

Thank you for joining us for the
Special Education State Design Team
Final Recommendations Meeting!

We will get started in a few minutes.



2021–22 OSPI Special Education State Design Team Recommendations

A Collaborative Partnership among
the Office of Superintendence of Public Instruction (OSPI),
the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and
Partners across education in Washington state




Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Tuesday, January 11, 2022

How You Can Engage with Us Today

- This session will be recorded and posted to the OSPI Special Education [OSPI Special Education Webinars](#) page.
- The link to the slides will be dropped into the chat throughout the session.
- Use the Q & A button to ask a question or comment on a question.
- Live captioning is also available; click on the “CC” button:



Tribal Land Acknowledgement

We respectfully acknowledge the Indigenous people who have stewarded this land since time immemorial and who still inhabit the area today, the Steh-Chass Band of Indigenous people of the Squaxin Island Tribe.




Today's Discussion

- State Design Team Focus Group Activities
- Target Setting Recommendations
- Systemic Equity Review Updates
- Next Steps for the State Design Team
- How to Stay Involved



Overview of State Design Team Activities



Target Setting Recommendations from SDT Focus Groups

- Early Childhood (Indicators B6, B7 and B17)
- Secondary Transition (Indicators B1, B2 and B14)
- Outcomes & Inclusionary Practices (Indicators B3 and B5)
- Parent Engagement (Indicator B8)
- Disproportionality and Significant Discrepancy (Indicator B4A)



Early Childhood Focus Group

(Indicators B6, B7, and B17)



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Early Childhood LRE


Target Recommendations

Indicator B6	OSPI Recommendations	
	Target	Baseline <small>*2020-21 data reflects OSEPs to report PreK separate from K</small>
6A: Attending a regular early childhood program and majority of services provided in early childhood setting	Proposed 2025 Target: 32% Current Target: 29.2% Current % reported: 21%	2020-21 21%
6B: Students attending separate class, school or residential facility	Proposed 2025 Target: 43% Current Target: 37.8% Current % reported: 53.5%	2020-21 53%
6C: Services provided at home	Proposed 2025 Target: 1.0 % Current Target: 0.53% Current % reported: 0.53%	0.53%



Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

% Attending Regular EC Program and Majority of Services Provided in EC Setting (B6A)




Early Childhood Outcomes

Indicator B7	Recommendations			
	Target		Baseline	
A1/A2 Social Emotional Skills	Proposed 2025 Target: 89.6% Current Target: 83.7% Current % reported: 89.6%	Proposed 2025 Target: 45% Current Target: 51.2% Current % reported: 38.1%	1 2020-21	2 2020-21
B1/B2 Knowledge and Skills	Proposed 2025 Target: 89% Current Target: 82.7% Current % reported: 88.9%	Proposed 2025 Target: 45% Current Target: 52.2% Current % reported: 37.6%	1 2020-21	2 2020-21
C1/C2 Use of Appropriate Behaviors	Proposed 2025 Target: 89% Current Target: 81.7% Current % reported: 86.7%	Proposed 2025 Target: 55% Current Target: 66.2% Current % reported: 48.1%	1 2020-21	2 2020-21



Social/Emotional Skills (7A1/7A2)



B17 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

Percent Met Proficiency:

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
SWDs	49.9	48.8	46.5	38.7	47.3	44.1	49.0
nSWDs	77.0	76.1	75.6	72.1	79.6	78.1	82.1

Number of students participating in the assessment:

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
SWDs	3,234	2,899	4,925	6,683	7,249	7,546	7,599
nSWDs	35,209	39,493	53,354	70,608	72,004	72,600	73,027

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Proposed Target =	50.25	51.75	53.25	54.75	56.25	57.75

Data Source: OSPI Data Portal Kindergarten Readiness from 2011-12 through 2020-21



Secondary Transition Focus Group

(Indicators B1, B2, and B-14)



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Secondary Transition Focus Group

*Across all secondary transition indicators OSPI is recommending that the 2019 data point serve as the baseline year, as the 2020 data point was an outlier with both COVID-19 and graduation waiver impacts

