



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

*Washington State
Performance Plan
(SPP)/Annual Performance
Report (APR) Part B: For
Reporting on FFY 2020*

2022

WASHINGTON STATE SPP/APR PART B

For Reporting on Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020

2022

Dr. Tania May
Assistant Superintendent of Division

Prepared by:

- **Jennifer Story**, Program Improvement Coordinator, Special Education
jennifer.story@k12.wa.us | 360-725-6075
- **Sandy Grummick**, Data Manager, Special Education
sandy.grummick@k12.wa.us | 360-725-6075
- **Dean Runolfson**, Data Consultant, Special Education
dean.runolfson@k12.wa.us | 360-725-6075

Submission:

U. S. Department of Education
Office of Special Education Programs
February 1, 2022



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	4
Indicator 1: Graduation.....	15
Indicator 2: Drop Out	20
Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs.....	24
Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)....	29
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)	34
Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)	39
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion.....	44
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion	50
Indicator 5: Education Environments (Children Five (Kindergarten)–21)	56
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments	60
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes.....	65
Indicator 8: Parent involvement	73
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation	79
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories.....	84
Indicator 11: Child Find.....	89
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition.....	95
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition.....	101
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes.....	106
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions	119
Indicator 16: Mediation	122
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan	125
Abbreviations Glossary	155
Certification.....	159
Legal Notice	160

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 the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the state's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance (TA) System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro—Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Washington state continues efforts focused on indicators leading to improved outcomes for students with disabilities in post-secondary education, employment, and independent living, and incorporating 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 Individualized Education Program (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 for general educators, special educators, paraeducators, administrators, and parents/families (e.g., IEP team members) addressing all of the above;
5. Priority-driven resource allocation (braiding, consolidated application, reducing costs for administrative tasks, increasing direct support to students, data-based decision-making); and
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.

Educational partners agree that systemic change is needed, and with the Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), have focused on increasing inclusionary practices over the past three plus years, with visible improvements in student data. Washington's approved Every Student Succeeds Act (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 created a comprehensive plan that is specifically targeting

improvement efforts regarding the outcomes of students with disabilities. On an annual basis, Washington state commits additional state and federal resources to address areas in which there was slippage or targets were not met, as well as areas where partners indicate greater needs.

The June 24, 2021, 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 IDEA for more than two years and directs Washington state to report with this federal fiscal year (FFY) 2020 state performance plan (SPP) / annual performance report (APR) submission on two elements: (1) TA sources accessed and from which the state received assistance, and (2) actions taken by the state as a result of the TA. Washington continues working with multiple national TA centers, including the:

- National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI);
- National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII);
- Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA);
- Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID);
- IDEA Data Center (IDC) to support data integration, analysis, and accuracy efforts across the agency; and
- 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. TA efforts have been focused on the priority areas and areas of the SPP/APR showing slippage, not meeting targets, and/or needing improvement, such as preschool LRE and outcomes, post-school outcomes, disproportionality and equity, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Theory of Action and evaluation plan. As a result of the TA received, Washington state continued to analyze data specific to students with disabilities, reviewed research and policy, discussed promising practices, and continued efforts to address root causes of outcomes. These efforts are continuing and ramping up with additional resources dedicated to these areas during FFY 2020, which will also be reflected in our IDEA funding application.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Uploaded the Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 508) Report indicating the non-compliance worksheet was Section 508-compliant in addition to embedding it into the actual document.

Rearranged the OSPI website to make it easier to navigate to the FFY 2019. The documents are all now linked on the same page (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection>) within the SPP/APR accordion drop menu.

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

284

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 agency/division work groups:

1. ***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, monitoring, and regulation of federal funding.
2. ***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.
3. ***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 educational partners/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 over the past year(s), including the engagement of diverse families, to ensure that the needs of each student with an IEP are considered during improvement planning.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the state has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high-quality, evidenced-based TA and support to LEAs.

The data included in this report, as well as other available data, have been analyzed at the state and regional levels, and analyses with school district staff and education partners are held at least annually as part of comprehensive improvement efforts, including those under the ESSA.

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 2020, and remote options have increased to address safety needs during COVID-19. As noted in previous submissions, 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/state-needs-projects>.

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 children 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, education partners/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 statewide 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 contributes 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 online and in-person 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.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the state's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the state has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's SSIP.

For Indicators B-1 through B-14 and B-17, OSPI issued an invitation in April 2021 for individuals who were interested in joining a Special Education State Design Team (SDT). Individuals were directed to complete an invitation survey (<https://survey.alchemer.com/s3/6323118/Invitation-to-Serve-2021-22-Special-Education-State-Design-Team>) that was translated into the 13 most commonly spoken languages in Washington state. The survey identified the individual's contact information, age group(s) representing, county/school district representing, race/ethnicity (optional), role/position, focus area(s) of interest, and any accommodations or language access considerations needed. The invitation was disseminated statewide through multiple methods, including but not limited to GovDelivery communications, OSPI's Special Education Monthly Updates, ESD meetings, Spanish and English radio and newspaper advertisements, and collaboration with statewide professional organizations, including diverse community-based organizations (CBOs) and the state Parent Training and Information (PTI) Centers.

As of the date of this report, the SDT includes 26 OSPI cross-divisional staff, 23 ESD representatives from all nine regions, 14 representatives from other state agencies, 280 external participants, and representatives of the NCSI. Of the total 343 SDT members, 12 are students, 30 are individuals with disabilities, and 140 are parents or family members of an individual with a disability.

Participants were assigned to one of seven focus groups based on their identified areas of interest and role. Each of the groups contained 45–50 participants with a representative mix of race/ethnicity, geographic location, background, and role. The demographics of each focus group was carefully monitored by the Special Education Program Improvement Coordinator to ensure maximum representativeness of each group given the pool of applicants.

Five of the seven focus groups were involved in indicator analyses and target-setting activities:

1. Early Childhood [Indicators B-6, B-7, B-12, and B-17 (SSIP)]
2. Secondary Transition (Indicators B-1, B-2, B-13, and B-14)
3. Inclusionary Practices and Student Outcomes (B-3 and B-5)
4. Parent Engagement (B-8)
5. Disproportionality and Significant Discrepancy (B-4, B-9, and B-10)

*The work of two of the seven focus groups, Monitoring & Educational Benefit and Exploring a

Statewide IEP, did not include target-setting and is, therefore, not included in this description of stakeholder input on the SPP indicators.

The full SDT kickoff meeting was held via Zoom on September 14, 2021, in collaboration with NCSI staff. Diversity, equity, and inclusion was emphasized as the foundation for the work of the SDT and all the focus groups. The individual focus groups, facilitated by OSPI staff, met in October through December 2021 to analyze indicator data and collaboratively develop recommendations for indicator targets. The full SDT was brought together for a second virtual meeting on January 11, 2022, to review the work of the focus groups and the recommended targets, prior to presenting the targets to the state Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) for review and approval on January 20, 2022. All focus group materials, including slide decks, indicator guides, discussion protocols, participant guidelines, meeting recordings/transcripts, and participant input were maintained in a shared Google Docs folder

(<https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/15Oq1HOpS7OyB49zMCQa-hV1I23gErdud>) for all participants to access. Additional opportunities to provide input included a parking lot document, homework assignments, and email. Updates on the work of the SDT and focus groups were posted publicly on OSPI's Special Education Family Engagement and Guidance webpage (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/family-engagement-and-guidance>). Summaries of SEAC meetings and decisions are posted on OSPI's SEAC webpage (<https://www.k12.wa.us/about-ospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisory-council-seac>).

Although there was no SDT focus group for Indicators B-15 and B-16, dispute resolution data are shared with stakeholders at least semi-annually, during SEAC meetings, as well as through presentations to special education and district administrators, families, advocates, and communities, and posted on the OSPI website. For these two indicators, the SEAC reviewed the applicable data and proposed targets on January 20, 2022. Summaries of SEAC meetings and decisions are posted on OSPI's SEAC webpage (<https://www.k12.wa.us/about-ospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisory-council-seac>).

An immediate point of clarification for reviewers will be that after extensive conversations with early childhood community partners, the Washington SSIP State Leads will not be using the term "stakeholder" within this report, or within companion tools within the SSIP, to respectfully honor relationships with Tribal Partners within advisory committees who represent their individual sovereign nations (29 federally recognized within Washington state). As a result, community partners (CPs) have requested this term be struck from all communications and references. By striking this term we are putting into practice our commitment to assess to our systems and interrupt institutional racism, and racist practices, ensuring that we are meeting the OSPI equity statement to: "...actively dismantle systemic barriers, replacing them with policies and practices that ensure all students have access to the instruction and support they need to succeed in our schools." OSPI understands that language and advocacy are fluid, and it is our intent to continue these conversations as they apply to the impacts of language used to describe CPs in additional contexts, including future iterations of the SPP/APR.

**Did you apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators?
(Yes / No):**

YES

Number of Parent Members:

150

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

As previously described, the 140 SDT participants, who were parents/family members of individuals with disabilities, were each assigned to one of seven focus groups based on their identified interests. The individual focus groups, facilitated by OSPI staff, met in October through December 2021 to analyze indicator data and collaboratively develop recommendations for indicator targets. The full SDT was brought together for a second virtual meeting on January 11, 2022, to review the work of the focus groups and the recommended targets, prior to presenting the targets to the state SEAC for review and approval on January 20, 2022. SEAC includes an additional 10 members who are parents of individuals with disabilities.

All focus group materials, including slide decks, indicator guides, discussion protocols, participant guidelines, meeting recordings/transcripts, and participant input was maintained in a shared Google Docs folder (<https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/15Oq1HOpS7OyB49zMCQa-hV1I23gErdud>) for all participants to access. Additional opportunities to provide input included a parking lot document, homework assignments, and email. Updates on the work of the SDT and focus groups were posted publicly on OSPI's Special Education Family Engagement and Guidance webpage (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/family-engagement-and-guidance>).

The SEAC met on January 20, 2022, to review the recommended targets for approval. Summaries of SEAC meetings and decisions are posted on OSPI's SEAC webpage (<https://www.k12.wa.us/about-osp/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisory-council-seac>).

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

As described previously, multiple efforts were made to ensure the diversity of the SDT participants. Interested individuals were directed to complete an invitation survey (<https://survey.alchemer.com/s3/6323118/Invitation-to-Serve-2021-22-Special-Education-State-Design-Team>) that was translated into the 13 most commonly spoken languages in Washington state. The survey identified the individual's contact information, age group(s) representing, county/school district representing, race/ethnicity (optional), role/position, focus area(s) of interest,

and any accommodations or language access considerations needed. The invitation was disseminated statewide through multiple methods, including but not limited to GovDelivery communications, OSPI's Special Education Monthly Updates, ESD meetings, Spanish and English radio and newspaper advertisements, and collaboration with statewide professional organizations and diverse CBOs and PTI Centers. The Spanish radio and newspaper advertisements were initiated upon review of the demographics of the preliminary participants and determining that individuals identified as Hispanic were underrepresented on the SDT.

Participants were assigned to one of seven focus groups based on their identified areas of interest and role. Each of the groups contained 45–50 participants with a representative mix of race/ethnicity, geographic location, background, and role. The demographics of each focus group was carefully monitored by the Special Education Program Improvement Coordinator to ensure maximum representativeness of each group given the pool of applicants and their area(s) of interest.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

In spring 2021, OSPI issued a request for individuals who were interested in joining a Special Education SDT. Individuals were directed to complete an invitation survey (<https://survey.alchemer.com/s3/6323118/Invitation-to-Serve-2021-22-Special-Education-State-Design-Team>) that was translated into the 13 most commonly spoken languages in Washington state. The survey identified the individual's contact information, age group(s) representing, county/school district representing, race/ethnicity (optional), role, focus area(s) of interest, and any accommodations or language access considerations needed. The invitation was disseminated statewide through multiple methods, including but not limited to GovDelivery communications, OSPI's Special Education Monthly Updates, ESD meetings, Spanish and English radio and newspaper advertisements, and collaboration with statewide professional organizations, diverse CBOs and PTI Centers.

Participants were assigned to a focus group based on their role and identified area(s) of interest. The individual focus groups, facilitated by OSPI staff, met virtually in October through December 2021 to analyze indicator data and collaboratively develop recommendations for indicator targets. The full SDT was brought together for a second virtual meeting on January 11, 2022, to review the work of the focus groups and the recommended targets, prior to presenting the targets to the state SEAC for review and approval on January 20, 2022. All focus group materials, including slide decks, indicator guides, discussion protocols, participant guidelines, meeting recordings/transcripts, and participant input was maintained in a shared Google Docs folder (<https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/15Oq1HOpS7OyB49zMCQa-hV1I23gErdud>) for all participants to access. Additional opportunities to provide input included a parking lot document, homework assignments, and email.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis,

development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

All focus group materials, including slide decks, indicator guides, discussion protocols, participant guidelines, meeting recordings/transcripts, and participant input was maintained in a shared Google Docs folder (<https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/15Oq1HOpS7OyB49zMCQa-hV1I23gErdud>) for all participants to access. Additional opportunities to provide input included a parking lot document, homework assignments, and email. Updates on the work of the SDT and focus groups were posted publicly on OSPI's Special Education Family Engagement and Guidance webpage (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/family-engagement-and-guidance>). Summaries of SEAC meetings and decisions are posted on OSPI's SEAC webpage (<https://www.k12.wa.us/about-ospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisory-council-seac>).

Reporting to the Public

How and where the state reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 APR, as required by 34 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the state's SPP/APR, including any revision if the state has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

The state continues to publicly post and report on both SEA and LEA performance on the original FFY 2012 (and adjusted) SPP targets. The FFY 2019 data were posted (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection>) in February 2021. Complete copies of the Washington SPP and APR are located on the same webpage.

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) and available to the media and families. This information was also distributed in the February 2021 special education monthly update, through the Partnerships for Action Voices for Empowerment (PAVE) PTI Center, to stakeholder committees who gave substantial input and feedback to the development of this document, and to the SEAC. This information is also 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.

State assessment data links are below:

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> (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", scroll down the page, then choose "Assessment" in the Student Performance Section, and then choose "Details".

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", scroll down the page, then choose "Assessment" in the Student Performance Section, and then choose "Details".

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 No. 1" 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, Seattle School District No. 1" and click "GO", scroll down the page, then choose "Assessment" in the Student Performance Section, and then choose "Details".

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

The state's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the state's 2021 determination letter, the U.S. Department of Education (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 and will not be posted on the Department'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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Intro—OSEP Response

The state's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021, determination letter informed the state that it 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. The state provided the required information.

Intro—Required Actions

The state's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the state's 2022 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, 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.

INDICATOR 1: GRADUATION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

Results Indicator

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma.

[20 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1416(a)(3)(A)]

Data Source

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.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14–21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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 federal fiscal year (FFY) 2020 state performance plan (SPP) / annual performance report (APR), use data from 2019–2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2018	68.21%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	54.90%	58.10%	61.30%
Data	57.97%	58.74%	59.41%	69.86%	62.24%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	71.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 8–9 above for a detailed description.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019–20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	6,529
SY 2019–20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019–20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	0
SY 2019–20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	30
SY 2019–20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	2,275

*SY = school year; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14–21)	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
6,529	8,834	62.24%	71.00%	73.91%	Met target	N/A

*FFY = federal fiscal year; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs; N/A = not applicable.

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

Washington State Requirements for the class of 2020: 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 labs, a 3rd credit of science*
- Social Studies (3): 1.0 U.S. History and Government, 0.5 Contemporary World History, Geography, and Problems, 0.5 credits of Civics, 1.0 credits of Social Studies Elective (may include 0.5 credits of a second semester of Contemporary World History or the equivalent)
- Arts (2): Performing or visual arts, one credit may be a Personalized Pathway Requirements**
- World Language (2): Both credits may be a Personalized Pathway Requirements**
- Health and Fitness (2): 0.5 credits of Health, 1.5 credits of Fitness, Students must earn credit for physical education unless excused per Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 28A.230.050
- Career and Technical Education (CTE) (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 (HSBP), 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. (See Washington Administrative Code (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 HSBP, that may include CTE and are intended to provide a focus for the student's learning.

Non-Credit Requirements:

- HSBP (https://www.sbe.wa.gov/faqs/high_school_beyond)
- Washington State History

Assessments:

[See the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) testing webpage (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/testing/state-testing>). For more information on state-approved alternative assessments see OSPI graduation alternatives webpage (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/graduation/graduation-requirements/graduation-pathways>)].

- High school English language arts Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC)* (or state-approved alternative).
- High school math SBAC* (or state-approved alternative).
- Students will take a high school science exam, the Washington Comprehensive Assessment of Science (WCAS) 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 (SBE) in August 2015, to meet graduation requirements. The graduation score is different from the college- and career-ready score (Level 3 on the SBAC).

Districts may have additional local requirements. Students and parents should check with school counselors for additional requirements for graduation. The requirements for the class of 2020 are described in WAC 180-51-068.

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)

The state did not identify barriers for this indicator as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic with regard to data collection, data completeness, validity, or reliability of the data. However, the pandemic did have an impact on performance for this indicator. Per OSPI bulletin 022-20, issued on March 20, 2020

(https://www.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/public/bulletinsmemos/bulletins2020/3_Guidance%20for%20Long-term%20School%20Closures%20as%20of%20March%2020.pdf), and supplemental

"Frequently Asked Questions" document

(https://www.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/public/communications/Class%20of%202020%20Graduation%20FAQ_OSPI%20April%202020.pdf), additional graduation flexibilities were provided to the

class of 2020 for all students, as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Flexibilities offered to the graduating class of 2020 included the waiver of up to two non-core credits, the Expedited Assessment Appeals (EAA) Waiver, and waiver of additional Local Educational Agency (LEA) graduation requirements. As a result, the graduation and dropout data for the 2019–20 school year were atypical and not reflective of the full graduation expectations for students in the state of Washington. After careful consideration and discussion, both the State Design Team (SDT) and Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) recommended using 2018–19 as the baseline year for setting targets for Indicators B-1 and B-2.

Baseline data were revised to reflect the FFY 2018 Section 618 exiting data, as required. Using the data from File Spec 009 for FFY 2018, the following are the data: 6,588 graduates/9,658 leavers = 68.21% graduation rate. The historical data reflected in the table above was calculated using Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) data, which based on stakeholder input, is no longer being used. The historical data in the table was not editable.

1—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

Response

The state has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The state provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

1—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 2: DROP OUT

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

Results Indicator

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) who exited special education due to dropping out.

[20 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1416 (a)(3)(A)]

Data Source

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.

Measurement

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 exited special education (ages 14–21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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 federal fiscal year (FFY) 2020 state performance plan (SPP) / annual performance report (APR), use data from 2019–2020), and compare the results to the target.

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019–2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

2—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2018	31.93%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	5.60%	5.55%	5.50%	5.45%	5.45%
Data	6.34%	6.74%	6.43%	6.61%	6.81%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	31.00%	30.50%	29.00%	27.50%	26.20%	25.10%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 8–9 above for a detailed description.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019–20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	6,529
SY 2019–20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019–20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	0
SY 2019–20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	30
SY 2019–20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	2,275

*SY = school year; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14–21)	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
2,275	8,834	6.81%	31.00%	25.75%	Met target	N/A

*FFY = federal fiscal year; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs; N/A = not applicable.

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

Dropping out is 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 as dropping out 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 as dropping out.

Dropping out includes those students who provide a reason for dropping out, those who leave school to attempt/obtain a General Equivalency Degree (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 dropping out between students with or without disabilities.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (Yes / No)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

The data reflected in the historical table above does not reflect the calculation used in this SPP cycle. The historical data was calculated using Option 1 and updated baseline, data and new targets are calculated using Option 2. Please do not compare FFY 2020 data to previous years, which were calculated using a different methodology.

