4). With the COS process, a team of individuals who are familiar with a child (including parents) can consider multiple sources of information about his/her functioning, including parent/provider observation and results from direct assessment. Additionally, the COS process allows early intervention and early childhood special education programs to synthesize information about children across different assessment tools to produce data that can be summarized across programs in the state, as well as across states for a national picture. The ECTA Center developed a print resource providing an Overview of the COS Process (http://dasyonline.org/olms2/435692).

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

In spring 2020, OSPI convened a stakeholder workgroup (in addition to the SEAC) to inform recommendations and guidance for school districts as they plan for the reopening of Washington's school facilities being closed from providing in-person instruction from March–June 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This broad stakeholder workgroup consisted of more than 120 educators, education leaders, elected officials, community-based organizations, parents, students, and community members. The topics discussed during these stakeholder workgroups included a discussion of the challenges in the provision of preschool services during the school facility closures as well as the collection of data to complete the child outcomes summary. In response to these discussions, additional guidance was developed and provided to all districts (https://www.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/public/specialed/earlychildhood/pubdocs/ECSE-Guidance-School-Facility-Closure.pdf).

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling **of parents from whom response is requested** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? | NO |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Washington State continues to benefit from broad and extensive stakeholder input on all aspects of its State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, including the setting of, and if needed, the revision of performance targets. The overarching external stakeholder group is the Washington State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC). This stakeholder group typically includes a roster of members from IDEA-required multi-disciplinary fields including K-12 education, mental health, parent advocacy, early childhood, secondary transition, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile justice, and higher education.  
  
The State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) approved updated targets at the October 2020 meeting. Information regarding the stakeholders included and minutes of the meeting are posted at Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (https://www.k12.wa.us/aboutospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisorycouncil-seac). The FFY 2019 target is an increase on baseline year data.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2011 | 21.10% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 21.50% | 21.70% | 21.90% | 22.10% | 22.30% |
| Data | 19.37% | 27.32% | 28.68% | 28.03% | 30.27% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 22.50% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities** | **Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities** | | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,031 | | 3,188 | 30.27% | 22.50% | 32.34% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

19,418

**Percentage of respondent parents**

16.42%

**Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.**

Washington State is not using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children. The State continues to use a single instrument for students ages 3-21; therefore, there is only one data set for baseline data, targets, and actual target data.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. | YES |

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.**

The State continues to conduct analyses to determine possible strategies for statewide technical assistance and guidance to help ensure progress and movement towards the targets in this indicator. The data for all cohort districts were reviewed and disaggregated by geographical location (regional review by ESD) and district size. Other factors considered during the analysis included a review of the response rates, the degree of representativeness of the survey respondents (by race/ethnicity, grade level, LRE placement, disability category, and school type), and the potential of non-response bias. The potential for non-response bias was minimized through an in-depth comparison of respondent and target population characteristics. The analyses suggest that the results of the survey are statistically representative of the target population with variance noted within two race/ethnicity groups, and across two disability categories. Parents of students identified as Hispanic/Latino are slightly under-represented, while parents of students identified as White are somewhat over-represented. Parents of students identified as Hispanic/Latino are 24% of the sample but 15% of the respondents; parents of students identified as White are 62% of the sample but 71% of the respondents. The variance represented in these two race/ethnicity groups has increased slightly in comparison to prior year analyses. Similar to the prior year's results, parents of students qualifying for special education under the category of Autism are slightly over-represented, while parents of students qualifying for special education under the category of Specific Learning Disability are somewhat underrepresented. Parents of students eligible under the category of Autism are 11% of the sample but 15% of the respondents. Conversely, parents of students eligible under the category of Specific Learning Disability are 31% of the sample but 24% of the respondents. The results were found to be representative across all of the other areas of analysis (i.e., grade level, LRE placement, and school type).

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The administration of the FFY 2019 parent surveys was postponed from March 2020 to October 2020 as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, this did not appear to have a negative impact on either the response rate or the parents who reported positive results as both of these showed improvement from the FFY 2018 parent survey results.  
  
The survey has not changed; therefore, a survey instrument is not attached.