Key
= Agree
↗ Increase

Indicators	Decision Making Process	OSPI Target Setting Recommendation
B1. Graduation: Percent of youth with IEPs exiting from high school with a regular high school diploma.	OSPI Recommendation	Continue with the ESSA targets which are already set for this indicator
	Focus Group Feedback	Majority, agree to continue with ESSA targets =
	Final Recommendation	Continue with the ESSA targets which are already set for this indicator
B2. Drop Out: Students Who Exited by Dropping Out	OSPI Recommendation	Use the standard deviation methodology for target setting
	Focus Group Feedback	All, increase in rigor (Average Difference), majority with a slow start ↗
	Final Recommendation	Include slow start to the more rigorous goal (Average Difference)
B-14. Post School Outcomes for higher education (B-14A), higher education or competitively employed (B-14B) or Engaged (B-14C).	OSPI Recommendation	Use the standard deviation methodology for target setting
	Focus Group Feedback	All, increase in rigor (Average Difference), majority with a slow start ↗
	Final Recommendation	Include slow start to the more rigorous goal (Average Difference)



Outcomes & Inclusionary Practices Focus Group

(Indicators B3 and B5)



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Student Outcomes B-3(b-d)

Proficiency rate on state assessments

Recommendation: Follow ESSA recommendation to increase target in reading by 6.6% and math by 6.9% to meet 90% by 2027 to close the achievement gap

Focus Group Consensus:

Rigor: Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Rigorous since we are starting with such big gaps ● Overall rate of progress is not enough, especially in math
Achievable: No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Barriers include equitable access to curriculum and instruction and meaningful engagement ● Not achievable at all grade levels based, especially secondary ● Concerns that rate of growth is not enough ● Achievable with inclusionary practices, LRE, professional development, and general education involvement.
OSPI to SEAC	<p>Maintain recommendation to follow ESSA targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A higher rate of participation and higher rate of LRE should result in more opportunities and more accurate proficiency data for students with IEPs ● Professional development through IPP has resulted in an increase in inclusionary practices <p>Proposal: SDT focus group for ongoing monitoring of progress and review of initiatives</p>



K-12 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) (B5)

Indicator	OSPI Recommendations	Focus Groups Consensus: Rigorous? No Achievable? Yes.	OSPI to SEAC
5A - Inside the regular class 80% - 100% of the day	Follow calculation increase of 1.66%per year (upward trajectory)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not rigorous enough • Need to set higher goals for inclusive practices • Students need access to content experts and the curriculum to close the achievement gap • Recommend increasing the target for B-5A 1.7% per year or more 	Recommend target of 1.7
5B - Inside the regular class 0-39% of the day	Follow standard decrease each year by .06%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend decreasing the percentage of students in B-5B. • The rigor in increasing LRE 80-100 should have parallel targets for decreasing all other LRE categories 	Recommend decreasing target .05%

FG comments and letters will be made available to SEAC

Propose SDT focus group continues to meet for ongoing monitoring of progress and review of initiatives

Preliminary 2021 LRE Data!

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Category	DRAFT 2021 Data	% Change from 2018 Baseline
LRE 1 (80-100% general ed):	62.37%	+ 5.77%
LRE 2 (40-79% general ed):	24.31%	- 5.11%
LRE 3 (0-39% general ed):	11.65%	- 1.15%

Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2021). DRAFT *Special Education Federal Child Count*.



Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Trends in WA

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Category	2018 Baseline	2019 Update	2020 Update	DRAFT 2021 Data	% Change from 2018 Baseline
LRE 1 (80–100% general ed):	56.6%	57.7%	60.0%	62.37%	+ 5.77%
LRE 2 (40–79% general ed):	29.2%	28.4%	26.3%	24.31%	– 5.11%
LRE 3 (0–39% general ed):	12.8%	12.4%	12.2%	11.65%	– 1.15%

Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2022). *Special Education Federal Child Count*.