The state did not identify barriers for this indicator as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic with regard to data collection, data completeness, validity, or reliability of the data. However, the pandemic did have a tremendous impact on performance for this indicator. Per Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) bulletin 022-20, issued on March 20, 2020 (https://www.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/public/bulletinsmemos/bulletins2020/3_Guidance%20for%20Long-term%20School%20Closures%20as%20of%20March%2020.pdf), and supplemental "Frequently Asked Questions" document (https://www.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/public/communications/Class%20of%202020%20Graduation%20FAQ_OSPI%20April%202020.pdf), additional graduation flexibilities were provided to all students in the class of 2020 as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Flexibilities offered to the graduating class of 2020 included the waiver of up to two non-core credits, the Expedited Assessment Appeals (EAA) Waiver, and waiver of additional Local Educational Agency (LEA) graduation requirements. As a result, the graduation and dropout data for the 2019–20 school year was atypical and not reflective of the full graduation expectations for students in the state of Washington. After careful consideration and discussion, both the State Design Team (SDT) and Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) recommended using 2018–19 as the baseline year for setting targets for Indicators B-1 and B-2.

Baseline data were revised to reflect the FFY 2018 Section 618 exiting data, as required. Per Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) feedback, when using Option 2 and the Section 618 exiting data, the baseline percentage is 31.93. The historical data reflected in the table above was calculated using Option 1 from the Requirements Table, which based on stakeholder input, is no longer being used. The historical data in the table was not editable.

2—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2—OSEP Response

The state has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

2—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 3A: PARTICIPATION FOR CHILDREN WITH IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

Results Indicator

Participation and performance of children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

[20 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1416 (a)(3)(A)]

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the U.S. Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), using *EDFacts* file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

- A. 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. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school (HS). 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 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the website where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, and HS. Account for **all** children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and HS, 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.

3A—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Subject	Group	Group name	Baseline year (FFY)	Baseline data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	95.00%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	92.60%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	88.40%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	94.90%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	92.10%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	86.60%

*FFY = federal fiscal year; HS = high school.

Targets

Subject	Group	Group name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

*HS = high school; years are federal fiscal years.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 8–9 above for a detailed description.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020–21 Assessment Data Groups—Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	11,879	11,124	9,975
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	8,612	7,292	6,361
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1,426	1,084	737
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	624	502	529

* HS = high school; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs.

Data Source:

School Year (SY) 2020–21 Assessment Data Groups—Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	11,880	11,124	9,972
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	6,839	5,154	4,842
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	3,170	3,177	2,172
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	617	500	540

* HS = high school; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs. The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row "a" for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs participating	Number of children with IEPs	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	10,662	11,879	N/A	95.00%	89.76%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	8,878	11,124	N/A	95.00%	79.81%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	7,627	9,975	N/A	95.00%	76.46	N/A	N/A

*FFY = federal fiscal year; SPP = State Performance Plan; APR = Annual Performance Report; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs; N/A = not applicable.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs participating	Number of children with IEPs	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	10,626	11,880	N/A	95.00%	89.44%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	8,831	11,124	N/A	95.00%	79.39%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	7,554	9,972	N/A	95.00%	75.75%	Did not meet target	N/A

* FFY = federal fiscal year; SPP = State Performance Plan; APR = Annual Performance Report; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs; N/A = not applicable.

Regulatory Information

The State Educational Agency (SEA) [or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, Local Educational Agency (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 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.160(f)].

Public Reporting Information

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

Report Card—Washington State Report Card (ospi.k12.wa.us)

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard/ViewSchoolOrDistrict/103300>

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

In collaboration with the U.S. Department of Education (Department), the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) agreed to postpone administration of the spring 2021 statewide assessments of English Language Arts (ELA), math, and science until fall of 2021, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Smarter Balanced Assessments (SBAC) will be administered between September 2021 and November 2021. The Washington Access to Instruction & Measurement (WA-AIM) alternate assessment window opens in September 2021 and closes in December 2021. For more details on this test administration visit <https://www.k12.wa.us/about-ospi/press-releases/novel-coronavirus-covid-19-guidance-resources>. The EDFacts file specs will be submitted February 2022. Partner Support Center (PSC) will load the data into the platform in March of 2022 to allow Washington state staff to address Indicator 3A–D during the clarification period.

Clarification was made regarding the baseline year. Changed the text from 2018–19 to federal fiscal year (FFY) 2018 as required in the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response section of the platform. File Spec 185 (Math Participation) was successfully loaded into EDFacts and populated into the platform prior to the clarification period. OSPI staff were unaware that File Spec 188 (Reading Participation) did not successfully load during February 2022. As of April 19, 2022, those data have been included and loaded into the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS) Platform under Indicator 3A, and included the Clarification Change form, line-item Indicator 3A as additional information provided.

3A—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A—OSEP Response

The state has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the state did not provide an explanation for the revision.

The state provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The state provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the state has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

OSEP notes that the state reported: "File Spec 185 (Math Participation) was successfully loaded into *EDFacts* and populated into the platform prior to the clarification period. OSPI staff were unaware that File Spec 188 (Reading Participation) did not successfully load during February 2022." The state provided the correct data in the narrative section of the Annual Performance Report (APR) and noted that the data has been reloaded into the *EMAPS* platform.

3A—Required Actions

With the FFY 2021 State Performance Plan (SPP) / APR, the state must provide an explanation for the revision of the baseline to FFY 2018.

OSEP notes that the state submitted verification that the attachment(s) complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 508), as amended. However, one or more of the Indicator 3A attachment(s) included in the state's FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the Department'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 3B: PROFICIENCY FOR CHILDREN WITH IEPS (GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

Results Indicator

See [Indicator 3A Results Indicator](#) above on page 24.

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the U.S. Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), using *EDFacts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

- B. Proficiency rate percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards}}{\text{total \# of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment}} \right]$. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school (HS). 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 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the website where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR) must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and HS, 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.

3B—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Subject	Group	Group name	Baseline year (FFY)	Baseline data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	25.50%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	15.60%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	24.80%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	24.30%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	10.00%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	6.30%

*FFY = federal fiscal year; HS = high school.

Targets

Subject	Group	Group name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	50.50%	57.10%	63.70%	70.30%	76.90%	83.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	50.50%	57.10%	63.70%	70.30%	76.90%	83.50%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	50.50%	57.10%	63.70%	70.30%	76.90%	83.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	48.30%	55.20%	62.10%	69.00%	75.90%	82.80%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	48.30%	55.20%	62.10%	69.00%	75.90%	82.80%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	48.30%	55.20%	62.10%	69.00%	75.90%	82.80%

*HS = high school; years are federal fiscal years.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 8–9 above for a detailed description.

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

School Year (SY) 2020–21 Assessment Data Groups—Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	10,038	8,376	7,098
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,870	1,253	1,477
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	199	142	134

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
scored at or above proficient against grade level			

*HS = high school; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs.

Data Source:

SY 2020–21 Assessment Data Groups—Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	10,009	8,331	7,014
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,354	353	287
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	128	47	25

*HS = high school; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,069	10,038	N/A	50.50%	20.61%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	1,395	8,376	N/A	50.50%	16.65%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	1,611	7,098	N/A	50.50%	22.70%	Did not meet target	N/A

*FFY = federal fiscal year; SPP = State Performance Plan; APR = Annual Performance Report; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs; HS = high school; N/A = not applicable.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,482	10,009	N/A	48.30%	14.81%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	400	8,331	N/A	48.30%	4.80%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	312	7,014	N/A	48.30%	4.45%	Did not meet target	N/A

* FFY = federal fiscal year; SPP = State Performance Plan; APR = Annual Performance Report; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs; HS = high school; N/A = not applicable.

Regulatory Information

The State Educational Agency (SEA) [or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, Local Educational Agency (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 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.160(f)].

Public Reporting Information

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

Report Card—Washington State Report Card (ospi.k12.wa.us)

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard/ViewSchoolOrDistrict/103300>

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

In collaboration with the U.S. Department of Education (Department), the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) agreed to postpone administration of the spring 2021 statewide assessments of English Language Arts (ELA), math, and science until fall of 2021, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Smarter Balanced Assessments (SBAC) will be administered between September 2021 and November 2021. The Washington Access to Instruction & Measurement (WA-AIM) alternate assessment window opens in September 2021 and closes in December 2021. For more details on this test administration visit <https://www.k12.wa.us/about-ospi/press-releases/novel-coronavirus-covid-19-guidance-resources>. The ED Facts file specs will be submitted February 2022. Partner

Support Center (PSC) will load the data into the platform in March of 2022 to allow Washington state staff to address Indicator 3A–D during the clarification period.

File Spec 175 (Math Proficiency) and 178 (Reading Proficiency) were successfully loaded into *EDFacts* and populated into the platform prior to the clarification period.

Clarification was made regarding the baseline year. Changed the text from 2018–19 to FFY 2018 as required in the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response section of the platform.

3B—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B—OSEP Response

The state has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018 but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the state did not provide an explanation for the revision.

The state provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because OSEP cannot determine whether the state's end target for FFY 2025 will reflect improvement over the state's baseline data as the baseline was not accepted, as noted above.

The state provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the state has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

3B—Required Actions

With the FFY 2021 SPP/APR the state must provide an explanation for the baseline revision.

With the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the state must ensure that its FFY 2025 targets reflect improvement over the baseline.

INDICATOR 3C: PROFICIENCY FOR CHILDREN WITH IEPS (ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

Results Indicator

See [Indicator 3A Results Indicator](#) above on page 24.

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the U.S. Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), using *EDFacts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

- C. Proficiency rate percent = $[(\# \text{ of children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment})]$. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school (HS). 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 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.160(f) (i.e., a link to the website where these data are reported).

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR) must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and HS, 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

Historical Data

Subject	Group	Group name	Baseline year (FFY)	Baseline data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	56.10%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	58.30%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	33.60%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	58.40%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	48.90%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	60.50%

*FFY = federal fiscal year; HS = high school.

Targets

Subject	Group	Group name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	50.50%	57.10%	63.70%	70.30%	76.90%	83.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	50.50%	57.10%	63.70%	70.30%	76.90%	83.50%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	50.50%	57.10%	63.70%	70.30%	76.90%	83.50%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	48.30%	55.20%	62.10%	69.00%	75.90%	82.80%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	48.30%	55.20%	62.10%	69.00%	75.90%	82.80%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	48.30%	55.20%	62.10%	69.00%	75.90%	82.80%

*HS = high school; years are federal fiscal years.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 8–9 above for a detailed description.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

School Year (SY) 2020–21 Assessment Data Groups—Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	624	502	529
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	259	232	212

*HS = high school; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs.

Data Source:

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	617	500	540
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	257	220	317

*HS = high school; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards	Number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	259	624	N/A	50.50%	41.51%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	232	502	N/A	50.50%	46.22%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	212	529	N/A	50.50%	40.08%	Did not meet target	N/A

*IEP = Individualized Education Programs; FFY = federal fiscal year; HS = high school; N/A = not applicable.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards	Number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	257	617	N/A	48.30%	41.65%	Did not meet target	N/A

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards	Number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	220	500	N/A	48.30%	44.00%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	317	540	N/A	48.30%	58.70%	Met target	N/A

*IEP = Individualized Education Programs; FFY = federal fiscal year; HS = high school; N/A = not applicable.

Regulatory Information

The State Educational Agency (SEA) [or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, Local Educational Agency (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 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.160(f)].

Public Reporting Information

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

Report Card—Washington State Report Card (ospi.k12.wa.us)

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard/ViewSchoolOrDistrict/103300>

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

In collaboration with the U.S. Department of Education (Department), the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) agreed to postpone administration of the spring 2021 statewide assessments of English Language Arts (ELA), math, and science until fall of 2021, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Smarter Balanced Assessments (SBAC) will be administered between September 2021 and November 2021. The Washington Access to Instruction & Measurement (WA-AIM) alternate assessment window opens in September 2021 and closes in December 2021. For more details on this test administration visit <https://www.k12.wa.us/about-ospi/press-releases/novel-coronavirus-covid-19-guidance-resources>. The EDFacts file specs will be submitted February 2022. Partner Support Center (PSC) will load the data into the platform in March of 2022 to allow Washington state staff to address Indicator 3A–D during the clarification period.

File Spec 175 (Math Proficiency) and 178 (Reading Proficiency) were successfully loaded into EDFacts and populated into the platform prior to the clarification period. Clarification was made regarding the baseline year. Changed the text from 2018–19 to federal fiscal year (FFY) 2018 as

required in the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response section of the platform.

3C—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C—OSEP Response

The state has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018 but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the state did not provide an explanation for the revision.

The state provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, but OSEP cannot accept those targets because OSEP cannot determine whether the state's end target for FFY 2025 will reflect improvement over the state's baseline data as the baseline was not accepted, as noted above.

The state provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the state has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

3C—Required Actions

With the FFY 2021 SPP/APR the state must provide an explanation for the baseline revision.

With the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the state must ensure that its FFY 2025 targets reflect improvement over the baseline.

INDICATOR 3D: GAP IN PROFICIENCY RATES (GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

Results Indicator

See [Indicator 3A Results Indicator](#) above on page 24.

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the U.S. Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), using *EDFacts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

- D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020–2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020–2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school (HS). The proficiency rate includes all children 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 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the website where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR) must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020–2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020–2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and HS, including both children 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.

3D—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Subject	Group	Group name	Baseline year (FFY)	Baseline data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	32.30pp
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	44.10pp
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	48.00pp
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	30.70pp
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	37.20pp
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	36.30pp

*FFY = federal fiscal year; HS = high school; pp = percentage points.

Targets

Subject	Group	Group name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	28.50pp	24.70pp	20.90pp	17.10pp	13.30pp	9.50pp
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	40.30pp	36.50pp	32.70pp	28.90pp	25.10pp	21.30pp
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	44.30pp	40.50pp	36.70pp	32.90pp	29.10pp	25.30pp
Math	A <=	Grade 4	27.50pp	24.30pp	21.10pp	17.90pp	14.70pp	11.50pp
Math	B <=	Grade 8	34.00pp	30.80pp	27.60pp	24.40pp	21.20pp	18.00pp
Math	C <=	Grade HS	33.10pp	29.90pp	26.70pp	23.50pp	20.30pp	17.10pp

*HS = high school; pp = percentage points; years are federal fiscal years.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 8–9 above for a detailed description.

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2020 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

School Year (SY) 2020–21 Assessment Data Groups—Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	74,556	76,162	65,293
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	10,038	8,376	7,098
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	36,297	41,012	41,135

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	259	184	155
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,870	1,253	1,477
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	199	142	134

*HS = high school; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs.

Data Source:

SY 2020–21 Assessment Data Groups—Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	74,519	76,016	65,664
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	10,009	8,331	7,014
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	27,929	22,241	19,691
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	179	57	37
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,354	353	287
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	128	47	25

*HS = high school; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	20.61%	49.03%	N/A	28.50pp	28.42pp	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	16.65%	54.09%	N/A	40.30pp	37.44pp	Met target	N/A

Group	Group name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	22.70%	63.24%	N/A	44.30pp	40.54pp	Met target	N/A

*FFY = federal fiscal year; SPP = State Performance Plan; APR = Annual Performance Report; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs; HS = high school; pp = percentage points; N/A = not applicable.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	14.81%	37.72%	N/A	27.50pp	22.91pp	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	4.80%	29.33%	N/A	34.00pp	24.53pp	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	4.45%	30.04%	N/A	33.10pp	25.60pp	Met target	N/A

*FFY = federal fiscal year; SPP = State Performance Plan; APR = Annual Performance Report; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs; HS = high school; pp = percentage points; N/A = not applicable.

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

In collaboration with the U.S. Department of Education (Department), the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) agreed to postpone administration of the spring 2021 statewide assessments of English Language Arts (ELA), math, and science until fall of 2021, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Smarter Balanced Assessments (SBAC) will be administered between September 2021 and November 2021. The Washington Access to Instruction & Measurement (WA-AIM) alternate assessment window opens in September 2021 and closes in December 2021. For more details on this test administration visit <https://www.k12.wa.us/about-ospi/press-releases/novel-coronavirus-covid-19-guidance-resources>. The ED*Facts* file specs will be submitted February 2022. Partner Support Center (PSC) will load the data into the platform in March of 2022 to allow Washington state staff to address Indicator 3A–D during the clarification period.

File Spec 175 (Math Proficiency) and 178 (Reading Proficiency) were successfully loaded into ED*Facts* and populated into the platform prior to the clarification period. Clarification was made regarding the baseline year. Changed the text from 2018–19 to FFY 2018 as required in the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response section of the platform.

Consistent with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B Measurement Table and Instructions, the gap was calculated using the data from File Spec 175 (Math Proficiency) and 178

(Reading Proficiency). For each required grade level, the scores from Students with Disabilities subgroup were subtracted from the All Students group. This determined the baseline year's gap. Using this information and the annual increases to the targets set in Indicator 3B, stakeholders came to consensus that an annual reduction of 3.8% (Reading) and 3.2% (Math) were rigorous and achievable to apply to targets for this indicator. The data from FS 175 and 178 along with the application of the reductions to the gap target setting of Indicator 3D are provided in a table attached to Indicator 3D of this platform.

3D—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D—OSEP Response

The state has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018 and OSEP accepts that baseline.

The state provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The state provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the state has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

3D—Required Actions

OSEP notes that the state submitted verification that the attachment(s) complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 508), as amended. However, one or more of the Indicator 3D attachment(s) included in the state's FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the Department'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 4A: SUSPENSION/EXPULSION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

Results Indicator

Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the state, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs); and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the state, 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, as defined by the state, 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 United States Code (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 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (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

B-4A: 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.

Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs 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 federal fiscal year (FFY) 2020 State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR), use data from 2019–2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the state, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, states should examine the Section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a state has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019–2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported Section 618 data in 2019–2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the state then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020–2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019–2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, states must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019–2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum “n” and/or cell 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the state, 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 OSEP’s 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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
FFY 2016	2.51%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	6.50%	6.25%	2.50%	2.50%	2.25%
Data	3.33%	2.51%	0.72%	1.79%	3.19%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	3.16%	2.91%	2.66%	2.41%	2.16%	1.91%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 8–9 above for a detailed description.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (Yes / No)

YES

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

3

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the state's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
2	280	3.19%	3.16%	0.71%	Met target	No slippage

*LEAs = Local Educational Agencies; FFY = federal fiscal year.

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring [34 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §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:

For the 2019–20 data year, Washington defined a significant discrepancy 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 2020 (using 2019–20 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 0.53%.
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 2.53%.
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.

The percentage of districts in Washington identified by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (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 (2) by the total number of districts in Washington state who met the minimum "n" size requirement (280).

This information is published in the district data profile on OSPI's special education data webpage (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/special-education-data-reporting-and-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 under "Disciplinary Incidents of Students with IEPs" at <https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/special-education-data-reporting-and-collection>. 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)

The state did not identify barriers for this indicator as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic with

regard to data collection, data completeness, validity, or reliability of the data. Districts were given an extra month to complete, verify, and submit their discipline data for 2019–20. However, the pandemic did have an impact on performance for this indicator. As a result of the pandemic, school facilities were closed from mid-March 2020 through the end of the 2019–20 school year. LEAs were providing educational services remotely, which did not result in the same degree of suspensions as in-person settings.

Unrelated to the pandemic, beginning in the 2020–21 data year and moving forward, Washington will be using a new method for calculating a significant discrepancy for Indicator B-4. The new calculation will use a rate difference, which is the difference between the rate of out-of-school suspensions of more than 10 days for students with disabilities, and the rate for students without disabilities in the same LEA. A minimum “n” size of 10 total students with IEPs in the district will be applied—districts with fewer than 10 total students with IEPs in the district will not be included in the denominator of the Indicator B-4 calculation.

Rate difference = (number of students with disabilities suspended more than 10 days in LEA divided by all students with disabilities in LEA) **minus** (number of students without disabilities suspended more than 10 days in LEA divided by all students without disabilities in LEA)

A significant discrepancy is defined as a rate difference of 2.0 or more, with a minimum of two disciplinary incidents (out of school suspensions of more than 10 days) that year.