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8 - OSEP Response

## 8 - Required Actions

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

21

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 15 | 0 | 262 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

The State has a process in place for reviewing all districts and educational service agencies in the state each year with regard to disproportionate representation. The first step of this process includes a data analysis of all districts conducted by OSPI. The State utilizes Risk Ratios or Alternate Risk Ratios (RR) for the purpose of determining whether the district has met the state-defined threshold for disproportionate representation:  
  
Over-representation: RR = 2.0 for 3 consecutive years in the same race/ethnicity group, with a minimum cell size (numerator) of 10 and a minimum "n" size (denominator) of 20.  
  
The source data used to calculate the RRs for FFY 2019 were the Total Enrollment Report submitted by every district in the state in October 2019, and the November 2019 Federal Special Education Child Count and LRE Report submitted by every district in the state.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.**

Using the criteria established above, the State determined that 15 districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation under Indicator 9. A total of 21districts were excluded from the calculation due to not meeting the minimum “n” size requirement.  
  
The State analyzed the 15 districts identified through the FFY 2019 data review as having disproportionate representation to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. The identified districts were required to complete a self-review as part of the LEA federal fund application. The State provided feedback and technical assistance to districts and asked for further clarification as needed in this review.   
  
As part of the self-review, districts were required to review their policies, procedures, and practices related to child find, referral, evaluation and eligibility. The self-review also included an analysis of potential causal factors for the identified disproportionality and a description of the district's plan to address the disproportionality in the upcoming school year.   
  
The State examined the results of each district’s self-review of child find, referral, evaluation, and eligibility through the LEA federal fund application, as well as a review of each district’s written special education policies and procedures. In addition, data collections conducted through the general supervisory system were analyzed to verify district-reported results. The State also completed a comprehensive student record review within the disproportionate cells across designated districts.  
  
As a result of this process, the State found that all of the 15 identified districts were in compliance with child find, eligibility, and evaluation requirements. In these 15 districts, the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education was not the result of inappropriate identification.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2019, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2016 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.37% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 0% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

32

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 60 | 0 | 251 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

The State has a process in place for reviewing all districts and educational service agencies in the state each year with regard to disproportionate representation. The first step of this process includes a data analysis of all districts conducted by OSPI. The State utilizes Risk Ratios or Alternate Risk Ratios (RR) for the purpose of determining whether the district has met the state-defined threshold for disproportionate representation:  
  
Over-representation: RR = 2.0 for 3 consecutive years in the same race/ethnicity group, with a minimum cell size (numerator) of 10 and a minimum "n" size (denominator) of 20.  
  
The source data used to calculate the RRs for FFY 2019 were the Total Enrollment Report submitted by every district in the state in October 2019, and the November 2019 Federal Special Education Child Count and LRE Report submitted by every district in the state.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.**

Using the criteria established above, the State determined that 60 districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation under Indicator 10. A total of 32 districts were excluded from the calculation due to not meeting the minimum “n” size requirement.  
  
The State analyzed the 60 districts identified through the FFY 2019 data review as having disproportionate representation to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. The identified districts were required to complete a self-review as part of the LEA federal fund application. The State provided feedback and technical assistance to districts and asked for further clarification as needed in this review.   
  
As part of the self-review, districts were required to review their policies, procedures, and practices related to child find, referral, evaluation and eligibility. The self-review also included an analysis of potential causal factors for the identified disproportionality and a description of the district's plan to address the disproportionality in the upcoming school year.   
  
The State examined the results of each district’s self-review of child find, referral, evaluation, and eligibility through the LEA federal fund application, as well as a review of each district’s written special education policies and procedures. In addition, data collections conducted through the general supervisory system were analyzed to verify district-reported results. The State also completed a comprehensive student record review within the disproportionate cells across designated districts.  
  
As a result of this process, the State found that all of the 60 identified districts were in compliance with child find, eligibility, and evaluation requirements. In these 60 districts, the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education was not the result of inappropriate identification.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations.

**Measurement**

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child’s previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 98.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.26% | 99.27% | 99.27% | 99.30% | 99.36% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received** | **(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 22,544 | 22,401 | 99.36% | 100% | 99.37% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

143

**Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.**

Of the 29 LEAs not meeting the target, a review of both the range of days beyond the timeline the evaluation was completed and the reason(s) for the delay(s) was conducted.  
  