Parent Engagement Focus Group

(Indicator B8)



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Parent Involvement (B8)

Parent Involvement

Indicator	Decision Making Process	OSPI Target Setting Recommendation
8. Parent Involvement: 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.	OSPI Recommendation	Use the standard deviation methodology (an increase of about 0.73% per year), and re-set both the baseline and the targets when the new survey is implemented.
	Focus Group Feedback	Majority: increase is more rigorous than previous SPP (increase of 0.2% per year) and achievable. Targets will be reset for the new survey.
	Final Recommendation for SEAC	Increase the percentage 0.73% per year



Disproportionality & Significant Discrepancy Focus Group

(Indicator B4A)




Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Significant Discrepancy in Discipline Rates (B4A)

Disproportionality and Significant Discrepancy		
Indicator	Decision Making Process	OSPI Target Setting Recommendation
B4A Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of out of -school suspensions and expulsions for students with IEPs for greater than 10 days (consecutive or accumulated) in a school year.	OSPI Recommendation	Reduce the percentage 0.25% per year (recommended by SEAC for previous SPP)
	Focus Group Feedback	Majority: decrease is rigorous and achievable.
	Final Recommendation for SEAC	Reduce the percentage 0.25% per year




Significant Discrepancy = % Districts Whose Rate Difference for SWDs is 2.0 or Greater for Students Suspended/Expelled Greater than 10 Days. (B4A)



Systemic Equity Review: Updates & Next Steps

Systemic Equity Review: Timeline & Scope of Work



Phase 1A – Complete ✓



Develop

Develop audit framework
and process in
partnership with WA state
team

Develop Communication
Strategy



Identify

Identify research
questions and data
sources



Determine

Determine composition of
WA state team as well as
identify stakeholders
internal and external to
the SEA to involve in the
process




Finalize

Finalize project plan with
specified activities,
timelines and participants

Phase 1b (Data): In Process

PreK-12 Equity Goals	Data Sources (all disaggregated by race/ethnicity)	Readily Available	Public	Requires Data Request	Requires Collection	Not Accessible
Equitable Student Outcomes	Graduation pathways data					
	High School and Beyond Planning data					
	Post-school outcomes data					
	Early childhood data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C-to-B transition • Child outcome summaries for Pre-K • Kindergarten readiness 					
	English Learners with disabilities (progress/participation)					
	Placement data (LRE)					
	MTSS data (tiered fidelity inventory)					
Equitable Student Access, Inclusion, and Discipline	Identification rates					
	Discipline data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discipline referrals • Suspension data 					
	IEP Educational Benefit Review data					
	Special Education Monitoring data					
	Dual credit (and early college) data					


Pause & Reflect Activity: Takeaways




- Successes
 - Collaborative Partnerships
 - Commitment from leadership & staff
 - Cross-agency involvement
- Challenges
 - Staffing changes
 - Competing priorities (other timelines)
 - Need for increased diversity of voices
- Potentials
 - Center community values
 - Continue State Design Team meetings
 - Model for other states to follow

Special Ed State Design Team: Diversity Report

Washington State



State Design Team



Source: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>





State Design Team

- Recommended Targets will be shared with SEAC on January 20. [Register here.](#)
- Statewide IEP and Monitoring focus group will continue meeting.

Systemic Equity Review

- Targeted community outreach
- Complete Phase 1b (data); begin Phase 2 (planning & capacity building)

How to Stay Involved!

- Join semi-annual State Design Team update meetings
- Contact us (360-725-6075 or WISM@k12.wa.us) with questions and input.







Except where otherwise noted, this work by the [Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction](#) is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution License](#).

This presentation may contain or reference links to websites operated by third parties. These links are provided for your convenience only and do not constitute or imply any affiliation, endorsement, sponsorship, approval, verification, or monitoring by OSPI of any product, service or content offered on the third party websites. In no event will OSPI be responsible for the information or content in linked third party websites or for your use or inability to use such websites. Please confirm the license status of any third-party resources and understand their terms of use before reusing them.