This is a new method for calculating Indicator B-4A, therefore Washington will be resetting its baseline in its FFY 2021 APR. The 2019–20 school year was not a complete year of data due to the COVID school facility closures. Therefore, after a review and discussion of the preliminary data for the new calculation through stakeholder meetings, the State Design Team (SDT) and Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) recommended using the discipline data from 2018–19 to establish the new baseline for this indicator beginning with the FFY 2021 APR submission. Since the SDT and SEAC had access to the preliminary data for this new calculation as part of the stakeholder meetings, this information factored into the target-setting process for this SPP submission. The SDT and SEAC also assisted the state in determining the new definition of significant discrepancy described in this section.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019–2020 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”, two districts exceeded the single state bar and were therefore identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2020 (using FFY 2019 data).

For both 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 in FFY 2020, 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. Both of the identified districts were required to complete a self-review of discipline, and other related policies, procedures, and practices.

The identified districts used the self-review process embedded in the IDEA federal fund application. The districts were required to report on their review of policies procedures, and practices; identify potential root causes for the significant discrepancy; and describe their plan for addressing the discrepancy in the upcoming school year. If revisions were made to the district’s policies, procedures, or practices as a result of this review, the district was 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.

Data collections conducted through the general supervisory system were analyzed to verify district-reported results. The state also completed a student record review from the discrepant cells in designated districts. The state did not identify any noncompliance with IDEA Part B requirements as a result of the review.

The state **did not** identify noncompliance with IDEA Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 C.F.R. §300.170(b).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

4A—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A—OSEP Response

The state provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

4A—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 4B: SUSPENSION/EXPULSION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

Compliance Indicator

Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the state, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs); and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the state, 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, as defined by the state, 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 United States Code (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 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (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 = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of LEAs that meet the state-established "n" and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the state, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the state, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards}}{\text{\# of LEAs in the state that meet the state-established "n" and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups}} \right] \times 100$.

Include state's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs totally 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 federal fiscal year (FFY) 2020 State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR), use data from 2019–2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the state, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, states should examine the Section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a state has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019–2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported Section 618 data in 2019–2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the state then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020–2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019–2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, states must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019–2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the state-established "n" and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the state, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the state, 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 OSEP's 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2016	1.66%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.37%	1.66%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (Yes / No)

YES

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

24

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the state's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status
15	0	259	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target

*LEAs = Local Educational Agencies; FFY = federal fiscal year.

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

For the 2019–20 data year, Washington defined a significant discrepancy in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for students with IEPs by race/ethnicity through the following steps:

1. Calculate the state-level suspension/expulsion rate for students with IEPs for FFY 2020 (using 2019–20 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 0.53%.
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 2.53%.
3. Calculate each district's rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for each race/ethnicity group (total number of students with IEPs who were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days for each race/ethnicity divided by the total number of students with IEPs for that race/ethnicity in the district). This process will result in each district's rate of suspensions/expulsions for students with IEPs for each race/ethnicity group.
4. The rate of suspensions/expulsions of students with IEPs for each race/ethnicity group in the district is compared to the Single State Bar.
5. Districts that are above the Single State Bar for any race/ethnicity group are identified as having a significant discrepancy.
6. Districts with fewer than 30 total students with IEPs in the identified race/ethnicity group are not included in the analysis. A total of 24 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.

This information is published in the district data profile on the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) 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 <https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/special-education-data-reporting-and-collection>. 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)

The state did not identify barriers for this indicator as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic with

regard to data collection, data completeness, validity, or reliability of the data. Districts were given an extra month to complete, verify, and submit their discipline data for 2019–20. However, the pandemic did have an impact on performance for this indicator. As a result of the pandemic, school facilities were closed from mid-March 2020 through the end of the 2019–20 school year. LEAs were providing educational services remotely, which did not result in the same degree of suspensions as in-person settings.

Unrelated to the pandemic, beginning in the 2020–21 data year and moving forward, Washington will be using a new method for calculating a significant discrepancy for Indicator B-4B. The new calculation will use a rate difference, which is the difference between the rate of out-of-school suspensions of more than 10 days for students with disabilities by race/ethnicity, and the rate for students without disabilities by race/ethnicity in the same LEA. A minimum “n” size of 10 total students with IEPs in the district will be applied—LEAs with fewer than 10 total students with IEPs from an identified race/ethnicity group in the LEA will not be included in the denominator of the Indicator B-4B calculation.

Rate difference = (number of students with disabilities from a race/ethnicity group suspended more than 10 days in LEA divided by all students with disabilities from that race/ethnicity group in LEA) **minus** (number of students without disabilities from that race/ethnicity group suspended more than 10 days in LEA divided by all students from that race/ethnicity group without disabilities in LEA).

A significant discrepancy is defined as a rate difference of 2.0 or more for any of the seven race/ethnicity groups, with a minimum of two disciplinary incidents (out of school suspensions of more than 10 days) for the identified race/ethnicity group that year.

The Disproportionality and Significant Discrepancy Focus Group [part of the State Design Team (SDT)] reviewed information and data related to the proposed change in calculation for this indicator and assisted the state in determining the new definition of significant discrepancy described in this section.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019–2020 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”, 15 districts exceeded the single state bar and were therefore identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2020 (using FFY 2019 data).

For all 15 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 in FFY 2020, 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 15 districts were required to

complete a self-review of discipline, and other related policies, procedures, and practices.

The identified districts used the self-review process embedded in the IDEA federal fund application. The districts were required to report on their review of policies procedures, and practices; identify potential root causes for the significant discrepancy; and describe their plan for addressing the discrepancy in the upcoming school year. If revisions were made to the district's policies, procedures, or practices as a result of this review, the district was 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.

Data collections conducted through the general supervisory system were analyzed to verify district-reported results. The state also completed a student record review from the discrepant cells in designated districts. The state did not identify any noncompliance with IDEA Part B requirements as a result of the review.

The state DID NOT identify noncompliance with IDEA Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.170(b).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

4B—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B—OSEP Response

None

4B—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 5: EDUCATION ENVIRONMENTS (CHILDREN FIVE (KINDERGARTEN)–21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

Results Indicator

Percent of children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged six 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 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1416(a)(3)(A)]

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the U.S. Department of Education (Department) under Section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged six through 21 served inside the regular class 80\% or more of the day)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged six through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged six through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40\% of the day)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged six through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged six through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged six through 21 with IEPs)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

Instructions

Sampling from the state's Section 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

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	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2005	Target >=	52.05%	52.25%	52.35%	55.00%	57.00%
A	49.05%	Data	54.35%	55.21%	56.01%	56.63%	57.73%
B	2005	Target <=	13.26%	13.16%	13.06%	12.96%	12.75%
B	14.11%	Data	13.24%	13.13%	13.13%	12.83%	12.43%
C	2005	Target <=	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
C	1.09%	Data	0.83%	0.86%	0.86%	0.89%	0.95%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	60.00%	61.70%	63.40%	65.10%	66.80%	68.50%
Target B <=	12.20%	12.13%	12.06%	11.99%	11.92%	11.85%
Target C <=	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 8–9 above for a detailed description.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020–21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data Group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21	137,052
SY 2020–21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data Group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	82,211
SY 2020–21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data Group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16,653
SY 2020–21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data Group 74)	07/07/2021	C1. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	983
SY 2020–21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data Group 74)	07/07/2021	C2. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	207
SY 2020–21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data Group 74)	07/07/2021	C3. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	157

*SY = school year; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs.

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 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	82,211	137,052	57.73%	60.00%	59.99%	Did not meet target	No slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16,653	137,052	12.43%	12.20%	12.15%	Met target	No slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. Calculation: [c1+c2+c3]	1,347	137,052	0.95%	1.00%	0.98%	Met target	No slippage

*FFY = federal fiscal year; SPP = State Performance Plan; APR = Annual Performance Plan; IEPs = Individualized Education Plans.

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

The state did not identify barriers for this indicator as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic with

regard to data collection, data completeness, validity, or reliability of the data. However, the pandemic did have a potential impact on performance for this indicator. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) noted a decrease in enrollment in the November 1, 2020, Child Count report. In addition, at that time (November 2020), many districts were still providing a variety of instructional models, including remote, hybrid, and/or in-person instruction, so that likely had an impact on the reported LRE data. When students were receiving services at home, the home was considered the general education setting in most circumstances. OSPI provided guidance to districts, including an LRE Case Study document (<https://www.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/public/specialed/pubdocs/LRE-Case-Study.pdf>) to assist district teams in determining LRE for students in virtual and/or hybrid instructional programs.

5—Prior Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) Required Actions

None

5—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response

The state has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2005, but OSEP cannot accept that revision because the state did not transition to including 5-year-olds in Kindergarten in its FFY2005 data (EDFacts file specification FS002). The state must revise baseline using FFY2020 data.

OSEP cannot accept the state's FFYs 2020–2025 targets for this indicator because OSEP cannot determine whether the state's end targets for FFY 2025 reflect improvement over the state's baseline data, given that the state's revised baseline cannot be accepted, as noted above. The state must ensure its FFY 2025 targets reflect improvement.

5—Required Actions

In its FFY 2021 State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR), the state must revise its baseline, using FFY 2020 data and provide the required targets for FFY 2020 through FFY 2025, and ensure its FFY 2025 targets reflects improvement over baseline.

INDICATOR 6: PRESCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

Results Indicator

Percent of children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) aged three, four, and five years who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

[20 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1416(a)(3)(A)]

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the U.S. Department of Education (Department) under Section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in *EDFacts* file specification FS089.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children ages three, four, and five years with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program}}{\text{total \# of children ages three, four, and five years with IEPs}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children ages three, four, and five years with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility}}{\text{total \# of children ages three, four, and five years with IEPs}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children ages three, four, and five years with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home}}{\text{total \# of children ages three, four, and five years with IEPs}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling from the state's Section 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages three, four, and five years, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: states are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children

receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the state chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages three, four, and five years, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, states are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR).

For Indicator 6C: states may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75–85%). 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 IDEA Section 618, explain.

6—Indicator Data

Historical Data—6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	28.75%	28.90%	29.05%	29.20%	29.20%
A	Data	24.88%	24.81%	23.80%	25.29%	26.39%
B	Target <=	38.40%	38.20%	38.00%	37.80%	37.80%
B	Data	40.51%	40.96%	41.85%	40.71%	39.03%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 8–9 above for a detailed description.

Targets

Please select if the state wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e., separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages three, four, and five years.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the state wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline year (FFY)	Baseline data
A	2020	21.04%
B	2020	53.50%
C	2020	0.53%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Inclusive Targets—6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	21.04%	23.24%	25.44%	27.64%	29.84%	32.04%
Target B <=	53.50%	51.40%	49.30%	47.20%	45.10%	43.00%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Inclusive Targets—6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	1.00%	0.90%	0.80%	0.70%	0.60%	0.50%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

School Year (SY) 2020–21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data Group 613)

Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5—Total
Total number of children with IEPs	3,254	5,554	1,342	10,150
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	579	1,231	326	2,136
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,803	2,755	579	5,137
b2. Number of children attending separate school	94	164	30	288
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	2	3	0	5
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	21	23	10	54

*IEPs = Individualized Education Plans.

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 2020 SPP/APR Data—Aged Three through Five

Preschool environments	Number of children with IEPs aged three through five served	Total number of children with IEPs aged three through five	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the	2,136	10,150	26.39%	21.04%	21.04%	N/A	N/A

Preschool environments	Number of children with IEPs aged three through five served	Total number of children with IEPs aged three through five	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
regular early childhood program							
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	5,430	10,150	39.03%	53.50%	53.50%	N/A	N/A
C. Home	54	10,150	N/A	1.00%	0.53%	N/A	N/A

*FFY = federal fiscal year; SPP = State Performance Plan; APR = Annual Performance Plan; IEPs = Individualized Education Plans; N/A = not applicable.

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

The change in baseline for this indicator was due to the federal change in the data captured in the data source, which now excludes children aged five years and in kindergarten.

The state did not identify barriers for this indicator as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic with regard to data collection, data completeness, validity, or reliability of the data. However, the pandemic did have a potential impact on performance for this indicator. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) noted a decrease in enrollment in the November 1, 2020, Child Count report. In addition, at that time (November 2020), many districts were still providing a variety of instructional models, including remote, hybrid, and/or in-person instruction, so that likely had an impact on the reported LRE data. When students were receiving services at home, the home was considered the general education setting in most circumstances. OSPI provided guidance to districts, including an LRE Case Study document (<https://www.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/public/specialed/pubdocs/LRE-Case-Study.pdf>) to assist district teams in determining LRE for students in virtual and/or hybrid instructional programs.

Upon review of the Indicator 6C data, stakeholders recommended maintaining a target of less than 1.0% for this indicator. However, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) response indicated that the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2025 target should show a decrease from the baseline data. Therefore, the targets have been revised to start at 1.0% to honor stakeholder input and decrease over time to show improvement over the baseline by FFY 2025.

6—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6—OSEP Response

The state has revised baseline for 6A and 6B and established the baseline for 6C of this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision. The state provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 7: PRESCHOOL OUTCOMES

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

Results Indicator

Percent of preschool children aged three through five with Individualized Education Programs (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 United States Code (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 = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of preschool children who did not improve functioning)}}{\text{(\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers)}}{\text{(\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it)}}{\text{(\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers)}}{\text{(\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers)}}{\text{(\# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

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 six 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 six 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.

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 federal fiscal year (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 Center) 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 six or seven 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

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2020	Target >=	83.30%	83.40%	83.50%	83.60%	83.70%
A1	87.01%	Data	90.17%	91.19%	90.79%	91.00%	89.59%
A2	2020	Target >=	50.60%	50.80%	51.00%	51.20%	51.20%
A2	38.14%	Data	47.60%	48.91%	47.12%	47.89%	44.43%
B1	2020	Target >=	82.30%	82.40%	82.50%	82.60%	82.70%
B1	86.01%	Data	88.78%	89.93%	88.46%	88.97%	88.77%
B2	2020	Target >=	51.60%	51.80%	52.00%	52.20%	52.20%
B2	37.56%	Data	50.51%	49.67%	48.26%	48.74%	44.77%
C1	2020	Target >=	81.30%	81.40%	81.50%	81.60%	81.70%
C1	86.65%	Data	89.56%	91.20%	89.61%	89.50%	88.91%
C2	2020	Target >=	65.60%	65.80%	66.00%	66.20%	66.20%
C2	48.06%	Data	62.79%	62.81%	61.72%	60.43%	54.74%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	87.00%	87.40%	87.90%	88.30%	88.70%	89.20%
Target A2 >=	38.10%	39.30%	40.40%	41.60%	42.70%	43.90%
Target B1 >=	86.00%	86.50%	87.00%	87.50%	88.00%	88.50%
Target B2 >=	37.56%	38.80%	40.10%	41.30%	42.50%	43.80%
Target C1 >=	86.65%	87.10%	87.50%	87.80%	88.20%	88.60%
Target C2 >=	48.06%	49.30%	50.40%	51.60%	52.70%	53.90%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 8–9 above for a detailed description.

FFY 2020 State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR) Data

Number of preschool children aged three through five with IEPs assessed

4,247

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	67	1.58%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	444	10.45%

Outcome A progress category	Number of children	Percentage of children
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,116	49.82%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,307	30.77%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	313	7.37%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 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 six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	3,423	3,934	89.59%	87.00%	87.01%	N/A	N/A
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,620	4,247	44.43%	38.10%	38.14%	N/A	N/A

*N/A = not applicable.

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	80	1.88%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	478	11.26%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,094	49.31%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,337	31.48%

Outcome B progress category	Number of children	Percentage of children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	258	6.07%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 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 six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	3,431	3,989	88.77%	86.00%	86.01%	N/A	N/A
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,595	4,247	44.77%	37.56%	37.56%	N/A	N/A

*N/A = not applicable.

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	80	1.88%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	423	9.96%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,703	40.10%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,563	36.80%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	478	11.26%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age	3,266	3,769	88.91%	86.65%	86.65%	N/A	N/A

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$</i>							
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$</i>	2,041	4,247	54.74%	48.06%	48.06%	N/A	N/A

*N/A = not applicable.

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 ECO Center COS Form 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 ECO Center. The state continues to use the instrument (7-point scale) and training modules developed jointly by the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) and the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA Center).

The 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 (<https://ectacenter.org/outcomes.asp>).

Beginning with the 2020–21 school year Washington added all the elements of the COS to the statewide student information system. Any student with an IEP in grade level preschool (PreK) was required to submit COS data to this system. This was the first time to receive this detailed information as it included all corresponding demographic data for each of these students, in addition to the COS data. The validations in place in Washington's student information system insured all data elements were received and met the requirements associated with each element (as outlined in the ECTA document "Calculating OSEP [Office of Special Education Programs] Categories from COS Responses"). By adding these elements to Washington's statewide student information system, the manual checking by the State Part B Data Manager of missing elements or duplicate students has been eliminated, saving time, and ensuring a higher quality of data collected. With the implementation of these elements to the statewide student information system, stakeholders have recommended using the 2020–21 as a new baseline for these indicators.

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

With the implementation of new elements to the statewide student information system described above, stakeholders [including the State Design Team (SDT) and Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)] have recommended using 2020–21 as a new baseline for these indicators.

In spring 2020, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (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>).

The state did not identify barriers for this indicator as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic with regard to data collection, data completeness, validity, or reliability of the data. However, the pandemic did have a potential impact on performance for this indicator. During the 2020–21 school year, many districts were providing a variety of instructional models, including remote, hybrid, and/or in-person instruction, which impacted a child's ability to access their least restrictive environment, and structured activities with their nondisabled peers. OSPI anticipates that the impacts of COVID will be reflected in the overall development of all children, with and without disabilities and therefore do not anticipate documented global delay for children with disabilities only.

In response to community partner inquiries relating to strategies for completing the COS when teams could not meet in person, the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Coordination Team convened and drafted guidance to support local school districts and family partners. Specific areas of focus included strategies to gather and review entry and exit level data, as well as engagement strategies necessary when interacting with families and children in a virtual setting. The Washington ECSE Coordination Team has reviewed and enhanced their COS training materials with the support of ECTA Technical Assistance leads to be responsive to the needs of their regional partners. The ECSE Coordination Team has also encouraged their district partners to utilize the COS entry rating as a baseline measure for student performance, and to elevate the COS form as a progress monitoring tool to be paired with the child's annual IEP review, to ensure greater validity of COS exit ratings.

7—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7—OSEP Response

The state has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision. The state provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 8: PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Free, appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (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 United States Code (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.*

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 State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR).

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data. States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The state must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the state's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the state.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom 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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, states must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the state's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their Office of Special Education Programs (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

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 8–9 above for a detailed description.

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2011	21.10%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	21.70%	21.90%	22.10%	22.30%	22.50%
Data	27.32%	28.68%	28.03%	30.27%	32.34%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	33.10%	33.80%	34.60%	35.30%	36.00%	36.80%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY 2020 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 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
519	1,236	32.34%	33.10%	41.99%	Met target	No slippage

*FFY = federal fiscal year; SPP = State Performance Plan; APR = Annual Performance Plan.

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.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

7,566

Percentage of respondent parents

16.34%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response rate	16.42%	16.34%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Current strategies for increasing response rates include providing the survey in the 12 most commonly spoken languages in Washington, piloting of an online version of the survey tool (in addition to the paper copy), additional follow-up reminders to parents to complete the survey, working with the local school district to provide advance notice to parents that the survey is coming, and collection of feedback from parents who have completed the survey.

Washington has convened a Parent Engagement Focus Group, part of the State Design Team (SDT), which will engage in ongoing work related to Indicator B-8. The Parent Engagement Focus Group consists of 51 participants, including three individuals with disabilities and 30 parents/family

members of individuals with disabilities. The group also includes representatives from all seven federal race/ethnicity groups, tribal partners, advocates, general and special education teachers and administrators, state agency staff, and professional and community organizations. The group's work is focused on the development of the new survey tool, as well as methods for implementing the new survey process. This will include analyzing survey data and response rates and identifying methods for increasing response rates particularly for underrepresented groups.