For those 143 children whose evaluations were not completed on time or under federal exception,   
88.1% (126) were late due to district scheduling and/or staffing issues with no agreement to extend;   
5.6% (8) the evaluations were late due to other issues not specified by the district;   
2.1% (3) family scheduling/child not available; and   
0.7% (1) testing/evaluation delays; and  
3.5% (5) data/tracking errors.  
  
With regard to the range of days for the 143 students reported above, a total of 75% (107) were delayed 15 school days or less and 25% (36) were delayed more than 15 school days.  
  
Further data analysis addressing the reasons for delay and an examination of the range of days by geographic region and district size groupings within each of the nine regions, was completed and discussed with stakeholders. There were no emerging patterns or trends identified in a specific LEA or region. Universal supports are provided for the correction of noncompliance to all LEAs not at 100% compliance through the designated regional professional development system.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).**

Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 392-172A-03005(3): When the student is to be evaluated to determine eligibility for special education services and the educational needs of the student, the school district shall provide prior written notice to the parent, obtain consent, fully evaluate the student, and arrive at a decision regarding eligibility within: (a) Thirty-five school days after the date written consent for an evaluation has been provided to the school district by the parent; or (b) Thirty-five school days after the date the consent of the parent is obtained by agreement through mediation, or the refusal to provide consent is overridden by an administrative law judge following a due process hearing; or (c) Such other time period as may be agreed to by the parent and documented by the school district, including specifying the reasons for extending the timeline. (d) Exception. The thirty-five school day time frame for evaluation does not apply if: (i) The parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (ii) A student enrolls in another school district after the consent is obtained and the evaluation has begun but not yet been completed by the other school district, including a determination of eligibility. (e) The exception in (d)(ii) of this subsection applies only if the subsequent school district is making sufficient progress to ensure a prompt completion of the evaluation, and the parent and subsequent school district agree to a specific time when the evaluation will be completed.   
  
In spring 2020, OSPI convened a workgroup to inform recommendations and guidance for school districts after school was closed from providing in-person instruction from March–June 2020 due to COVID-19. The broad workgroup consisted of more than 120 educators, education leaders, elected officials, community-based organizations, parents, students, and community members. One of the topics discussed during these stakeholder workgroups was the completion of evaluations during the school facility closures. In response to these discussions, as well as input from the Washington State Association of School Psychologists, the state added a temporary allowable exception to this indicator: School closures due to COVID-19 (and school staff were unavailable or the parent stated that distance meeting options would impede participation or the assessment couldn’t be completed due to safety restrictions). Records identified with this exception were included in parts (a) and (b) of the calculation for this indicator.

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

A statewide data collection process was implemented in FFY 2006. All districts continue to report evaluation and eligibility data on all children referred to Part B for initial eligibility determination. The data collection template and its instructions are located at https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/federal-data-collection-forms. Built into this template are checks and balances ensuring that the logic of the reported data is verified prior to a district submitting the data to OSPI. Districts submitting data templates with logic errors receive an immediate email returning the report and requiring it to be fixed and resubmitted. Data are not considered submitted until those logic checks are passed.  
  
This indicator was calculated using raw data submitted by local districts through a report form that was included in the State’s required data reports as outlined in the annual Federal Special Education Data Reporting Requirements bulletin.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

As described above, a temporary exception was added in spring 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic: School closures due to COVID-19 (and school staff were unavailable or the parent stated that distance meeting options would impede participation or the assessment couldn’t be completed due to safety restrictions). This additional exception allowed the state to specifically measure the impact of the COVID-19 school facility closures on the timely completion of initial evaluations. A total of 523 evaluations were not completed on time per this additional state exception. These 523 records were included in both parts (a) and (b) of the calculation for this indicator.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The districts identified root causes of the noncompliance, and reviewed policies, procedures, and/or practices that contributed to the noncompliance. Actions were taken by the district to address the identified root causes and were reported to OSPI through the IDEA Compliance Package.  
  
In order to verify that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of CFR §300.301(c)(1), a review of updated data, conducted by regional Educational Service District (ESD) representatives and validated by OSPI, was completed. Verification activities included on-site visits (prior to the COVID-19 school facility closures), staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. This review verified 100% compliance; all 50 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The identified districts corrected and accounted for all individual instances of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. Special education representatives from the regional ESDs and OSPI verified that the 50 districts’ corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits (prior to COVID-19 school facility closures), staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. Regional ESD representatives reviewed data to verify that the noncompliance was corrected. All 50 districts were found to have completed the evaluation, although late, for every student whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district.  
  