Considerations for the new tool have included discussions on methods for increasing response rate, such as decreasing the number of survey questions, ensuring clarity of the questions being asked, increasing the languages in which the survey is available, the use of incentives, accessibility of the tool, implementing multiple submission options, and more.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

The data for all cohort districts were reviewed and disaggregated by geographical location [regional review by Educational Service District (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, survey language, grade level, least restrictive environment (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 for the FFY 2020 survey data suggest that the results of the survey are statistically representative of the target population (+/- 3.0%) across all areas of race/ethnicity, survey language, grade level, LRE, and 12 of the 14 disability categories. For the first time, the results were statistically representative for all seven race/ethnicity groups. However, 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 13% of the population surveyed but represent 18% of the respondents. Conversely, parents of students eligible under the category of specific learning disability are 29% of the population surveyed but represent 22% of the respondents. The results were found to be representative across all of the other disability categories and the other areas of analysis (i.e., race/ethnicity, survey language, grade level, LRE placement, and school type).

The state continues to conduct analyses to determine strategies for statewide technical assistance and guidance to help ensure progress and movement toward the targets for this indicator, as well as to reduce identified biases and increase responses from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities. As previously described, Washington is working with stakeholders (the Parent Engagement Focus Group) to improve both the parent survey tool and the process for implementing the parent surveys. The Parent Engagement Focus Group consists of 51 participants including three individuals with disabilities and 30 parents/family members of individuals with disabilities. The group also includes representatives from all seven federal race/ethnicity groups, tribal partners, advocates, general and special education teachers and administrators, state agency staff, and professional and community organizations. The group's work is focused on the

development of the new survey tool, as well as methods for implementing the new process. This will include analyzing survey data and identifying methods for increasing response rates particularly for underrepresented groups.

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) is also participating in a collaborative equity audit with the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) to ensure that diversity, equity, and inclusion are the foundation for our work, including the efforts of the stakeholder groups.

Include in the state's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. states should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of student, disability category, and geographic location in the state.

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, survey language, grade level, least restrictive environment (LRE) placement, disability category, and school type), and the potential of non-response bias.

The analyses for the FFY 2020 survey data suggest that the results of the survey are statistically representative of the target population (+/- 3.0%) across all areas of race/ethnicity, survey language, grade level, LRE, and 12 of the 14 disability categories. For the first time, the results were statistically representative for all seven race/ethnicity groups. However, 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 13% of the population surveyed but represent 18% of the respondents. Conversely, parents of students eligible under the category of specific learning disability are 29% of the population surveyed but represent 22% of the respondents. The results were found to be representative across all of the other disability categories as well as the other areas of analysis (i.e., race/ethnicity, survey language, grade level, LRE placement, and school type).

Since the results were representative across all areas of race/ethnicity, survey language, grade level, LRE, school type, and 12 of 14 disability categories, Washington has determined that the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, as indicated below.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (Yes / No)

YES

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Washington uses +/-3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

The survey has not changed; therefore, a survey instrument is not attached. Washington is currently working with stakeholders to develop a new parent survey tool for gathering data for this indicator, as described in [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 8–9 above. A copy of the new instrument will be submitted with the state's Annual Performance Report (APR) after the new survey tool is developed and implemented.

The state did not identify barriers for this indicator as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic with regard to data collection, data completeness, validity, or reliability of the data. However, the pandemic did have a positive impact on performance for this indicator. The current survey results represent both (a) the highest response rate, and (b) the highest percent of parents reporting that schools made efforts to partner with them, since the survey was first implemented in FFY 2005. This may have been to more families at home during the pandemic, as well as the increased communication attempts from schools.

8—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8—OSEP Response

The state provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

8—Required Actions

None

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 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1416(a)(3)(C)]

Data Source

State's analysis, based on state's child count data collected under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (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 = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of districts, that meet the state-established "n" and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification}}{\text{\# of districts in the state that meet the state-established "n" and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups}} \right] \times 100$.

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 Section 618 data for the reporting year, 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 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §§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 federal fiscal year (FFY) 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged five years who are enrolled in kindergarten and six 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) response for the previous State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

9—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2020	0.00%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY 2020 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/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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” and/or cell size	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
9	0	263	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

*FFY = federal fiscal year; N/A = not applicable.

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 the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (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 or greater for three 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 2020 were the Total Enrollment Report submitted by every district in the state in October 2020, and the November 2020 Federal Special Education Child Count and Least Restrictive Environment (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 nine districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation under Indicator 9. A total of 21 districts were excluded from the calculation due to not meeting the minimum “n” size requirement.

The state analyzed the nine districts identified through the FFY 2020 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 Local Educational Agency (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 nine identified districts were in compliance with child find, eligibility, and evaluation requirements. In these nine 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)

The state did not identify barriers for this indicator as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic with regard to data collection, data completeness, validity, reliability of the data, or performance. Revised baseline year to FFY 2020 based on OSEP's response to this indicator.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

9—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9—OSEP Response

The state has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

9—Required Actions

None

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 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1416(a)(3)(C)]

Data Source

State's analysis, based on state's child count data collected under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (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 = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of districts, that meet the state-established "n" and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification}}{\text{\# of districts in the state that meet the state-established "n" and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups}} \right] \times 100$.

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 Section 618 data for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2020, 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 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §§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 specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020

reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged six through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a state has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the state must include these data and report on whether the state determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

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 specific disability categories 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) response for the previous State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

10—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2020	0.00%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY 2020 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/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the state's minimum “n” and/or cell size	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
52	0	252	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

*FFY = federal fiscal year; N/A = not applicable.

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 the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (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 or greater for three 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 2020 were the Total Enrollment Report submitted by every district in the state in October 2020, and the November 2020 Federal Special Education Child Count and Least Restrictive Environment (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 52 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 52 districts identified through the FFY 2020 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 Local Educational Agency (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 52 identified districts were in compliance with child find, eligibility, and evaluation requirements. In these 52 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)

The state did not identify barriers for this indicator as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic with regard to data collection, data completeness, validity, reliability of the data, or performance.

Revised baseline year to FFY 2020 based on OSEP's response to this indicator.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

10—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10—OSEP Response

The state has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

10—Required Actions

None

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 United States Code (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 Local Educational Agencies (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 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §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 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) response for the previous State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Review (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 federal fiscal year (FFY) 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

11—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2005	98.00%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.27%	99.27%	99.30%	99.36%	99.37%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY 2020 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 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
19,629	19,575	99.37%	100%	99.72%	Did not meet target	No slippage

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

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

54

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.

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 54 children whose evaluations were not completed on time or under federal exception,

- 59.3% (32) were late due to district scheduling and/or staffing issues with no agreement to extend;
- 24.1% (13) were late due to other issues not specified by the district;
- 13.0% (7) agreement to extend did not meet requirements; and
- 3.7% (2) were due to data/tracking errors.

With regard to the range of days for the 54 students reported above, a total of 53.7% (29) were delayed 15 school days or less and 46.3% (25) 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:

- Thirty-five school days after the date written consent for an evaluation has been provided to the school district by the parent; or*
- 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*
- 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.*
- Exception. The thirty-five-school-day time frame for evaluation does not apply if:*
 - The parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or*
 - 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 through the 2020–21 school year: 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 2020. All districts continue to report evaluation and eligibility data on all children referred to Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B for initial eligibility determination but at the student level using the statewide student database. District staff review and verify the student record level data submitted for the reporting time period. This indicator is then calculated using the student level data verified by district staff to determine the statewide percentage of on-time initial evaluations.

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

The state did not identify barriers for this indicator as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic with regard to data collection, data completeness, validity, reliability of the data, or performance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of noncompliance identified	Findings of noncompliance verified as corrected within one year	Findings of noncompliance subsequently corrected	Findings not yet verified as corrected
29	29	0	0

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY 2019 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 the Office of Superintendent of Public

Instruction (OSPI) through the IDEA Compliance Package.

In order to verify that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of C.F.R. §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 and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. This review verified 100% compliance; all 29 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §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 29 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. Regional ESD representatives reviewed data to verify that the noncompliance was corrected. All 29 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.

11—Prior FFY 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.

11—OSEP Response

None

11—Required Actions

Because the state reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the state must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the state must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the state did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

INDICATOR 12: EARLY CHILDHOOD TRANSITION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition.

Compliance Indicator

Percent of children referred by IDEA Part C prior to age three years, who are found eligible for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B, and who have an Individualized Education Program (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

[20 United States Code (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 IDEA 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 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under IDEA 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 C.F.R. §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 Local Educational Agencies (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%.

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 C.F.R. §303.211 or a similar state option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) response for the previous State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (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 federal fiscal year (FFY) 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

12—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2005	83.00%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.65%	98.65%	98.31%	97.53%	97.93%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in IDEA Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,462
b. Number of those referred determined to be not eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	415

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,449
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 C.F.R. §300.301(d) applied.	541
e. Number of children who were referred to IDEA Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	18
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 C.F.R. §303.211 or a similar state option.	0

*FFY = federal fiscal year; SPP = State Performance Plan; APR = Annual Performance Plan; IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; IEP = Individualized Education Plan; C.F.C. = Code of Federal Regulations.

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by IDEA Part C prior to age three who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,449	2,488	97.93%	100%	98.43%	Did not meet target	No slippage

*FFY = federal fiscal year; IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; IEP = Individualized Education Plan.

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

39

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.

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 39 children whose evaluations were not completed on time or under federal exception:

- 41.0% (16) were due to the transition meeting not occurring at least 90 days prior to the student's third birthday;
- 35.9% (14) were due to the family and district agreeing to extend the timeline; and
- 23.1% (9) were because the student was referred late to IDEA Part B.

With regard to the range of days for the 39 students reported above, 100% were completed 30 or more calendar days beyond the child's third birthday. None of the students were in the ranges of 1–15 calendar days or 16–29 calendar days beyond the 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.

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 2020. All districts continue to report evaluation and eligibility data on all children referred to IDEA Part B for initial eligibility determination but at the student level using the statewide student database. District staff review and verify the student record level data submitted for the reporting time period. This indicator is then calculated using the student level data verified by district staff to determine the statewide percentage of on-time initial evaluations.

In spring 2020, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (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 IDEA 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 through the 2020–21 school year: 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 IDEA Part C to Part B transition process. A total of 489 transitions were not completed on time per this additional state exception.

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

The state did not identify barriers for this indicator as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic with regard to data collection, data completeness, validity, reliability of the data, or performance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of noncompliance identified	Findings of noncompliance verified as corrected within one year	Findings of noncompliance subsequently corrected	Findings not yet verified as corrected
25	25	0	0

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY 2019 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 C.F.R. §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 and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. This review verified 100% compliance; all 25 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §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 25 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. Regional ESD representatives reviewed data to verify that the noncompliance was corrected. All 25 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.

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2019 for Indicator 12 was corrected within one year of identification.

12—Prior FFY 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.

12—OSEP Response

None

12—Required Actions

Because the state reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the state must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the state must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the state did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

INDICATOR 13: SECONDARY TRANSITION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition.

Compliance Indicator

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (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 service 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

[20 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1416(a)(3)(B)]

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age-appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition service needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority)}}{\text{(\# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)}} \right] \times 100$.

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 State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (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 Local Educational Agencies (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 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) 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 federal fiscal year (FFY) 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

13—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2009	83.70%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	93.94%	95.22%	95.81%	96.99%	97.47%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY 2020 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 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
1,072	1,082	97.47%	100%	99.08%	Did not meet target	No slippage

*FFY = federal fiscal year; SPP = State Performance Plan; APR = Annual Performance Plan; IEPs =

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/virtual 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)

The state did not identify barriers for this indicator as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic with regard to data collection, data completeness, validity, reliability of the data, or performance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of noncompliance identified	Findings of noncompliance verified as corrected within one year	Findings of noncompliance subsequently corrected	Findings not yet verified as corrected
14	14	0	0

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY 2019 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 97.47% compliance in FFY 2019. Fourteen districts were determined to be noncompliant with the requirements of 34 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §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 the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), was completed. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, observations, etc. This review verified 100% compliance; the 14 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.320(b) and 300.321(b).

Describe how the state verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The 14 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 14 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, observations, etc. All 14 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 2019, 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 2019 for Indicator 13 was corrected within one year of identification.

13—Prior FFY 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.

13—OSEP Response

None

13—Required Actions

Because the state reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the state must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the state must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the state did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

INDICATOR 14: POST-SCHOOL OUTCOMES

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition.

Results Indicator

Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. 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 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1416(a)(3)(B)]

Data Source

State-selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

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.

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019–2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019–2020 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”:

- Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2015 State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (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 of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, the Office of Special Education Programs (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 one 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

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

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); or
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.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The state must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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 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. states should consider categories such as race/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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents 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 must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the state's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

14—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2013	Target >=	25.80%	25.90%	26.00%	26.10%	26.20%
A	23.74%	Data	22.13%	21.79%	21.31%	20.45%	19.50%
B	2013	Target >=	49.35%	49.55%	49.75%	49.95%	52.21%
B	52.11%	Data	55.56%	57.13%	56.08%	56.64%	52.95%
C	2013	Target >=	67.23%	67.33%	67.43%	67.53%	70.00%
C	65.13%	Data	70.46%	72.21%	72.19%	74.68%	72.04%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	19.75%	20.50%	21.40%	22.40%	23.40%	24.40%
Target B >=	54.00%	55.40%	57.40%	59.40%	61.40%	63.30%
Target C >=	73.00%	74.00%	75.50%	77.50%	80.00%	83.00%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 8–9 above for a detailed description.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	9,173
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	7,170
Response rate	78.16%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,200
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1,948

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)	333
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).	1,533

*IEPs = Individualized Education Programs.

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 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education. Calculation: (1)	1,200	7,170	19.50%	19.75%	16.74%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. Calculation: (1+2)	3,148	7,170	52.95%	54.00%	43.91%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment. Calculation: (1+2+3+4)	5,014	7,170	72.04%	73.00%	69.93%	Did not meet target	Slippage

*IEP = Individualized Education Plan; FFY = federal fiscal year.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	In part due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on K-12 schools, postsecondary education, employment, and community beginning in Washington state in March 2020. School facilities, including institutions of higher education, closed across the state, moved to virtual instruction. Transition programs struggled to find opportunities during the quarantine, to provide appropriate transition services for some students with disabilities; Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams are considering the need for recovery/compensatory services. Additionally, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) has identified that some students with disabilities were

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>not receiving information on post-secondary education from school counselors, as part of their High School and Beyond Plans (HSBPs); recent changes in state law has addressed this concern.</p> <p>Although there is not rigorous research to draw correlation between the effects of the pandemic on Washington state's post-school outcomes, statewide there appears to be a negative impact on rates of higher education. Overall engagement is 69.9%, a decrease of 2.2 percentage points from federal fiscal year (FFY) 2019. This is the lowest rate of engagement since FFY 2015.</p> <p>Despite concerns about the impact the pandemic might have on the survey response rate, statewide there was a small increase in the percentage of former students who were contacted and responded to the survey. FFY 2020's response rate is 78.2, up by 1.1 percentage points from FFY 2019. This is the highest response rate in Washington state since FFY 2017. In conversations with representatives from other states, this does not appear to be a nationwide trend. One possible reason for the increase is that people were more likely to be home to answer calls due to the pandemic. Credit should be given to the dedicated teachers and staff members who made the survey calls.</p>
B	<p>In part due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on K–12 schools, postsecondary education, employment, and community beginning in Washington state in March 2020. School facilities closed across the state, moving to virtual instruction. Businesses, particularly those in the service industry, moved to online services or closed (temporarily or permanently). Transition programs struggled to find opportunities during the quarantine, to provide appropriate transition services for some students with disabilities; IEP teams are considering the need for recovery/compensatory services.</p> <p>Although there is not rigorous research to draw correlation between the effects of the pandemic on Washington state's post-school outcomes, statewide there appears to be a negative impact on rates of Competitive Employment and Higher Education, and a positive impact on the rate of Other Employment. Overall engagement is 69.9%, a decrease of 2.2 percentage points from FFY 2019. This is the lowest rate of engagement since FFY 2015.</p> <p>Despite concerns about the impact the pandemic might have on the survey response rate, statewide there was a small increase in the percentage of former students who were contacted and responded to the survey. FFY 2020's response rate is 78.2, up by 1.1 percentage points from FFY 2019. This is the highest response rate in Washington state since FFY 2017. In conversations with representatives from other states, this does not appear to be a nationwide trend. One possible reason for the increase is that people were more likely to be home to answer calls due to the pandemic. Credit should be given to the dedicated teachers and staff members who made the survey calls.</p>
C	<p>In part due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on K–12 schools, postsecondary education, employment, and community beginning in Washington state in March 2020. School facilities closed across the state, moving to virtual instruction. Businesses, particularly those in the service industry, moved to online services or closed (temporarily or permanently). Transition programs struggled to find opportunities during the quarantine, to provide appropriate transition services for some students with disabilities; IEP teams are considering the need for recovery/compensatory services.</p> <p>Although there is not rigorous research to draw correlation between the effects of the pandemic on Washington state's post-school outcomes, statewide there appears to be a negative impact on rates of Competitive Employment and Higher Education, and a positive impact on the rate of Other Employment. Overall engagement is 69.9%, a decrease of 2.2 percentage points from FFY 2019. This is the lowest rate of engagement since FFY 2015.</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	Despite concerns about the impact the pandemic might have on the survey response rate, statewide there was a small increase in the percentage of former students who were contacted and responded to the survey. FFY 2020's response rate is 78.2, up by 1.1 percentage points from FFY 2019. This is the highest response rate in Washington state since FFY 2017. In conversations with representatives from other states, this does not appear to be a nationwide trend. One possible reason for the increase is that people were more likely to be home to answer calls due to the pandemic. Credit should be given to the dedicated teachers and staff members who made the survey calls.

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.

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response rate	77.10%	78.16%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Continued analyses of the response rate data are completed by OSPI and the Center for Change in Transition Services (CCTS) for each data collection in order to identify strategies to increase response rates.

There were 125 eligible leavers that were not contacted by school district personnel for the FFY 2020 survey. Surveys for these youth were never started, and they are not included in the total count of non-respondents or as part of the Indicator B-14 calculation. These youth were typically enrolled in high school reengagement programs or in school districts without active users in the Transition Systemic Framework 2.0 (TSF2) data collection platform. CCTS is working with school districts to reduce the number of students who are not contacted for the 2022 survey.

CCTS is making additional improvements to the TSF2 data collection platform and 2022 training materials in hopes that representativeness will continue to increase among the most difficult to reach students.

In addition, Washington has convened a Secondary Transition Focus Group, part of the State Design Team (SDT). The Secondary Transition Focus Group consists of 47 participants including six individuals with disabilities and 16 parents/family members of individuals with disabilities. The group also includes tribal partners, advocates, general and special education teachers and administrators, state agency staff, and professional and diverse community-based organizations. The group will assist OSPI and CCTS in analyzing response rate data and identifying methods for increasing response rates.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section 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 2019–2020 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 leavers using informal student exit survey information and student records. Surveys were conducted between June 1, 2021, and November 1, 2021. The majority of districts recorded at least three attempts to contact each of their leavers during this timeframe and during different times of the day and week. Staff conducting the calls reported any reason for being unable to conduct the survey with each former student or their designated family member (e.g., parent or grandparent). All survey data are recorded online in the TSF2.

The overall response rate continues to be high with 78.2% for the 2019–2020 leavers, exceeding the target of 70%.

Non-Respondents

Although post-school outcome data could not be collected for the 1,878 non-respondents, the demographic information on record indicates that the majority of these youth are categorized as white (49.5%), male (64.3%), with a specific learning disability (48.9%) or other health impairment (26.0%). For non-respondents, the dropout rate is 27.3% (for respondents, 12.0%).

The survey response data is not an indicator of outcomes, as districts have various practices for who makes the survey phone calls and when they start. Former students are contacted at different dates and times throughout a five-month period.

Representativeness

After the census was conducted, a Response Calculator from the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) was used to measure the representativeness of the respondent group. Calculations were made on the characteristics of disability type, race/ethnicity, gender, English language proficiency, 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 2019–20.

According to the NTACT:C Response Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of $\pm 3\%$ 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 $\pm 3\%$ interval. The NTACT:C Response Calculator includes eight categories of respondents for measuring representativeness: Specific Learning Disability, Emotional Behavioral Disability, Intellectual Disability, All Other Disabilities, Female, Non-white, English Learner, and Drop-out. Washington data were representative of 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 (-4.10%), as shown below.

Target Leaver Difference

- Specific Learning Disability = -0.55%
- Emotional Behavioral Disability = -0.59%
- Intellectual Disability = 0.45%
- All Other Disabilities = 0.69%
- Female = 0.03%
- Non-white Race/Ethnicity = -0.72%
- English Learner = 0.18%
- Drop-out = -4.10%*

Note: positive difference indicates overrepresentation, negative difference indicates underrepresentation. A difference of greater than +/-3% is indicated with an asterisk.

Selection Bias

Post-school outcome data collection continues to show representativeness in areas of disability, gender, and ethnicity. There was a slight increase in representativeness among students who dropped out from 2018–19 (-5.21%) to 2019–20 (-4.10%). These youth continue to be underrepresented in the current response group.

The reasons for the increase in representativeness among students who drop out from the previous year may be due to improved training and user permissions in the data collection platform, or because more people were home to answer phone calls throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. CCTS is making additional improvements to the TSF2 data collection platform and 2022 training materials in hopes that representativeness will continue to increase among the most difficult to reach students.

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.

Post-school outcome data collection continues to show representativeness in areas of disability, gender, and ethnicity. There was a slight increase in representativeness among students who dropped out from 2018–19 (-5.21%) to 2019–20 (-4.10%). These youth continue to be underrepresented in the current response group.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (Yes / No)

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.

The CCTS website (<https://www.seattleu.edu/ccts/>) houses various resources designed to support schools and families in the survey process. The Guidance for Students page includes answers to frequently asked questions to help prepare students for the survey phone call. This information is available in both English and Spanish.

The Guidance for Educators page includes links to all Post-School Survey training materials and

webinars. This page also links to a Google Drive folder that houses training manuals to support TSF2 users in navigating the system and understanding best practices of data collection, including increasing response rates. Recommendations include:

- Prepare students and gather contact information before they exit high school;
- Send students an email reminder several weeks before making the phone call;
- Have someone they know conduct the survey;
- Make contact attempts on different days of the week at different times; and
- Utilize community/online resources if contact information is outdated.

CCTS also sends email reminders and updates to TSF2 users throughout the survey process. These emails include a summary of the district's progress, percentage of surveys completed, response rate, important reminders, links to resources, and CCTS contact information for technical assistance. In mid-October, targeted emails are sent to districts that are less than 50% complete.

For the 2022 survey, CCTS is updating training modules to include additional information about representativeness that align with the improvements to the TSF2 platform. Best practices will be highlighted in quarterly TSF2 user meetings that will be recorded and posted to the CCTS website.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Washington uses +/-3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

The state did not identify barriers for this indicator as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic with regard to data collection, data completeness, validity, or reliability of the data. However, the pandemic did have an impact on performance for this indicator. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on K–12 schools, postsecondary education, employment, and community beginning in Washington state in March 2020. School facilities closed across the state, moving to virtual instruction. Businesses, particularly those in the service industry, moved to online services or closed (temporarily or permanently). Additionally, OSPI has identified that some students with disabilities were not receiving information on post-secondary education from school counselors, as part of their High School and Beyond Plans; recent changes in state law has addressed this concern.

Although there is not rigorous research to draw correlation between the effects of the pandemic on Washington state's post-school outcomes, statewide there appears to be a negative impact on rates of Competitive Employment and Higher Education, and a positive impact on the rate of Other Employment. Overall engagement is 69.9%, a decrease of 2.2 percentage points from FFY 2019. This is the lowest rate of engagement since FFY 2015.

Despite concerns about the impact the pandemic might have on the survey response rate, statewide there was a small increase in the percentage of former students who were contacted and responded to the survey. FFY 2020's response rate is 78.2, up by 1.1 percentage points from FFY 2019. This is the highest response rate in Washington state since FFY 2017. In conversations with representatives from other states, this does not appear to be a nationwide trend. One possible reason for the increase is that people were more likely to be home to answer calls due to the pandemic. Credit should be given to the dedicated teachers and staff members who made the survey calls.

14—Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The overall response rate continues to be high with 78.2% for the 2019–2020 leavers, exceeding the target of 70%.

Non-Respondents

Although post-school outcome data could not be collected for the 1,878 non-respondents, the demographic information on record indicates that the majority of these youth are categorized as white (49.5%), male (64.3%), with a specific learning disability (48.9%) or other health impairment (26.0%). For non-respondents, the dropout rate is 27.3% (for respondents, 12.0%).

The survey response date is not an indicator of outcomes, as districts have various practices for who makes the survey phone calls and when they start. Former students are contacted at different dates and times throughout a five-month period.

Representativeness

After the census was conducted, a Response Calculator from NTACT:C was used to measure the representativeness of the respondent group. Calculations were made on the characteristics of disability type, race/ethnicity, gender, English language proficiency, 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 2019–20.

According to the NTACT:C Response Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of $\pm 3\%$ 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 $\pm 3\%$ interval. The NTACT:C Response Calculator includes eight categories of respondents for measuring representativeness: Specific Learning Disability, Emotional Behavioral Disability, Intellectual Disability, All Other Disabilities, Female, Non-white, English Learner, and Drop-out. Washington data were representative of 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 (-4.10%), as shown below.

Target Leaver Difference

- Specific Learning Disability = -0.55%
- Emotional Behavioral Disability = -0.59%
- Intellectual Disability = 0.45%
- All Other Disabilities = 0.69%
- Female = 0.03%
- Non-white Race/Ethnicity = -0.72%
- English Learner = 0.18%
- Drop-out = -4.10%*

Note: positive difference indicates overrepresentation, negative difference indicates underrepresentation. A difference of greater than +/-3% is indicated with an asterisk.

Selection Bias

Post-school outcome data collection continues to show representativeness in areas of disability, gender, and ethnicity. There was a slight increase in representativeness among students who dropped out from 2018–19 (-5.21%) to 2019–20 (-4.10%). These youth continue to be underrepresented in the current response group.

The reasons for the increase in representativeness among students who drop out from the previous year may be due to improved training and user permissions in the data collection platform, or because more people were home to answer phone calls throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. CCTS is making additional improvements to the TSF2 data collection platform and 2022 training materials in hopes that representativeness will continue to increase among the most difficult to reach students.

Actions the State is Taking to Address Representativeness

The CCTS website (<https://www.seattleu.edu/ccts/>) houses various resources designed to support schools and families in the survey process.

The Guidance for Students page includes answers to frequently asked questions to help prepare students for the survey phone call. This information is available in both English and Spanish.

The Guidance for Educators page includes links to all Post-School Survey training materials and webinars. This page also links to a Google Drive folder that houses training manuals to support TSF2 users in navigating the system and understanding best practices of data collection, including increasing response rates. Recommendations include:

- Prepare students and gather contact information before they exit high school
- Send students an email reminder several weeks before making the phone call;
- Have someone they know conduct the survey;
- Make contact attempts on different days of the week at different times; and
- Utilize community/online resources if contact information is outdated.

CCTS also sends email reminders and updates to TSF2 users throughout the survey process. These

emails include a summary of the district's progress, percentage of surveys completed, response rate, important reminders, links to resources, and CCTS contact information for technical assistance. In mid-October, targeted emails are sent to districts that are less than 50% complete.

For the 2022 survey, CCTS is updating training modules to include additional information about representativeness that align with the improvements to the TSF2 platform. Best practices will be highlighted in quarterly TSF2 user meetings that will be recorded and posted to the CCTS website.

14—OSEP Response

The state provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14—Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the state must report whether the FFY 2021 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 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1416(a)(3)(B)]

Data Source

Data collected under Section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) [IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)].

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 and targets and report on them in the corresponding State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (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 Local Educational Agency (LEA) level.

15—Indicator Data

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020–21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	79

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020–21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	21

*SY = school year; EMAPS = EDFacts Metadata and Process System; IDEA = Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

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

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 8–9 above for a detailed description.

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2013	27.66%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	25.75%	26.00%	26.25%	26.50%	26.75%
Data	33.33%	30.77%	32.14%	38.89%	27.14%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	27.69%	28.63%	29.57%	30.51%	31.46%	32.40%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
21	79	27.14%	27.69%	26.58%	Did not meet target	No slippage

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

The state did not identify barriers for this indicator as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. There has been no waiver of the IDEA or implementing regulation requirements for special education, and therefore there continue to be special education disputes addressed through due process resolution sessions and mediations. COVID has not changed the way Washington collects these data and therefore has had no impact on the performance, data completeness, validity, and reliability for this indicator.

15—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response

The state provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

15—Required Actions

None

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 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1416(a)(3)(B)]

Data Source

Data collected under Section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) [IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)].

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 mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (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 Local Educational Agency (LEA) level.

16—Indicator Data

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020–21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	37

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020–21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2
SY 2020–21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	28

*SY = school year; EMAPS = EDEfacts Metadata and Process System.

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

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 8–9 above for a detailed description.

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2013	78.00%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	75.20%–85.20%	75.30%–85.30%	75.40%–85.40%	75.50%–85.50%	75.60%–85.60%
Data	77.50%	88.89%	95.59%	87.50%	81.40%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	82.40%	83.40%	84.40%	85.40%	86.40%	87.40%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY 2020 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 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status
2	28	37	81.40%	82.40%	81.08%	Did not meet target

*FFY = federal fiscal year; SPP = State Performance Plan; APR = Annual Performance Plan.

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

The state did not identify barriers for this indicator as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. There has been no waiver of the IDEA or implementing regulation requirements for special education, and therefore there continue to be special education disputes addressed through due process

resolution sessions and mediations. COVID has not changed the way Washington collects data and therefore has had no impact on the performance, data completeness, validity, and reliability for this indicator.

16—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response

The state provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

16—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 17: STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

General Supervision.

The state's State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR) includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The state's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

- **Baseline Data:** The state must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage, and which is aligned with the state-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.
- **Targets:** In its federal fiscal year (FFY) 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the state must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The state's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the state's baseline data.
- **Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the state must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages), and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR). In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the state must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the state's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- SiMR;

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for Local Educational Agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013–2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the state and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the state must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes:

- A. Data and analysis on the extent to which the state has made progress toward and/or met the state-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the SiMR;
- B. The rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the state intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and
- C. A description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement.

If the state intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the state must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the state must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The state must report on whether the state met its target. In addition, the state may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The state must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the state's last SSIP submission

(i.e., February 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The state must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the state intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the state must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The state must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the state and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The state must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021–June 30, 2022).

The state must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the ongoing use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The state must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the state addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The state should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021–June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The state should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17—Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the SiMR?

Washington's SiMR is designed to increase the social emotional learning (SEL) performance rates of students with disabilities. The SEL domain of the Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS) entrance assessment is the primary performance measure; the observational tool used to collect the data is GOLD® by Teaching Strategies® (TSG).

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (Yes / No)

YES

Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.

During the previous SSIP cycle, the SSIP State Design Team (SDT) discussed modifying the evaluation plan, logic model, and corresponding short, intermediate, and long-term outcomes to be more responsive to the needs of early childhood programs. Recognizing that with greater emphasis on SEL, the early childhood practitioner would have increased awareness of individual implicit biases, the trauma experienced by children within their communities (including historical trauma), and the need to create environments that meet the needs of all children. Over the course of the SSIP development process, the SDT reviewed the WaKIDS fall entry data for children with and without disabilities over three years to identify performance trends in the literacy and SEL domains, as well as the Washington state preschool (PreK)–12 discipline data, and the Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF) state and federal PreK discipline data. The SSIP SDT then reviewed the previous SSIP Evaluation Plan to determine the appropriateness of identified evaluation tools to answer the following questions:

- What are the current data telling us?
- Is it measuring what we need it to?
- What data are missing?

Following data analysis, the SDT determined that shifting the existing SiMR from early literacy to SEL would be most beneficial to the Washington state current early childhood landscape with the primary long-term outcome being to significantly increase state, regional, and local district capacity to select, implement, scale-up, and sustain evidence-based practices (EBPs). This will be accomplished by utilizing intensive technical assistance in social-emotional development, along with system-level coaching within a Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS) infrastructure for program staff in integrated/inclusive early learning environments.

Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR.

- B-1 Graduation Data, 2019–2020
- B-3 3rd, 4th, 8th, 10th Grade(s) State English Language Arts (ELA) and Math Assessments, 2018–2019
- B-4 Significant Discrepancy and Disproportionality, 2014–2020
- B-5 Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Data, 2019–present
- B-6 LRE Data, 2018–present
- B-7 Early Childhood Outcomes, 2019–2020
- B-8 Parent Engagement
- B-14 Post-School Data, 2019–2020
- WaKIDS Social Emotional Domain, 2013–present
- WaKIDS Literacy Domain, 2013–present
- Healthy Youth Survey, 2019–2020

Provide a description of how the state analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.

Washington state's SSIP for the previous State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) cycle (2013–19) focused on the use of intensive technical assistance, systems level, and instructional coaching paired with professional development to close gaps in literacy between entering kindergarteners with and without disabilities.

After an extensive review of the WaKIDS fall entry literacy data, the SSIP SDT identified a gap trending at 20% or more, from 2013 to 2019, for students with disabilities when compared to their nondisabled peers. When comparing these achievement trends with data collected for the social emotional domain for the 2019 school year, the gap increased to 33.1% for students with disabilities compared to nondisabled peers, a significantly disproportionate rate of performance for students with IEPs. This aligned with the trends for students with disabilities when looking at overall school readiness in all assessed domain areas (social-emotional, physical, language, cognitive, literacy, and math). Additional data sources were reviewed, including the 2020 Annual Child Count and LRE Data Report. Currently in Washington state, 21% (2,136) of all children with IEPs in PreK programs, ages 3–5 years, are enrolled in a regular early childhood program with nondisabled peers with the majority of services occurring within that program. In contrast, of the 10,150 students with disabilities ages 3–5 in Washington with an Individualized Education Program (IEP), 8,014 (53.5%) children are receiving services away from their peers.

The SDT also reviewed the B-7 Child Outcome Summary data and invited IDEA Part C State Agency (DCYF) Leadership to share strategies employed within IDEA Part C SSIP (as it related to SEL) and technical assistance and professional learning opportunities to address data quality. It is the intent of the SDT and SSIP State Leadership to strengthen the alignment of the IDEA Part B and C SSIP implementation work in the future of this SSIP cycle.

A review of the statewide discipline data identified that within the 2019–2020 school year, 3,827 students in Washington state were restrained or isolated. Of those children, 91.9% (representing 14.1% total enrollment) were students with disabilities and 8.8% of these children were identified as Black/African American (representing 4.6% total enrollment). In the 2018–19 school year, 1,245 kindergarten students were subjected to exclusionary discipline, representing 8.5% of kindergarteners with IEPs and 3.2% without IEPs. The SDT sought discipline data for children with disabilities in Washington PreK programs but found that the number of children reported was not robust (<10 children statewide) and therefore could not be used to guide data-based decision making. The SDT, with input from community partners (CPs), determined that Washington state does not currently have an aligned behavior incident form or reporting system that can be utilized in both school and community settings and shared across agencies. Recognizing this, the SDT with the support of the Washington Pyramid Model State Leadership Team (WAPM SLT) have chosen to include the Behavior Incident Reporting System as an evaluation tool within SSIP implementation activities. With the adoption of this tool, the SSIP SDT has ensured that exclusionary practices data will be collected, and included into the one database, the Pyramid Model Implementation Data System (PIDS), for all children, 3–5 years, enrolled in the SSIP Implementation Integrated PreK programs.

The SDT suggested that the SSIP state leadership continue to use WaKIDS fall assessment data, a main data metric (and the only common statewide measure) to track progress on the proposed SiMR. This SSIP submission will highlight Washington state's efforts to align technical assistance in

the area of social-emotional development in the next SSIP cycle, with an emphasis on implementation of MTSS. This will offer a clear intersect between SEL and inclusionary practices to ensure strong foundations are laid for students, staff, and families for accessing high-quality, integrated and inclusive early learning settings. To further strengthen the alignment with cross-agency data partners at DCYF, it was suggested that the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) access the assessment data captured from the SSIP Implementation sites who contract with the DCYF Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP) and utilize the PreK TSG spring data collected, the same assessment tool used by local districts for the fall WaKIDS assessment, as a secondary evaluation tool.

The SDT believes that the focus on SEL will empower educational partners and offer more equitable access to learning and growth among the children and families farthest from educational justice. This modification would also create intentional alignment with the Washington state IDEA Part C SSIP and current Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) initiatives targeting the implementation of inclusionary practices, SEL, and MTSS infrastructures statewide.

Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.

With input from the SSIP SDT and the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), along with analysis of state ECSE data, the SSIP state leadership has decided to maintain the infrastructure of the current SSIP but shift the SiMR to support the development of the whole child, moving away from early literacy and instead aligning with current ECSE initiatives targeting the implementation of inclusionary practices and more specifically, SEL. CPs believe that this will offer a broader view of student achievement, recognizing that there is a direct correlation between the impacts of SEL on core academics and the access to high-quality, integrated and inclusive early childhood programs, and increased student performance over time. The proposed SiMR shift from early literacy to SEL will also align with the SPP/APR Indicator 7B data, which is consistent with the IDEA Part C SiMR.

Is the state using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (Yes / No)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

Washington's SiMR is designed to increase the SEL performance rates of entering kindergartners with disabilities in five identified Educational Service Districts (ESDs) (ESD 121, 101, 171, 105, and 113), which represent 63% of all preschoolers with IEPs statewide. All local districts recruited will be contractors or subcontractors with ECEAP which is funded by Washington state, or Head Start, and enroll children three to five years of age with and without disabilities, who meet specific enrollment criteria.

Is the state's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (Yes / No)

YES

Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

With the SSIP SDT and Regional Leads (RLs), the Theory of Action was reviewed and modified to better reflect the OSPI Implementation Framework, which outlines essential partners (state, regional, and local district teams), including families and community partners. It was necessary to

include an additional strand to capture the Systems Level and Instructional Coaching requirements within the WAPM Training and Coaching to Fidelity Sequence, modify language to reflect the shift from Early Learning (EL) to SEL, and elevate the roles of community partners and families to further strengthen their role in coordinated recruitment and enrollment, the expansion of existing continuums of alternative placement options, and to increase access to a child's LRE.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

Washington SSIP 2021–2022 Theory of Action

(<https://www.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/public/specialed/earlychildhood/pubdocs/WA-SSIP-2021-2022-Theory-of-Action.pdf>)

Does the state intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (Yes / No)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

The SSIP SDT, taking into consideration that Washington state was awarded a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) in the fall of 2020, proposed continuing the current SSIP with modifications. Intentionally integrating the SSIP implementation project with that of the Center for the Improvement of Student Learning (CISL) ensures aligned PreK–12+ support in the development of MTSS structures across the state. These change activities will focus on implementing and assessing the effectiveness of SEL intensive technical assistance, coaching, and professional development associated with the WAPM, an early childhood MTSS implementation structure. For example, OSPI will provide instructional training and system-level coaching to implementation sites to meet fidelity using evidence-based practices, including Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT), Practice-Based Coaching (PBC), WAPM Inclusive and Equitable Pyramid Model Practices (Tier 1/Tier 2), and Prevent-Teach-Reinforce for Young Children (PTR-YC). OSPI plans to implement evidence-based data management strategies, including the Behavioral Incident Report System, which will require the SSIP implementation sites to collect and report pre- and post-data connected to the change activities, in collaboration with the local program-wide leadership team and ESD RL.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific federal fiscal year (FFY) listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages). Select yes if the state uses two targets for measurement. (Yes / No)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2019	49.00%

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

Targets

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

*FFY = federal fiscal year.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

The # of students with IEPs entered K ready in SEL	The # of students with IEPs	FFY 2019 data	FFY 2020 target	FFY 2020 data	Status	Slippage
1,708	3,368	49.00%	50.25%	50.71%	N/A	N/A

*FFY = federal fiscal year; SPP = State Performance Plan; APR = Annual Performance Plan; IEPs = Individualized Education Programs; K = kindergarten; N/A = not applicable.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

WaKIDS Fall Kindergarten Entry Assessment SEL Domain.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

Each fall, approximately August to November, kindergarten teachers of record, along with certified special education teachers who provide specialized instruction to kindergarten students, observe and conduct formative assessments based on children's everyday activities and interactions with others. Teachers then enter student ratings into the TSG platform by the due date. OSPI data analysts process the data and provide each district with a scorefile that indicates kindergarten readiness for each child with reliable data, based on widely-held expectations for five-year-olds. The data are then shared with the OSPI Special Education Division by the OSPI Assessment Office, and are further disaggregated by demographics (LRE, disability, etc.) and then summarized by ESD region.