At the time of the COVID-19 school facility closures in mid-March 2020, school districts had already completed their corrections for FFY 2018, and the verification of the corrections was in process. OSPI worked with regional ESD representatives and the affected districts to identify alternate methods for verifying the corrections that did not involve visiting the district in person, such as emailing a protected document for electronic review, reviewing documents together via Zoom (or similar platform), providing screenshots of specific portions of the document, allowing temporary access to the identified records in the district's electronic system, telephone consultations, and more. These additional options enabled the verification process to be completed in a timely manner.  
  
All identified noncompliance from FFY 2018 for Indicator 11 was corrected within one year of identification.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.

c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 83.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 98.07% | 97.65% | 98.65% | 98.31% | 97.53% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 3,931 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 685 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 2,887 |
| d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied. | 274 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 24 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 2,887 | 2,948 | 97.53% | 100% | 97.93% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**

61

**Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.**

Of the 25 LEAs not meeting the target, a review of both the range of days beyond the timeline that the evaluation was determined and the IEP developed (if found eligible), and the reason for the delay was completed.  
  
For those 61 children whose evaluations were not completed on time or under federal exception,   
65.6% (40) were late due to district scheduling and/or staffing issues;   
19.7% (12) were because the student was referred late to Part B;   
11.5% (7) were due to the family and district agreeing to extend the timeline;   
1.6% (1) were due to districts not providing any additional information; and   
1.6% (1) were due to the transition meeting not occurring at least 90 days prior to the student's third birthday.  
  
With regard to the range of days for the 61 students reported above 55.7% (34) were delayed 15 calendar days or less, 13.1% (8) were delayed 16 to 29 calendar days beyond the child's third birthday, and 31.1% (19) were completed 30 or more calendar days beyond the child's third birthday.  
  
Further data analysis addressing the reasons for delay and an examination of the range of days by geographic region and district size groupings within each of the nine regions, was completed and discussed with stakeholders. There were no emerging patterns or trends identified with one exception. In addition to the universal supports provided for the correction of noncompliance to all LEAs not at 100% compliance, targeted and/or intensive technical assistance will be provided to this LEA through the designated regional professional development system.

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

A statewide data collection process was implemented in FFY 2006. All districts continue to report evaluation and eligibility data on all children referred to Part B for initial eligibility determination. The data collection template and its instructions are located at https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/federal-data-collection-forms. Built into this template are checks and balances ensuring that the logic of the reported data is verified prior to a district submitting the data to OSPI. Districts submitting data templates with logic errors receive an immediate email returning the report and requiring it to be fixed and resubmitted. Data are not considered submitted until those logic checks are passed.  
  
This indicator was calculated using raw data submitted by local districts through a report form that was included in the State’s required data reports as outlined in the annual Federal Special Education Data Reporting Requirements bulletin.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

In spring 2020, OSPI convened a workgroup to inform recommendations and guidance for school districts after school was closed from providing in-person instruction from March–June 2020 due to COVID-19. The broad workgroup consisted of more than 120 educators, education leaders, elected officials, community-based organizations, parents, students, and community members. One of the topics discussed during these stakeholder workgroups was the transition of children from Part C to Part B during the school facility closures. In response to these discussions, as well as input from the Washington State Association of School Psychologists, the state added a temporary allowable exception to this indicator: School closures due to COVID-19 (and school staff were unavailable or the parent stated that distance meeting options would impede participation or the assessment couldn’t be completed due to safety restrictions). Records identified with this exception were included in parts (a), (c) and (d) of the calculation for this indicator.  
  
This additional exception allowed the state to specifically measure the impact of the COVID-19 school facility closures on the timely completion of the Part C to Part B transition process. A total of 207 transitions were not completed on time per this additional state exception.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 35 | 35 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The districts identified root causes of the noncompliance, and reviewed policies, procedures, and/or practices that contributed to the noncompliance. Actions were taken by the district to address the identified root causes and were reported to OSPI through the IDEA Compliance Package.  
  
In order to verify that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.124(b), a review of updated data, conducted by regional Educational Service District (ESD) representatives and validated by OSPI, was completed. Verification activities included on-site visits (prior to the COVID-19 school facility closures), staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. This review verified 100% compliance; all 35 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 CFR §300.124(b).

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The identified districts corrected and accounted for all individual instances of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings.   
  
Special education representatives from the regional ESDs and OSPI verified that the 35 districts’ corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits (prior to COVID-19 school facility closures), staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. Regional ESD representatives reviewed data to verify that the noncompliance was corrected. All 35 districts were found to have completed the evaluation and implemented the IEP (if eligible), although late, for every student whose transition was not timely, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district.  
  
At the time of the COVID-19 school facility closures in mid-March 2020, school districts had already completed their corrections for FFY 2018, and the verification of the corrections was in process. OSPI worked with regional ESD representatives and the affected districts to identify alternate methods for verifying the corrections that did not involve visiting the district in person, such as emailing a protected document for electronic review, reviewing documents together via Zoom (or similar platform), providing screenshots of specific portions of the document, allowing temporary access to the identified records in the district's electronic system, telephone consultations, and more. These additional options enabled the verification process to be completed in a timely manner.  
  
All identified noncompliance from FFY 2018 for Indicator 12 was corrected within one year of identification.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 12 - OSEP Response

## 12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Secondary transition: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 83.70% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 95.79% | 93.94% | 95.22% | 95.81% | 96.99% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition** | **Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,310 | 1,344 | 96.99% | 100% | 97.47% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

These data are collected from the State’s monitoring activities, which include on-site visits, off-site desk reviews, and files submitted for Safety Net reimbursement.  
  
During the monitoring review, a comprehensive student file review is conducted which includes IEPs of students turning 16 and above to determine whether the elements described below are appropriately documented in the IEP:  
  
a. Evidence that the measurable post-secondary goal(s) were based on age appropriate transition assessment(s).  
  
b. Measurable post-secondary goal(s) that are updated annually and address education, training, employment, and if appropriate, independent living skills.  
  
c. Transition services that focus on improving academic and functional achievement of the student to facilitate their movement from school to post-school settings.  
  
d. Course(s) of study needed to assist the student in reaching the identified postsecondary goal(s).  
  
e. Annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable the student to meet the identified post-secondary goal(s).  
  
f. Evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed.  
  
g. For transition services that are likely to be provided or paid for by other agencies, evidence that, with parent consent, representatives of the agency(ies) were invited to the IEP meeting.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16? | NO |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 19 | 19 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

The State reported 96.99% compliance in FFY 2018. Nineteen districts were determined to be noncompliant with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b) and 300.321(b). The districts were notified in writing of the identified noncompliance and were required to correct this noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.  
  
In order to verify that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, a review of updated data, conducted by regional Educational Service District (ESD) representatives and validated by OSPI, was completed. Verification activities included on-site visits (prior to COVID-19 school facility closures), staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, observations, etc. This review verified 100% compliance; the 19 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 CFR §300.320(b) and 300.321(b).

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The 19 identified districts corrected and accounted for all individual instances of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. The correction of each individual case of noncompliance was summarized and reported by the district to OSPI through the IDEA Compliance Package.  
  
Special education representatives from the regional ESDs and OSPI verified that the 29 districts’ corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits (prior to COVID-19 school facility closures), staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, observations, etc. All 19 districts were found to have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district.  
  
At the time of the COVID-19 school facility closures in mid-March 2020, school districts had already completed their corrections for FFY 2018, and the verification of the corrections was in process. OSPI worked with regional ESD representatives and the affected districts to identify alternate methods for verifying the corrections that did not involve visiting the district in person, such as emailing a protected document for electronic review, reviewing documents together via Zoom (or similar platform), providing screenshots of specific portions of the IEP, allowing temporary access to the identified records in the district's electronic IEP system, telephone consultations, and more. These additional options enabled the verification process to be completed in a timely manner.  
  