Optional: Has the state collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, continuous quality improvement (CQI), survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (Yes / No)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the state to assess progress toward the SiMR.

In addition to the SiMR, SSIP leadership identified additional assessment measures to reflect input from state, regional, and local school district partners. These prescribed assessment measures include:

1. The State Infrastructure Leadership Capacity Assessment adapted from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA). This assessment, completed by individual SSIP SDT members, evaluates the impact of the state infrastructure related to collaboration, motivation and guidance, and vision and direction.
2. The SLT Benchmark of Quality (BoQ). This assessment, completed by the WAPM-SLT, is employed by the cross-agency leadership to assess progress and plan future actions to advance Pyramid Model evidence practices.
3. The TPOT. This tool evaluates and reinforces high-quality practices that support children's social-emotional development and behavior. TPOT assessments are conducted two times annually across program sites implementing Pyramid Model practices to measure progress and fidelity.
4. The Local District Preschool Inclusion Self-Assessment (LDPIISA). This self-assessment tool evaluates partnerships among schools, early care, and education providers to promote the

inclusion of young children with disabilities. Programs engaging in exploration, planning and installation stages are identified as "slow track" programs. These programs are required to conduct this initial assessment to collect a baseline and engage in exploratory, installation, and planning activities.

5. The Early Childhood Program-Wide PBS Benchmark of Quality (EC-BoQ). This tool evaluates program progress towards implementing the Pyramid Model program wide. This instrument is administered two times annually across "fast track" program sites implementing Pyramid Model. "Fast track" programs are programs engaging in the "implementation" stage ranging from initial to full implementation.
6. The BIRS. This monthly data system collects and analyzes behavior incidents in programs to inform data-based decision-making with additional analysis related to possible equity issues by calculating disproportionality.
7. The Parent Survey Instrument: Schools Efforts to Partner with Parent Scale: This nationally normed evaluation instrument was administered in correlation to the parent engagement strand of the theory of action annually across all participating programs. These data provide valuable information about the extent of parental involvement within the context of Indicator B-8 on the State Performance Plan. These results indicate the extent to which parents believe that school districts have facilitated their involvement in their child's education as a means of improving student outcomes.
8. The Participant Survey Instrument. This post-training survey, aligned with survey criteria related to the TPOT, collects data related to quality, relevance, usefulness of professional development activities and measures knowledge gain directly related to technical assistance provisions.

Did the state identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (Yes / No)

NO

Did the state identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (Yes / No)

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the state must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the state's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the state took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

1. A reduction in student enrollment impacted the data pool sample, resulting in nearly a quarter of students with at least one incomplete domain-level data out of the six possible areas of assessment, despite two extra weeks added to conduct the assessment. Data may have been impacted by teachers leaving the workforce, impacting the program's ability to conduct the assessment. In some instances, programs reported that teachers were hired later in the school year and, as a result, missed the training window to implement the assessment, resulting in a low n-count. It should be noted that the number of 'not observed' items was not counted towards the 70% threshold to produce the domain-level score.

Notably, the number of kindergarten students who participated in WaKIDS this fall is about 12,000 lower than in previous years. With the population being significantly smaller and the high number of students missing at least one out of six domain-level data, it was not possible to produce appropriate state-level readiness data. OSPI advised district and building administrators that the rate of non-participation and the systemic nature of the non-participation mean that the comparisons across schools or districts or over time at the state level may not be possible. Thus, data use should be limited to local, formative assessment practices, including facilitating conversations about student development between families and schools, and should not be presented in aggregate as representations of overall “readiness” at a school level or higher without first checking to see rates of assessment completion. Limited opportunities to engage in direct observational measures like the TPOT and BIRS were recorded via RL narrative.

2. The first confirmed COVID-19 case in the United States was identified on January 21, 2020, in Washington state. To ensure adherence to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) of 1996, which guarantees protection of individual protected health information, barriers in conducting external observational interactions occurred, as such, limited observations across several SSIP sites were conducted via video recording. When possible, RLs reported that TPOTs were conducted via direct observation methods, yielding a statewide 30% response rate. The BIRS yielded a statewide response rate of 10%. The SDT identified ongoing coaching and training opportunities as a critical element to ensure fidelity in assessment and analysis in subsequent reporting cycles. In addition to direct observation methods, programs were directed to complete either the Local District Preschool Inclusion Self-Assessment Tool, yielding a 50% instrument response rate, and/or the EC-BoQ, yielding a statewide 50% instrument response rate. Note that 40% of participating programs conducted both self-assessment instruments. For programs unable to complete the initial assessment instrument (40%), a narrative was provided by RLs detailing the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, citing the high rate of quarantine activities among staff and students and implementation strain due to staffing shortages as significant to data collection and reporting. In these instances, sites continue to move towards building systems that are sustainable in building capacity, scaffolding expansions, and preparing programs to be self-sufficient in sustaining programming.
3. Following the first school facility closure on March 12, 2020, the state detailed data collection mitigation strategies in the Reopening Washington Schools 2020: Special Education Guide aligned to health and safety guidelines from the Washington Department of Health (DOH) and the Washington Department of Labor & Industries (L&I). Along with the OSPI Provisions of Services to Children with Disabilities in Early Childhood Programs During a School Facility Closure document, detailed ongoing communication and clear expectations around documentation and data collection processes during the FFY 2020 SSIP reporting period were provided. This guidance details ongoing technical assistance and support related to data collection processes, along with documentation related to assessment, observation, and referral methodology. Data quality concerns have been regularly addressed during SDT meetings, which include regional leads and the technical support advisory committee. In response to this request, the state developed and

maintained an interactive resource dashboard to capture community partner/regional lead feedback and submit data. The SDT and RL discussion centered around identifying alternative implementation processes to further enhance data collection measures and teaming strategies by providing technical assistance and ongoing coaching calls related to data input, collection, and analysis. Activities included completing focused observations and debrief cycles; engaging in inter-rater reliability activities to ensure data reliability and fidelity in practice; and developing a cascading coaching structure to support fidelity in both implementation and data analysis processes (e.g., implementation specialists, program coaches, and practitioner coaches).

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the state's current evaluation plan.

Washington SSIP 2021–2022 Evaluation Plan Worksheet 8

(<https://www.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/public/specialed/earlychildhood/pubdocs/WA-SSIP-2021-2022-Evaluation-Plan.pdf>)

Is the state's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (Yes / No)

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

Changes and updates include removal of:

- Regional Needs Assessment;
- Stage-Based Active Implementation Planning Self-Assessment; and
- Division for Early Childhood (DEC) Interaction Fidelity Checklists.

And the inclusion of:

- State BoQ;
- TPOT;
- EC-BoQ;
- LDPISA;
- BIRS; and
- WAPM Coaching Logs.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

The Washington SSIP Evaluation plan was changed to complement the revised SiMR and the intentional alignment with agency cross-division partners and efforts to create a PreK–12+ MTSS infrastructure statewide. These steps will ensure that the current evaluation plan reflects the data metrics necessary to allow for systems-level change at all levels of implementation, allowing for data-based decision making for individual students, programs, and state-wide systems.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Prioritization of the improvement strategies and key measures was initiated by the SDT with direct input from the Transformation Zone Research to Action Site Regional Leads. The prioritized infrastructure improvement strategies were directly taken from the integrated and streamlined ongoing partnership contact and related action planning. Infrastructure strategies include the SSIP

Implementation Framework promoting state/regional/local district efforts to improve current communication and engagement strategies and expand to include community and families throughout the process. The SDT noted that intentional integration of implementation science in the framework is an essential component of the project work, laying out the necessary steps, stage-by-stage, for full implementation of evidence-based practices and sustaining the effort. This is based upon the identified problem of practice: lack of access to inclusive, high-quality early childhood learning experiences with integrated SEL infrastructures for children with disabilities contributes to opportunity gaps in social emotional development as these students enter kindergarten.

The establishment of a statewide network of WAPM Implementation Specialists Training and Coaching Network Infrastructure with the UW Haring Center and Regional ESDs, in collaboration with DCYF, is a critical component in advancing the SSIP project work. School district and DCYF Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP) preschool staff, under the direction of Program and Practitioner Coaches, have begun to implement the essential social-emotional frameworks needed to ensure all students have access to high-quality learning environments.

The engagement of SSIP Regional Leads (RLs) from three times per year to monthly meetings with IDEA Data Center (IDC) / NCSI TA, reinforced intentional collaboration to increase understanding of evaluation tools (logic model, evaluation plan, and theory of action), stages of implementation science, and defining roles and responsibilities of regional and local districts. The SDT hypothesizes that employing this infrastructure strategy to integrate aligned EBPs within agency cross-sector EL programs, 0–5 years, will result in increased knowledge of fidelity criteria and systems infrastructure, as well as increased knowledge of systems change and leadership practices.

Continued collaboration with ECSE Coordinators/RL SSIP Leads to create and disseminate training opportunities relating to IDEA performance indicators (B-6, B-7) will support the intermediate and long-term outcomes, resulting in an increase in children in general early childhood placements. The ECSE Coordinators continue to facilitate intensive technical assistance, coaching (systems level and instructional), and professional development within identified regular early childhood programs (RECPs) to support IDEA performance indicators for programs participating at the implementation sites.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the state and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

The SDT noted that intentional integration of implementation science in the SSIP framework resulted in identifying the necessary steps, stage-by-stage, for full implementation of evidence-based practices across sites (e.g., exploration and planning, installation, implementation: initial to full). Employing implementation science to guide practice resulted in 100% program self-identification and alignment to the stages of implementation science. Three implementation sites

identified a comprehensive 5-year action plan to promote fidelity in practice aligned with the stages of implementation science with data markers (e.g., LDPIISA, EC-BoQ) to monitor progress and recalibrate as necessary. Accordingly, the implementation of this improvement strategy is imperative in supporting system sustainability necessary to achieving the SiMR, along with establishing and promoting intentional alignment of project practice related to accountability and monitoring. Analysis from the SLT-BoQ Indicator 13 illustrates a 1-point moderate gain (ceiling of 2 points) related to exercising sustainability and scale up objectives and strategies to achieve statewide, high-fidelity implementation of EBPs. The SSIP SDT expects to meet the terminal goal (raw score of 2 points) within the next reporting cycle.

Specific evidence-based strategies that have continued include identifying and agency cross-training program specialists to serve as coaches for the selection and implementation of specific EBPs for use in PreK special education settings. The SSIP SDT has successfully engaged in recruitment and development to support a statewide network of implementation specialists and program coaches to provide culturally responsive, practice-based coaching with fidelity, through collaborative partnerships with practitioners. Biannual training, monthly coaching, and ongoing technical assistance are in place to promote fidelity in implementation and best practice as it relates to EBPs. Employing a statewide network of coaches has resulted in a 14.3% increase (extensive) with a 57.1% moderate increase in overall practices knowledge gain. By providing varying dimensions related to the statewide network, the SSIP SDT is better equipped to provide both programmatic, fiscal, and governance recommendations to support future implementation. Preliminary data indicates a cumulative 111 participants have engaged in foundational training offerings, with 40% of participating programs having met fidelity in attendance per the prescribed training sequence.

The ESD regional leads responsible for the oversight of the SSIP remain dedicated to the implementation of the Research to Action project work and embrace the benefits of actively engaging internal agency representatives and external practitioners and leaders, which include family partnerships and community partners. In the current SSIP implementation cycle period alone, SSIP SDT Regional Leads participated in approximately eight supplemental monthly core convenings, launched April 26, 2021, and extended throughout the current SSIP reporting cycle. As a result, RLs employed the principles of implementation science to develop criteria related to quality standards in practice. Additionally, RLs inventoried current program progress and trajectory based on data analysis and EBP and plan to convene regularly for analysis. Key outcomes include implementing practice-based coaching as an aligned strategy across five regions promoted data-based decision making to inform current program practice. Data indicate that coaching provisions have resulted in the delivery of a cumulative 8,619 minutes of coaching to support the development of leadership teams, practitioner coaches, behavior specialists, and establish ongoing relationships with family and community partners and providers to promote access to high-quality educational environments.

Increased training opportunities related to IDEA performance indicators (B-6 and B-7) have supported regional alignment of technical assistance provisions, creating opportunities for agency cross-regional collaboration across SSIP programs while leveraging current initiatives to help ensure successful execution, implementation, and continuous quality standard improvements within the SSIP. Employing this framework has bolstered accountability and monitoring of practice,

as recorded through ongoing bi-monthly ECSE check-ins and current technical assistance modules (in development) related to Indicator 7. This infrastructure strategy informs current governance policy and practice, which has resulted in initial action planning to promote cross-agency work has expanded access to general early childhood programs for young children/students with disabilities to expand access to students with disabilities across EL programs [as reflected in the DCYF Saturation Study, request for applications (RFAs), and Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS)].

With these measures in place, improvement in the performance rates in social-emotional development among students with and without disabilities is expected. Targeted improvements to the system infrastructure, intentional scale-up, and sustainability in practice will yield knowledge of both system change and leadership practice(s) as measured through EBPs (TPOT, LDPISA, BIRS) for analysis. The SSIP SDT expects to engage in a comparative analysis of baseline data and future data in spring 2022 as collected via the TPOT instrument.

Did the state implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (Yes / No)

YES

Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

The SDT identified four new infrastructure strategies to further support system changes critical in supporting the achievement of the SiMR, reinforcing sustainability in systems improvement efforts, and actualizing scale up practices. The strategies are as follows:

1. Intentionally centering on community partner engagement strategies, including agency cross-sector representation of State Work Groups [e.g., Integrated PreK (IPK), Preschool Development Grant (PDG)], WAPM training and coaching materials for families, community partners, and programs, along with established family representation on Program-Wide Leadership Teams (PWLTS). These efforts ensure an aligned message reflects the strong working relationships built and sustained between leaders within the Special Education division at OSPI. Baseline statewide data indicates 40% of PWLTs have secured parent/family representation for ongoing decision-making and leadership development activities.
2. Employed synchronous facilitated training, including MTSS/WAPM training to increase trauma-informed practices, support the implementation of evidence-based practices, and increased data usage has resulted in the increased knowledge of inclusionary practices for Tier 1/Tier 2 MTSS/WAPM race and equity practices, and trauma-informed practices.
3. Focusing on coaching activities, including the utilization of evidence-based practices (e.g., TPOT, LDPISA, BIRS) to support increased knowledge of fidelity criteria and systems infrastructure, increased knowledge of trauma-informed practices, increased knowledge of race and equity practices, and increased family and community provider engagement within local EL programs.
4. Centering sustainability and scale-up considerations, including documentation of alignment and collaboration within SSIP implementation and cross-sector work that integrates a comprehensive database, scale-up plan protocol, criteria for fidelity, and ongoing action planning. Implementation of this strategy is hypothesized to increase knowledge of fidelity

criteria and systems infrastructure, along with knowledge of systems change and leadership practices. The scaling up of partnerships with external early learning content experts to support the integration and collaboration of new landmark initiatives with SSIP activities has been of particular benefit.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Infrastructure improvement/change activities will continue to focus on implementing and assessing the effectiveness of SEL intensive technical assistance, coaching, and professional development associated with the WAPM early childhood MTSS infrastructure.

Intentional alignment with implementation science to support the phases of implementation, including sustainability and scale-up, are expected to result in data-informed decision making related to the selection of EBPs, increasing knowledge of systems change and leadership practices, and increase in total sum (increasing skill acquisition) as collected in the State Infrastructure Leadership Capacity Assessment (three domains) and the State Leadership Team Benchmark of Quality (summative score) instrument. Accordingly, programs are expected to continue to demonstrate progress within each correlated stage as demonstrated via action planning and qualitative and quantitative data sourcing (e.g., LDPISA, TPOT, EC-BoQ, Coaching Log(s), BIRs). The SSIP SDT has centered on strategies for involving multiple divisions within OSPI to maximize the allocation of resources across multiple funding streams to support procedures and policies. The SLT-BoQ informs current efforts to scale-up and sustain evidence-based practices, requiring intentional co-creation and collaboration with community partners alike.

Increased family and community partner engagement strategies will promote knowledge of regional and local early learning systems, including the continuum of LRE placements. This will lead to intermediate outcomes to support both sustainability of improvement efforts and scale-up through strategic and intentional collaboration to enhance technical assistance provisions and fidelity in implementation to better meet the needs of community partners. It is the hypothesis of the SDT, SEAC, and ECSE Coordination team that with intensive technical assistance in the area of social-emotional development, along with system-level coaching in MTSS infrastructure development for program staff in integrated early learning environments, there will be an increase in family/community partnerships across all participating SSIP sites, yielding a 40% gain from baseline (80% PWLT parent/community representation as the terminal goal).

Multiple early childhood initiatives (e.g., WAPM, Learning Experiences—An alternative Program for Preschoolers and Parents (LEAP), Preschool Inclusion Champions Network, and the University of Washington–Haring Center Demonstration Sites) led by the OSPI Special Education division are directly aligned to the SSIP and prioritize the intersection of social-emotional development and embedded inclusionary practices in early childhood programs for all students, paired with intensive technical assistance and systems level coaching for preschool staff in integrated early learning environments. The SDT hypothesizes that in employing the statewide network of coaches, there will be an increase in inclusionary practice knowledge gain across the three tiers of coaching (e.g., implementation specialist, program coach, and practitioner coach). Coaching knowledge gain will be collected and analyzed in subsequent reports. Intentional engagement with SSIP SDT Regional Leads in coordinating, disseminating, and employing EBP is anticipated to result in increased rates

of response (as evidenced via participant survey response rate and training attendance).

The SDT employed synchronous facilitated training within targeted timelines and continued work specifically meant to target educational practitioners' access to professional learning related to trauma-informed practice, race and equity practices, and inclusionary practices to support ongoing quality standards. It is the hypothesis of the SDT that ongoing synchronous facilitated training, completed to fidelity per the prescribed sequence, will yield fidelity in practice application directly correlated with TPOT and LDPISA raw scores, resulting in 80% of programs meeting fidelity in the subsequent reporting cycle. By increasing training opportunities related to IDEA performance indicators, via intensive data analyses, accountability and monitoring, and broad community partner input, the SDT expects to see an increase in access to inclusive settings, improved academic settings, and a decrease in reported suspensions and expulsion rates of children, 3–5 years and beyond.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

The selected EBPs implemented by the state in the reporting period include:

1. WAPM;
2. MTSS; and
3. Implementation science.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

The state deployed EBPs to increase capacity to support regional and local educational systems and impact the SiMR. These practices include the implementation of WAPM, MTSS, and implementation science.

The SSIP SDT has begun to intentionally implement the Pyramid Model, a national innovation for equitable multi-level systems of support in participating SSIP programs. This framework is tailored to meet state-specific needs, promote inclusionary practices, and enhance social and emotional competence in infants, toddlers, and young children. The application of this framework in Washington is WAPM. The WAPM vision is aligned with the commitment to increase opportunities for all children to receive high-quality, early learning services in integrated and inclusive environments. WAPM is not a curriculum package, but a collection of programs and evidence-based classroom practices, selected by experts in early childhood research, to support optimal development and prevent challenging behaviors.