All identified noncompliance from FFY 2018 for Indicator 13 was corrected within one year of identification.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Post-school outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school****is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

**II. *Data Reporting***

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;

2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);

3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);

4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| A | 2013 | Target >= | 25.70% | 25.80% | 25.90% | 26.00% | 26.10% |
| A | 23.74% | Data | 22.30% | 22.13% | 21.79% | 21.31% | 20.45% |
| B | 2013 | Target >= | 49.15% | 49.35% | 49.55% | 49.75% | 49.95% |
| B | 52.11% | Data | 53.21% | 55.56% | 57.13% | 56.08% | 56.64% |
| C | 2013 | Target >= | 67.13% | 67.23% | 67.33% | 67.43% | 67.53% |
| C | 65.13% | Data | 67.38% | 70.46% | 72.21% | 72.19% | 74.68% |

**FFY 2019 Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target A >= | 26.20% |
| Target B >= | 52.21% |
| Target C >= | 70.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Washington State continues to benefit from broad and extensive stakeholder input on all aspects of its State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, including the setting of, and if needed, the revision of performance targets. The overarching external stakeholder group is the Washington State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC). This stakeholder group typically includes a roster of members from IDEA-required multi-disciplinary fields including K-12 education, mental health, parent advocacy, early childhood, secondary transition, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile justice, and higher education.  
  
The State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) approved updated targets at the October 2020 meeting. Information regarding the stakeholders included and minutes of the meeting are posted at Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (https://www.k12.wa.us/aboutospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisorycouncil-seac). The FFY 2019 target is an increase on baseline year data for 14A, 14B, and 14C.

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 6,867 |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 1,339 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 2,297 |
| 3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) | 295 |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 1,016 |

| **Measure** | **Number of respondent youth** | **Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 1,339 | 6,867 | 20.45% | 26.20% | 19.50% | Did Not Meet Target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 3,636 | 6,867 | 56.64% | 52.21% | 52.95% | Met Target | No Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 4,947 | 6,867 | 74.68% | 70.00% | 72.04% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Washington state conducted the Post-School Survey census to collect post-school outcome data from all 2018-2019 school-year leavers one year after they exited high school. Districts utilized administrative records to generate a list of all leavers (who had not re-enrolled in school and were alive at the time of data collection). School district personnel attempted to contact all leavers using informal student exit survey information and student records. The majority of districts recorded at least three attempts to contact each of their leavers and reported any reason for being unable to conduct the survey with each former student or their designated family member (i.e., parent or grandparent). All survey data are recorded online in the Transition Systemic Framework 2.0 (TSF2).  
  
Response Rate  
  
A total of 8,908 youth left school during FFY 2019, had not re-enrolled in secondary school, and were alive at the time of data collection. Contact was made with 7,111 leavers or their designated family members and interviews were conducted with 6,867 individuals. The contact rate is 79.8% (7,111 divided by 8,908) and the response rate is 77.1% (6,867 divided by 8,908).   
  
The overall response rate indicates that out of 8,908 students who left school last year, post-school outcome information for 22.9% (2,041) of former students was not obtained. Of the 2,041 leavers with no outcome data, 183 did not have data because their surveys were never started (i.e. school district personnel did not reach out to the leavers). One leaver had an incomplete survey, as school district personnel attempted to contact the leaver but did not complete the survey.   
  
This total number of leavers (183 not started/1 incomplete) is not included in the count of 1,857 non-responders. Of the 1,857 non-responders, educators reported a variety of reasons for non-response, including poor or no contact information (18.0%), unable to reach after three attempts (66.1%), declined interview (13.4%), and other reasons (2.8%).   
  
Missing data   
  
An analysis of the data was conducted to determine patterns of missing information (e.g., did missing data vary across districts and disability categories, etc.). Of the 1,857 youth not responding to the survey, the majority are categorized as white (52.3%), male (65.2%), with a specific learning disability (47.2%) or other health impairment (25.9%). The dropout-rate among non-responders is 34.6%. Further analyses are necessary to identify root causes and develop effective improvement strategies.  
  
Representativeness  
  
Response Calculator was used to measure the representativeness of the respondent group. Calculations were made on the characteristics of disability type, race/ethnicity, gender, and exit status in order to determine whether the leavers who responded to the interviews were similar, or different from, the total population of young adults with an IEP who exited school in 2018-19.   
  
According to the NTACT Response Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of ±3% are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representativeness of the group and positive differences indicate over-representativeness. In the Response Calculator, a red highlight is used to indicate a difference exceeding the ±3% interval.   
  
The NTACT Response Calculator lists nine categories of respondents for measuring representativeness: Specific Learning Disability, Emotionally/Behaviorally Disabled, Intellectual Disability, All Other Disabilities, Female, Minority, ELL and Drop-out. Washington state gathered representative data from all groups, except leavers who dropped out of school. Students who dropped out (didn’t receive a diploma) continue to be under-represented in the current response group (-5.21%) which is an improvement of .4 from the FFY 2018 submission.   
  