MTSS is a framework for enhancing the adoption and implementation of a continuum of evidence-based practices to achieve important outcomes for every student. The MTSS framework builds on a public health approach that is preventative and focuses on organizing the efforts of adults within systems to be more efficient and effective. MTSS helps to ensure students benefit from nurturing environments and equitable access to universal instruction and supports that are culturally and linguistically responsive, universally designed, and differentiated to meet their unique needs. MTSS integration involves coordination of tiered delivery systems, including Academic Response to Intervention (RTI), PBIS, WAPM, and SEL.

The state employed implementation science to build organizational commitment, capacity, and systems so that children, families, and communities' benefit from implementation practices and

improved outcomes are sustained. The ECTA identified five implementation stages to describe the implementation process:

1. Exploration;
2. Installation;
3. Initial implementation;
4. Full implementation; and
5. Expansion and scale-up.

Implementation stages identify specific activities, outcomes, and unique challenges associated with the implementation process. These stages help in the planning, communication, resource allocation, and evaluation of SSIP implementation.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

The impact related to each EBP (i.e., WAPM, MTSS, implementation science) includes improvements to the systems comprising the state infrastructure via the employment of family and community partner engagement strategies, synchronous facilitated training, coaching, and sustainability and scale-up activities.

Data sources informing EBPs impact include the LDPISA, TPOT, and EC-BoQ. These sources highlight program/district policies and practices for targeted increase and ongoing action planning to better inform current program/district practice and areas for improvement (e.g., family participation and monitoring and data-based decision-making).

Through data aggregated over the last two years of implementation, it is hypothesized that continuous implementation in WAPM will continue to move Washington state forward in increasing high-quality, integrated and inclusive early learning settings for young children. The utilization of data-based decision-making and comprehensive training and coaching based on said data, are the heart of WAPM fidelity in practice. WAPM employs ongoing practice-based coaching and fidelity of implementation by execution, implementation, and continuous monitoring as featured in the TPOT and BIRS. These instruments directly assess fidelity and impact provider practices, parents/caregiver outcomes, and child outcomes. Ongoing implementation of WAPM is hypothesized to increase SEL performance rates of entering Kindergarten students. Ongoing analysis and data collection processes (as featured in the bi-annual EC-BoQ self-assessment) are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies directly related to staff buy-in, leadership team development, family and community engagement, and integration of data-based decision-making. Additionally, the fidelity of WAPM implementation is hypothesized to impact teacher/provider practices specifically related to trauma-informed practices, race and equity, and inclusion. These practices are highlighted and assessed through the TPOT. The SSIP SDT hypothesizes that increased parent/caregiver outcomes, feedback, and concern will be recorded and addressed during monthly leadership team meetings and collected via parent/family survey data. The SSIP SDIT and WAPM SLT have worked in partnership to begin identifying areas for statewide improvement (e.g., family/community partnership) and engage in monthly action planning to address low-score indicators as collected via the State-level BoQ instrument for

increase.

The SSIP SDT has identified and developed agency cross-training program specialists to serve as coaches for the implementation of social-emotional specific practices who intentionally collaborate and partner with Washington MTSS experts. Ongoing efforts to cultivate formal partnerships with RLs implementing WAPM practices and Regional Implementation Coordinators (RICs) implementing MTSS practices are in development. To note, the essential components of MTSS are interrelated, and as the intensity of student need increases, each of the components also increases with intensity. Washington state MTSS implementation includes seven critical components:

1. Team Driven Shared Leadership;
2. Data-Based Decision-Making;
3. Family, Student, and Community Engagement;
4. Continuum of Supports;
5. Evidence-Based Practices;
6. Cascading District and School Systems; and
7. Implementation Stages.

MTSS implementation and alignment is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies through analysis using tools such as the District Capacity Assessment (DCA) and Schoolwide PBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory MTSS emphasized student voice in decision about their education and provide opportunities for choice and designing supports that fit individual strengths and needs. Implementation of MTSS requires engaging community partners in leadership team development, decision-making, and analysis. The SSIP SDT hypothesizes that meaningful partnerships with families and community members will be established through the employment of these EBPs in alignment with WAPM practice(s).

The SSIP SDT hypothesizes that, by building statewide capacity to scale up, sustaining implementation practices through the application of implementation science will significantly impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and practices. The ECTA affirms that the adoption of practices can work to support the state's great capacity for change. With an intentional focus on specific steps and associated activities per each stage, the SSIP SDT understands that each program requires individualized support to meet fidelity of implementation to impact the SiMR.

Integrating WAPM, MTSS, and implementation science provide the SSIP SDT opportunities to assess and revisit program progress based on data to inform decision-making and make individualized program recommendations aligned with relevant data.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

The state evaluated the outcomes of each improvement strategy through various data collection instruments.

Indicator B-7A (1) targets an increase in positive social emotional skills as measured by individual rate of growth with a proposed future target of 89.2% across a six-year period. Indicator B-7A (2), targeting an increase in positive social emotional skills, as measured within age expectations

yielded 38.1% in 2020–21 with a proposed future target of 43.9% in 2025–26.

An analysis of the State Infrastructure Leadership Capacity Assessment (8 respondents) indicates strong acquisition in the leadership area of collaboration with a mean score of 3.95. The assessment yielded a mean score of 3.96 in motivation and guidance and a mean score of 3.79 in vision and direction.

The State Leadership Team (SLT) Benchmark of Quality: Implementing Evidence-Based Practices Statewide indicates 12.2% of total indicators are “not in place,” demonstrating a longitudinal decrease of 57% across four administrations of the assessment (initially conducted in fall 2019). A reported 20.4% of indicators are “emerging and/or need improvement”, with an acceleration of 4% across four administrations spanning from 2019-present. A reported 67.3% of indicators are “in place”, yielding an increasing acceleration towards the terminal goal (80%) with a 53% increase from baseline.

The LDPIA evaluates partnerships among schools and early care and education providers to promote the inclusion of young children with disabilities. Programs that are identified as “slow tract” programs are required to conduct this initial assessment to collect baseline data and engage in exploratory, installation, and planning activities. The LDPIA yielded a 60% instrument response rate, indicating an average of 38% of indicators “in place” with an average 42% of indicators “in process but not in place”, with 12% of indicators planned but not implemented, and a total average of indicators 8% “not in place.” A statewide analysis of the data aggregated across the implementation cycle indicates developing formal collaborations with community partners (statewide average of 2.8/4) and enhancing professional development (statewide average of 2.83/4) as areas for future growth, with reviewing and modifying resource allocation (statewide average 3.46/4) and adhering to legal provisions of supports and services in inclusive settings with Individualized Education Programs (statewide average of 3.73/4) as statewide implementation strengths through comparative analysis.

This TPOT evaluates and reinforces high-quality practices that support children’s social-emotional development and behavior. TPOT assessments are conducted two times annually across program sites implementing Pyramid Model practices to measure progress and fidelity. The TPOT yielded a 30% response rate, indicating a statewide sum of average practices at 0.65/1.2 (ceiling) with a cumulative five red flags identified across statewide analysis. Teaching Behavior Expectations (TBE) yielded the lowest fidelity rating (0.37 mean). The SDT noted Providing Directions (PD) subscale yielded a 0.91 mean, recording a 0.54 difference in this element by comparison.

The EC-BoQ evaluates program progress towards implementing the Pyramid Model program-wide two times annually across program sites implementing the Pyramid Model identified in the “fast track” engaging in initial to full implementation stages. The EC-BoQ yielded a 50% instrument response rate, indicating that 34% of indicators were “in place,” 35% were “emerging and/or needed improvement,” and 29% were “not in place.” A statewide analysis of the data aggregated across the implementation cycle indicates professional development and staff support (57% of indicators in place/ partial) and family engagement (60% of indicators in place/ partial) as areas for future growth. Analysis indicates that procedures for responding to challenging behavior (91% of indicators in place/ partial) and program-wide expectations (89% of indicators in place/ partial)

critical elements have been implemented with the highest percentage of fidelity per comparative analysis.

The BIRS collects and analyzes behavior incidents in programs to inform data-based decision-making with additional analysis related to possible equity issues by calculating disproportionality. Analysis of the BIRS (2 program respondents/10 total program respondents) indicate a stable decrease in behavior incident report summaries (27.3% deceleration of Behavioral Incident Reports (BIRs) across a three-month data cycle), with a statewide average number of BIRs of 2.3 per month. Preliminary data collected from the respondents report 0% in-school suspensions, 0% out-of-school suspensions, and 0% of reported dismissals. The SDT noted that 23.1% of children with BIRs were classified as children with IEPs, and 76.9% of BIRs were documented for children without IEPs. Data indicates that the percentage of BIRs attributed to dual language learners (DLLs) is 31.6% with 77.5% of BIRs attributed to non-DLL children. The Race/Ethnicity equity profile for incident frequency indicates the following percentages of children with BIRs who belong to a student group:

- American Indian or Alaskan Native (0%);
- Asian (0%);
- Black or African American (15.4%);
- Hispanic or Latino of any race (23.1%);
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (0%);
- Two or more races (23.1%); and
- White (38.5%).

Data indicates 34.6% of children with BIRs are identified as female and 65.4% of children with a BIR identify as male. Note that the data reported includes 366 total students. The SSIP SDT understands that continued collection and analysis of BIRS data across Washington's mixed delivery system will better inform partners of current program practice as it relates to race, equity, and inclusionary practice. Gathering this preliminary data affirms the need for ongoing and continued technical assistance and support related to short term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes identified by the SSIP SDT.

Statewide analysis of program and practitioner coach activity logs indicates participating programs report a cumulative 5,665 minutes engaging in program coaching activities and 2,954 minutes recorded by practitioner coaches. Program coach data indicates 22% of coaching activities are targeted at assisting with meeting processes and procedures and 19.5% of coaching provision is spent reviewing fidelity tools (e.g., BoQ, TPOT, EL tool, BIR, Coach Log). Close-in analysis indicates that 47.4% of program coaching activities have been allocated to leadership team development, with 22.8% of provisions focused on developing practitioner coach activities. The SDT noted that 31.6% of program coaching activities were reported to occur in face-to-face meetings and 28.1% occurring via virtual meeting throughout the SSIP reporting cycle during the pandemic. Statewide practitioner coach data indicates 142 coaching cycles have been attempted, yielding a cumulative duration of 930 minutes across focused observations and 2,022 minutes allocated to debriefing coaching practices. Statewide data indicates 29% of coaching provisions are allocated to developing and setting goals/action plans, accounting for 23% of technical assistance allocated to individual child support.

The Parent Survey Instrument: School Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale results indicate that 50% of the parent respondents believe that schools have facilitated their involvement in their child's education. This reported yielded a 14.7% response rate (10 responses/68 total). The total sample of parents surveyed included parents of students identified as:

- Hispanic (32.4%);
- American Indian/Alaska Native (7.4%);
- Asian (2.9%);
- Black (8.8%);
- Pacific Islander (1.5%);
- Two or More Races (11.8%); and
- White (35.3%).

Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

To further enhance the work established within the current SSIP cycle, additional progress monitoring data have been collected to better assess current gains related to short-term outcomes, capturing knowledge gain related to inclusionary practice, race and equity practices, trauma-informed practices, system change and leadership practices, and fidelity criteria and systems infrastructure. Ongoing progress monitoring will be directly linked to the analysis and assessment of each EBP employed in subsequent reporting cycles. The SSIP SDT are in the early stages of SEL implementation and note that practitioner changes in knowledge are expected to lead to fidelity of implementation and ultimately to achieving the SiMR. The SSIP SDT will continue to analyze the Parent Survey Instrument: School Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale in subsequent reporting cycles to assess gains in family engagement as evidenced by participant response and raw data.

This process has been supported by the SSIP SDT, which represents a variety of partners across agencies representing children and families between the ages of 0–5 years. Collected through baseline participant surveys, knowledge gain related to inclusionary practices yielded a 28.60% increase in the extensive category and a 71.40% increase in the moderate category. Knowledge increase related to race and equity practices yielded a 100% increase in the moderate category. Knowledge increase related to trauma-informed practice reported a 100% moderate increase.

The SDT has also increased efforts to support educational practitioners in the field with updated technical assistance, professional learning, and coaching that will improve data quality in the long term. In utilizing the TPOT, the SDT has identified a statewide average score of 0.625 in the Communicating with Families (COM1-8) and a statewide average score of 0.525 in Supporting Family Use of the Pyramid Model Practices (INF1-7).

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

The use of EBPs strengthens capacity-building of regions and districts in alignment with the theory of action, prioritizing intensive technical assistance focused on implementation science, coordinated professional learning, coaching, and family engagement. With consistent implementation of the identified practices, research to action sites will have created systems to support the PreK SEL Performance rate SiMR hypothesis.

SSIP regional leads will continue to facilitate intensive technical assistance, coaching, and professional development within identified RECP to support the social-emotional development of all children participating at the implementation sites. Under the guidance of the SSIP state leadership, and with the use of implementation science, SSIP RECPs will engage in EBPs supported by Pyramid Model, a MTSS infrastructure to meet outcomes.

The SSIP Research to Action sites will increase employment of the biannual Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT) to 50% (20% increase from baseline utilization rate) to inform ongoing fidelity of implementation practice. Additional data will be collected and reported in subsequent reports to assess and recalibrate a goal specific to this instrument with an anticipated data pool increase (e.g., reduction of statewide red flag frequency, increase in statewide total sum).

The SSIP Research to Action sites will continue to utilize the annual LDPIA assessment measure (slow tract) to inform action planning and decision-making processes in alignment with program developed five-year planning procedures to support relationship building and gathering information via forming a leadership team, drafting a vision and mission, and developing a 3–5-year plan. Activities will include the ongoing refinement of vision and mission, gathering baseline understanding of EBPs and framework, defining roles, and scaffolding coaching and data coordinator roles as part of the PWLT.

Ongoing utilization of the biannual EC-BoQ employed by “fast track” programs will continue to inform EBPs in supporting the scaffolding of coaching and data coordination as part of the PWLT. Measurable outcomes will be documented via the EC-BoQ and correlated action plans will target indicators flagged for support by RL.

The SSIP SDT will continue to analyze monthly BIRs completed by “fast track” SSIP sites to monitor current practice related to social-emotional development, administrative response, infrastructure development and technical assistance related to practitioner, family, community, and student outcomes. The state anticipates ongoing analysis of current in-school, out-of-school, and dismissal data cross-referenced with race, ethnicity, and gender data to better inform the SSIP community of practice. Participants will increase employment of this tool to 50% (30% increase from baseline utilization rate) to inform ongoing fidelity of implementation practice.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 8–9 above for a detailed description.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

The engagement of CPs continues to be a strength in Washington state, as we take steps to increase the implementation of inclusionary practices and MTSS in early childhood programs across mixed delivery systems.

The list of essential partners in the efforts to meet the identified SiMR, and to improve the overall quality of early childhood programming has increased significantly in the past year due to intentional alignment of cross-divisional and agency cross-sector collaboration. Is it important to

note that the representatives identified (state, regional, local district, families, and community partners) within each partner group below, were actively engaged throughout the project work, with special consideration made to ensure equitable representation and opportunities for co-creation at each level of implementation. Examples of OSPI's efforts to create a greater platform for co-creation with families and CPs can be seen within the refinement for the Logic Model, Evaluation Plan, and Theory of Action for the SSIP Implementation work, as well as other cross-agency activities, including the Preschool Inclusion Collaboration Team's (PICT's) efforts to develop a joint position statement with OSPI and DCYF's ECEAP, and the Special Education ECSE Focus Group, who will be actively involved in supporting future planning related to Coordinated Recruitment and Enrollment (CRE) to ensure the expansion of local continuums of alternative placement options for children with disabilities.

The SSIP SDT, Washington state ECSE Coordination Team, SEAC, and Association of Educational Service Districts (AESD) Special Education Directors, along with the PreK Inclusion Champions Network, WAPM SLT and WAPM Coaching & Training Network [WAPM Implementation Specialists (ISs), Practitioner Coaches (PRCs), Programs Coaches (PCs)] continue to be essential partners of the SSIP implementation process, as well as with the ECSE PreK Inclusion Initiatives that have been developed to scaffold the learning of regional ESDs, local districts, community partners, and families, as they navigate the stages of implementation science. As the work to expand WAPM and the implementation of inclusionary practices continues, along with the understanding of the implications of race and equity within educational systems and personal biases, paired with the impacts of trauma, either current, intergenerational, or historical on children and families, the SSIP State Leadership has expanded collaboration opportunities to ensure greater representation of CPs and families from across 0–5 early childhood systems. This includes representation from the OSPI Office of Native Education (ONE), Committee members and representatives from the IDEA Part C State Lead Agency [Early Support for Infants and Toddlers (ESIT)], the Early Hearing-loss Detection, Diagnosis and Intervention (EHDDI) State Advisory, and most recently, the ECSE Focus Group convened to support target setting as it relates to early childhood. Each advisory group has been actively engaged in collective influence, identifying issues, solving problems, and taking action to ensure all students have access to high quality early learning environments across Washington state. Opportunities to engage have varied in an effort to be responsive to the needs of CPs at the state, regional, and local levels, offering monthly network meetings (PreK Inclusion Champion (PIC) Network), bi-weekly OSPI ECSE updates on hot topics (ECSE Coordination Team meetings) editing and writing sessions for upcoming guidance (ESIT and EHDDI), access to statewide advisories, including the ECSE Focus Group, CRE, and Integrated Early Childhood Programming in partnership with DCYF. To increase family and CP engagement at the local level, OSPI has leveraged federal IDEA Section 619 activity funds to incentive local districts to hold permanent positions on their PWLTs, and to include them in all relevant trainings and technical assistance opportunities related to the implementation of WAPM, inclusionary practices, race/equity, and/or the impacts of trauma.

Project outcomes cited by district partners engaged in the Washington state PreK Inclusion Champions Initiatives include:

- 'While this Leadership Team had only a short period of time together, much work was accomplished, especially as it relates to broadening the understanding of inclusive practices and the breadth of work needed ahead to create a truly inclusive system. This grant allowed the team to begin sensemaking and to begin some concrete tasks towards inclusive

practice including joint family activities, alignment of curriculum and assessment tools, and shared professional development across preschool groups.'

- 'Our Action Plans for Year 3 include expanding our knowledge and practice of using peer supported learning in classrooms, as well as Universal Design for Learning. As we continue to build staff knowledge and capacity, we plan to have all of our Inclusive Preschool classrooms use the 50/50 model beginning 20221–23, continue with the in-class model for students with disabilities in Head Start and ECEAP, and begin to implement a braided model with ECEAP services for at least one classroom in the 20221–23 school year.'

The Washington state ECSE Coordination Team continues to be an essential partner group, with intentional efforts made to assess current technical assistance and professional learning and modify as deemed necessary. With the support of national technical assistance partners from ECTA, IDC, and Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), the Washington state ECSE Coordination Team has been responsive to the needs of the practitioners in the field of early learning and ECSE by developing technical assistance materials supporting federal indicators; B-6, B-7, and B-12. Partners within this group have also been deemed WAPM Implementation Specialists and SSIP RLs and, in turn, have become the master trainers and coaches within their regions, ensuring that all training and technical assistance is aligned across regions, regardless of geographic location and local district size. This shift in engagement has empowered the ECSE Coordination Team to become the leaders of MTSS and WAPM implementation within their agencies, which in turn has ensured the successful integration of each framework within agency cross-sector and cross-divisional project work. These outcomes reinforce the belief of the SDT that increased efforts to support educational practitioners in the field with updated technical assistance, professional learning, and coaching will improve data quality in the long term.