Selection Bias  
  
Post-school outcome data collection continues to show representativeness in areas of disability, gender, and ethnicity. Students who dropped out of school continue to be under-represented in the current response group (-5.21%). This slight decrease from the previous year is likely due to improved training and user permissions in the data collection platform. CCTS included additional emphasis in Post-School Survey trainings that students who dropped out are considered leavers and must be included in the survey. In addition, new security permissions were added to the TSF2 that decreased the number of users who are able to delete students from the system. Students who drop are historically more difficult to contact as reported by districts and in the literature. Instead of deleting those leavers from the system as was done by some districts in prior years, they were included in this survey and counted as non-responders.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? | NO |

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

Training was provided and the data collection platform revised to assure students who dropped out were included in the survey. These additional students may have negatively impacted the response data. CCTS will identify districts with the highest response rates for dropouts and gather information to determine specific strategies that may be additional to the strategies already included in trainings. CCTS will consider districts with a low response rate of dropouts and target those districts with training opportunities.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2019 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR**

Post-school outcome data collection continues to show representativeness in areas of disability, gender, and ethnicity. Students who dropped out of school continue to be under-represented in the current response group (-5.21%). This slight decrease from the previous year is likely due to improved training and user permissions in the data collection platform. CCTS included additional emphasis in Post-School Survey trainings that students who dropped out are considered leavers and must be included in the survey. In addition, new security permissions were added to the TSF2 that decreased the number of users who are able to delete students from the system. Students who drop are historically more difficult to contact as reported by districts and in the literature.

## 14 - OSEP Response

## 14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results Indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 70 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/04/2020 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 19 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Washington State continues to benefit from broad and extensive stakeholder input on all aspects of its State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, including the setting of, and if needed, the revision of performance targets. The overarching external stakeholder group is the Washington State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC). This stakeholder group typically includes a roster of members from IDEA-required multi-disciplinary fields including K-12 education, mental health, parent advocacy, early childhood, secondary transition, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile justice, and higher education.  
  
The State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) approved updated targets at the October 2020 meeting. Information regarding the stakeholders included and minutes of the meeting are posted at Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (https://www.k12.wa.us/aboutospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisorycouncil-seac). The FFY 2019 target is an increase on baseline year data.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2013 | 27.66% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= | 25.50% | 25.75% | 26.00% | 26.25% | 26.50% |
| Data | 18.75% | 33.33% | 30.77% | 32.14% | 38.89% |

**Targets**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 26.75% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 19 | 70 | 38.89% | 26.75% | 27.14% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

No additional information to report.

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range is used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1 Mediations held | 43 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 6 |
| SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/04/2020 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 29 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Washington State continues to benefit from broad and extensive stakeholder input on all aspects of its State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report, including the setting of, and if needed, the revision of performance targets. The overarching external stakeholder group is the Washington State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC). This stakeholder group typically includes a roster of members from IDEA-required multi-disciplinary fields including K-12 education, mental health, parent advocacy, early childhood, secondary transition, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile justice, and higher education.  
  
The State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) approved updated targets at the October 2020 meeting. Information regarding the stakeholders included and minutes of the meeting are posted at Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (https://www.k12.wa.us/aboutospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisorycouncil-seac). The FFY 2019 target is an increase on baseline year data.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2013 | 78.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** |
| Target >= |  |  |  | 75.40% - 85.40% | 75.50% - 85.50% |
| Data | 84.62% | 77.50% | 88.89% | 95.59% | 87.50% |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | **2019 (low)** | **2019 (high)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Target | 75.60% | 85.60% |

**FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2018 Data** | **FFY 2019 Target (low)** | | **FFY 2019 Target (high)** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | 29 | 43 | 87.50% | 75.60% | 85.60% | | 81.40% | Met Target | No Slippage |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

No additional information to report.

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan



# Certification

**Instructions**

**Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.**

**Certify**

**I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier’s role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

**Name:**

Glenna Gallo

**Title:**

Assistant Superintendent

**Email:**

glenna.gallo@k12.wa.us

**Phone:**

8013499496

**Submitted on:**

04/19/21 4:21:34 PM

# ED Attachments
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