To better support the SSIP RLs, the SSIP State Leads modified the engagement plan, moving from a summer retreat, paired with three SDT meetings, to monthly meetings with RLs (expanding from three to five ESDs), State Leads, and IDC and NCSI TA partners. With this collaboration, in addition to the three SDT meetings with the larger partner group, this shift ensures opportunities for the RLs to fully engage in all improvement strategies, ensuring greater understanding of their roles and responsibilities within each stage of implementation. It was also through this partnership that OSPI ECSE and Early Learning were able to leverage PDG funds to hire an ECSE Inclusion Specialist, who has become an integral player in leading the WAPM Training and Coaching Network, and developing data management tools and communication systems (Smart Sheets Dashboards) that allow partners at each level of implementation to access key data metrics related to implementation (e.g., statewide LDPIISA analysis), professional development content (e.g., upcoming training opportunities), technical assistance (e.g., coaching materials and resources) and directly submit data collected by SSIP implementation sites.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (Yes / No)
YES

Describe how the state addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

The driving force behind the SSIP Implementation Project continues to be the SSIP SDT. At their request, the SDT convenings will be modified to bi-monthly meeting commencing spring of 2022 and continuing through the months leading to the next report submission. It was shared by the

SDT partners that they would like a more interactive role in the oversight of this implementation process, especially as CPs find themselves moving into the second year of the COVID Pandemic and are continuing to inventory short- and long-term impacts.

CPs identified evaluation tool alignment as a key concern throughout the SSIP implementation reporting cycle. CPs noted that intentional alignment of evaluation instruments is critical in promoting efficacy and fidelity in practice and provides the critical data needed to inform future decision-making processes across a mixed delivery system. In response to this concern, the SSIP SDT employed the use of the BIRS to capture current baseline data related to critical data as it relates to trauma-informed practices, race and equity, and inclusionary practice. In partnership with WAPM implementation specialists, the SSIP SDT developed professional development offerings to disseminate BIRS technical assistance to programs participating in initial to full implementation practices. It has also been suggested that the SSIP SDT and RLs work with agency cross-sector partners at DCYF-ECEAP and Head Start to collect preliminary BIRS data across the mixed delivery system.

Additionally, technical assistance offerings were developed to promote data literacy and analysis as criteria within the WAPM training sequence for SSIP program data coordinators. The SSIP SDT intends to offer quarterly data coordinator convenings to promote data-informed decision-making processes statewide to further inform infrastructure development and program progress. The SDT concluded that it was in the best interest of all parties to develop a data platform to better align the data collection process. In partnership with the Pyramid Model Consortium (PMC), the SSIP SDT will launch the PIDS in spring 2022 to further promote input and analysis processes necessary for scale up and sustainability in practice. For this reason, the SSIP State Leaders will maintain ongoing and intentional collaboration with the National Center of Pyramid Model Innovations (NCPMI) and PMC, with participation in shared professional learning and Pyramid Model Implementation Data System (PIDS) Network convenings.

To promote alignment in practice and technical assistance across a mixed delivery system, the State Design Team developed a content review process to provide community partners with opportunities to provide feedback related to content development and materials. Through content review meetings, SSIP SDT noted the imminent need to center on family/community voice, trauma-informed practice, inclusionary practice, and race and equity in all aspects of the implementation framework, cascading logic model, and theory of action. Accordingly, the state has employed an ongoing content review process to review all technical assistance content to further advance/promote family and community voice, trauma-informed practice, race and equity, and inclusionary practice for future training and coaching opportunities. The SSIP SDT regularly participates in technical assistance offerings and provides ongoing feedback as part of the content review process.

The SSIP SDT executed a contract in November 2021 with Swan Innovations to review existing technical assistance training materials and plan dialogue with tribal early learning programs to adapt materials for use in tribal early learning programs, State Compact Schools, and Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) Schools in Washington state. Swan Innovations offers unique and transformational experiences for Indigenous Communities, and those who serve them, by providing innovative training and creative health and wellness content aligned with Indigenous values and

worldview. Following the content review and analysis conducted by Swan Innovation consultants Dr. Martina Whelshula, PhD., and Cree Whelshula, a written summary of collected feedback and recommended revisions and adaptations from Tribal Consultation about the WAPM Coaching and Training materials. This planned review will be conducted to intentionally incorporate cultural teachings and practices related to the impacts of historical trauma as it relates to the implementation of WAPM.

These efforts were further strengthened with the support of the AESD Special Education Directors. The input and support of the AESD Regional Special Education Directors has become essential, as they are the leadership overseeing the work completed by the SSIP RLs and Implementation Sites. It is under their guidance that we have been able to expand our network and continue to explore various methods of scale-up across the state of Washington (e.g., PIC Network, Inclusionary Practices Professional Development Project (IPP) ECSE Demo Sites, MTSS PreK–12 Alignment).

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the state intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

As the SSIP state leads continue to collaborate with internal and external partners, several opportunities have arisen within the last year that will positively impact students with disabilities and Washington state's efforts to increase the implementation of inclusionary practices and MTSS alignment, PreK–12+.

In January 2020, Governor Jay Inslee issued Directive of the Governor 20-01 to Secretary Hunter of DCYF and a letter to Superintendent Reykdal at OSPI for the agencies to work together to identify near-term administrative efficiencies and longer-term strategies to improve the alignment and integration of high-quality early learning programs administered by both agencies. The directive acknowledges the need for robust agency cross-sector partnerships to increase kindergarten readiness for Washington children by expanding access to high-quality PreK programming through greater alignment and integration of existing systems. The complexities of the current systems, combined with national conversations about voluntary universal preschool, and the expansion of Transitional Kindergarten (TK) in school districts across the state, present an opportunity to dig deeper into how DCYF and OSPI systems interact and bring about the systematic changes needed to ensure Washington's children have access to high-quality, inclusive PreK classrooms that make lasting impacts on their healthy development and school readiness. While continuing to respond to the ongoing pandemic, DCYF and OSPI formed a core team to drive coordination and planning, as well as a statewide cross-agency workgroup to advise the work. The cross-agency workgroup consisted of partners representing school district and community-based early learning programs, advocacy groups, community colleges, and other regional and state organizations, all of whom will support and maintain their advisory role under this initiative, and a supplemental statewide advisory, the CRE Committee.

As Washington makes progress towards the goal of universal access to preschool experiences for all interested families and children, it is critical that OSPI and DCYF CPs tap into the existing strengths of the mixed delivery system in order to:

1. Remove barriers created through the use of multiple funding sources, policies, and regulations.
2. Ensure adequate placement options/access to a RECP for children with disabilities.
3. Create greater alignment among programs (e.g., coordinated recruitment and enrollment, curriculum, quality).
4. Expand systems that are responsive to child and family needs, including comprehensive services, translation/interpretation, transportation needs, and work schedules.

Throughout the state, OSPI initiatives like the PIC Network and the WAPM, are beginning to pave the way for creating responsive systems and collaborative partnerships that will increase access to high-quality, inclusive classrooms. Both agencies are in the early planning stages of an ECEAP & Developmental Preschool Integrated Programming pilot, which will be connected to OSPI's Special Education SSIP—B-17. The intent of this work will be to align local schools with CPs holding contracts to facilitate state-funded PreK and impact on policy and procedural change across state-funded PreK programs currently collaborating with local districts' Developmental PreK programs. Merging DCYF agency recommendations with technical assistance available through the ECTA, NCPMI, the TIES Center, and others, will enable a significant opportunity to affect the way programs deliver high-quality, inclusive PreK experiences to all children in the state, regardless of services delivered through DCYF contract providers and OSPI/school districts as a united team.

Efforts are underway to develop and refine a vision for a WAPM Coaching & Training Fidelity of Implementation sequence to support children ages, 0–3 years, to expand current WAPM efforts to reach children and early childhood systems, 0–5 years and beyond. This supports the WAPM SLT in meeting their vision of better supporting the systems that partner with the adults in children's lives to promote social-emotional health for children, prenatal to age five years. Three separate convenings (initiated September 7, 2021–January 2022) have occurred to strategically align this work with current practice, supporting seamless policy and practice alignment as it relates to the WAPM framework.

Similarly, recognizing the integration and alignment of inclusionary practices and MTSS infrastructures into our K–3 systems is critical to student outcomes, OSPI's ECSE and Early Learning division has joined forces to prioritize the integration of WAPM, race/equity, inclusionary practices, and trauma-informed practices within TK programs. Intentional alignment between TK and WAPM strengthens the quality of instructional practices. Deliberate and intentional coordinated collaboration meetings (ongoing bi-weekly meetings) continue to support the partnerships necessary to provide increased access to RECPs, with the development of Regional Implementation Teams (RITs), bringing together EL Coordinators, ECSE Coordinators, DCYF ECEAP and Head Start CPs to elevate an innovative and collaborative partnership.

Washington has an opportunity to reimagine a stronger, more aligned early learning and education system that prioritizes quality, inclusion, and family choice. High-quality early learning programs promote children's development, learning, health, and safety. Longitudinal research shows that high-quality programming has a lasting impact on the lives of our state's young learners from kindergarten and into adulthood. This alignment and integration work will bring needed changes to how children and families are served in their communities. Integrated early learning programs can be advanced through a commitment to cross-agency partnerships, well-supported high-quality

programming, intentional interagency, community-based collaborations, and future investments. In closing, the data summarized in this report is a call to action for increased collaboration and support for integrated early learning settings.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

The SSIP SDT developed a comprehensive timeline to inform current practice and promote the increased collaboration and support needed to meet the SiMR. The state launched the Integrated PreK: Aligning and Integrating Early Learning Programs project work on September 1, 2021. Phase I of this project extends from September 2021–January 2022, while Phase II of this project will span from January 2022–September 2022. Data sources for this work include the ECEAP saturation study, B-6 LRE data, and WAPM associated EBPs and data sources (e.g., TPOT, BIRS, LDPISA, EC-BoQ).

The state launched the Inclusive Transitional Kindergarten (ITK) Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) Project in mid-December 2021. Phase I of this project extends from SY 2021–June 2022. Phase II of this project will span from SY 2022–June 30, 2023. Data sources for this work will include the ECEAP saturation study, regional data collected from the Indicators and Elements of High-Quality Inclusionary Practices (Program-Field Review), and WAPM associated EBPs and correspondent data sources (e.g., TPOT, BIRs, LDPISA, EC-BoQ).

In partnership with DCYF, SSIP SDT leads developed the SSIP ECEAP/Developmental Disability (DD) PreK Integrated Programming Pilot with an anticipated spring 2022 launch. A core advisory committee has been developed to support ongoing planning and policy and practice alignment necessary to support identified SiMR outcome, including cross-agency policy and procedures necessary to expand access to students with disabilities across EL programs. Data sourcing and alignment will be reflected in the DCYF Saturation Study, RFA, and QRIS.

With the PDG Leadership Team, the SSIP SDT launched the WAPM 0–5 years Implementation Framework Project work in mid-December 2021. This project is anticipated to extend to December 2022. In 2021–22 and 2022–23, the OSPI’s Special Education and Early Childhood Education will draft and present a manual on transition practices for children exiting ESIT Birth to Three (IDEA Part C) and entering an LRE (IDEA Part B). The vision for this manual is that all children and their families benefit from a family-centered, statewide framework that supports coordinated, effective, equitable, culturally, and linguistically responsive transitions from early intervention to preschool special education services and/or the ECEAP, Head Start, and other high-quality early childhood settings.

In partnership with Swan Innovations, the SSIP SDT executed a contract in November 2021 to review existing technical assistance training materials and plan dialogue with tribal early learning programs to adapt materials for use in tribal early learning programs, State Compact Schools, and Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) Schools in Washington state. This work will include a written summary of collected feedback and recommended revisions and adaptations from tribal consultation about the WAPM Coaching and Training materials to foster healing of historical trauma among indigenous children, families, and early learning educators. This project is anticipated to extend into two phases. Phase 1 will extend from November 2021–June 30, 2022. Phase II will extend from July 1, 2022–June 30, 2023.

With the expansion of MTSS through WAPM, the SSIP SDT has welcomed partners representing Washington MTSS to support in the development of the SSIP Logic Model, Evaluation Plan, and Theory of Action to further enhance alignment. The goals of this project include supporting the implementation of MTSS, providing training and alignment to practice in Washington state, providing training and alignment of coaching statewide, and building capacity to scale up MTSS in Washington. Exploration of framework in alignment began in fall 2020 with MTSS implementation launching in fall 2021. The SSIP SDT anticipates that instrument cross-walking and future alignment (e.g., BIRS, EC-BoQ, DCA) will support future progress monitoring and analysis. Consequently, the SSIP SDT have identified the need to integrate a statewide data system to help support programs in data analysis and decision-making.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Though not new, the impacts of COVID-19 and the resulting pandemic have had a significant impact on our educational system and how students with disabilities are supported within their local district's early childhood program. As shared by one local district engaging in the LEAP PreK inclusion model, "remote methods were employed for staff sessions and a mix of virtual-learning with reduced class sizes for students due to our region's safety and health restrictions in response to the COVID-19 pandemic."

The most recent variable impacting the delivery of services and larger vision of expanding the continuum of alternative placement options for children with disabilities is statewide staff shortages. This has resulted in SSIP Implementation Teams having difficulty convening staff to engage in the required WAPM Training & Coaching Fidelity of Implementation sequence, including Program Wide Leadership Team meetings, professional learning, and CP and family recruitment activities. To be responsive to this need, the SSIP state leads have created two implementation tracks using the stages of implementation science, which allow local districts to choose to engage in either "Exploration and Installation" or "Initial and Full Implementation" activities under the supervision of their SSIP RLs.

17—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17—OSEP Response

The state has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The state provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The state provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the state has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

17—Required Actions

None

ABBREVIATIONS GLOSSARY

Abbreviation	Definition
AESD	Association of Educational Service Districts
APR	Annual Performance Report
BIE	Bureau of Indian Education
BIR	Behavior Incident Report
BIRS	Behavior Incident Report System
BoQ	Benchmark of Quality
C.F.R.	Code of Federal Regulations
CBO	Community-Based Organizations
CCTS	Center for Change in Transition Services
CIFR	Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting
CIID	Center for the Integration of IDEA Data
CISL	Center for the Improvement of Student Learning
COM1-8	Communicating with Families
COS	Child Outcomes Summary
CPs	Community Partners
CQI	Continuous Quality Improvement
CRE	Coordinated Recruitment and Enrollment
CSA	Coordinated Service Agreement
CTE	Career and Technical Education
DaSy	Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems
DCA	District Capacity Assessment
DCYF	Department of Children, Youth, and Families
DD	Developmental Disability
DEC	Division for Early Childhood
Department	U.S. Department of Education
DLLs	Dual Language Learners
DOH	Washington Department of Health
EAA	Expedited Assessment Appeals
EBPs	Evidence-Based Practices
EC-BoQ	Early Childhood Program-Wide PBS Benchmark of Quality
ECEAP	Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program
ECO	Early Childhood Outcomes Center
ECSE	Early Childhood Special Education
ECTA	Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center
EHDDI	Early Hearing-loss Detection, Diagnosis and Intervention
EL	Early Learning
ELA	English Language Arts

Abbreviation	Definition
EMAPS	EDFacts <i>Metadata and Process System</i>
ESD	Educational Service District
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
ESIT	Early Support for Infants and Toddlers
ESSA	Every Student Succeeds Act
ESSER	Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief
FAPE	Free, Appropriate Public Education
FFY	Federal Fiscal Year
GED	General Equivalency Degree
HEA	Higher Education Act
HIPAA	Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act
HSBP	High School and Beyond Plan
HSBP	High School
IDC	IDEA Data Center
IDEA	Individuals with Disabilities Education Act
IEP	Individualized Education Program
INF1-7	Supporting Family Use of the Pyramid Model Practices
IPK	Integrated PreK
IPP	Inclusionary Practices Professional Development Project
IS	Implementation Specialist
ITK	Inclusive Transitional Kindergarten
K	Kindergarten
L&I	Washington Department of Labor & Industries
LDPISA	Local District Preschool Inclusion Self-Assessment
LEA	Local Educational Agency
LEAP	Learning Experiences—An alternative Program for Preschoolers and Parents
LRE	Least Restrictive Environment
MTSS	Multi-Tiered System of Supports
N/A	Not Applicable
NCII	National Center for Intensive Intervention
NCPMI	National Center of Pyramid Model Innovations
NCSI	National Center for Systemic Improvement
NTACT:C	National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative
ONE	Office of Native Education
OSEP	Office of Special Education Programs
OSPI	Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
PAVE	Partnerships for Action Voices for Empowerment
PBC	Practice-Based Coaching
PBIS	Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports
PC	Programs Coach

Abbreviation	Definition
PD	Providing Directions
PDG	Preschool Development Grant
PIC	PreK Inclusion Champion
PICT	Preschool Inclusion Collaboration Team
PIDS	Pyramid Model Implementation Data System
PMC	Pyramid Model Consortium
pp	Percentage Points
PRC	Practitioner Coach
PreK	Preschool
PSC	Partner Support Center
PTI	Parent Training and Information
PTR-YC	Prevent-Teach-Reinforce for Young Children
PWLTs	Program-Wide Leadership Teams
QRIS	Quality Rating and Improvement System
RCW	Revised Code of Washington
RECPs	Regular Early Childhood Programs
RFAs	Request for Applications
RICs	Regional Implementation Coordinators
RIT	Regional Implementation Team
RLs	Regional Leads
RTI	Academic Response to Intervention
SBAC	Smarter Balanced Assessment (or Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium)
SBE	State Board of Education
SDT	State Design Team
SEA	State Educational Agency
SEAC	Special Education Advisory Council
Section 508	Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973
SEL	Social Emotional Learning
SiMR	State-identified Measurable Result(s)
SLT	State Leadership Team
SLT-BoQ	State Leadership Team Benchmark of Quality
SPDG	State Personnel Development Grant
SPP	State Performance Plan
SSIP	State Systemic Improvement Plan
SY	School Year
TA	Technical Assistance
TBE	Teaching Behavior Expectations
TFS2	Transition Systemic Framework 2.0
TK	Transitional Kindergarten
TPOT	Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool

Abbreviation	Definition
TSG	Teaching Strategies GOLD®
U.S.	United States
U.S.C.	United States Code
UDL	Universal Design for Learning
WA-AIM	Washington Access to Instruction & Measurement
WAC	Washington Administrative Code
WaKids	Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills
WAPM	Washington Pyramid Model
WAPM-SLT	Washington Pyramid Model State Leadership Team
WCAS	Washington Comprehensive Assessment of Science
WIOA	Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act
WISM	Washington Integrated System of Monitoring

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:

Tania May

Title:

Assistant Superintendent Special Education

Email:

tania.may@k12.wa.us

Phone:

360-725-6075

Submitted on:

04/28/22 12:02:37 PM

LEGAL NOTICE



Except where otherwise noted, this work by the [Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction](#) is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution License](#). All logos and trademarks are property of their respective owners. Sections used under fair use doctrine (17 U.S.C. § 107) are marked.

Alternate material licenses with different levels of user permission are clearly indicated next to the specific content in the materials.

This resource may contain links to websites operated by third parties. These links are provided for your convenience only and do not constitute or imply any endorsement or monitoring by OSPI.

If this work is adapted, note the substantive changes and re-title, removing any Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction logos. Provide the following attribution:

This resource was adapted from original materials provided by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. Original materials may be accessed at [Special Education Data Collection | OSPI \(www.k12.wa.us\)](#).

OSPI provides equal access to all programs and services without discrimination based on sex, race, creed, religion, color, national origin, age, honorably discharged veteran or military status, sexual orientation including gender expression or identity, the presence of any sensory, mental, or physical disability, or the use of a trained dog guide or service animal by a person with a disability. Questions and complaints of alleged discrimination should be directed to the Equity and Civil Rights Director at 360-725-6162 or P.O. Box 47200 Olympia, WA 98504-7200.

Download this material in PDF at [Special Education Data Collection | OSPI \(www.k12.wa.us\)](#). This material is available in alternative format upon request. Contact the Resource Center at 888-595-3276, TTY 360-664-3631.



**ESTD
1889**

*All students prepared for post-secondary pathways,
careers, and civic engagement.*



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Chris Reykdal | State Superintendent
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building | P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200