



Washington Office of Superintendent of  
**PUBLIC INSTRUCTION**

*Washington State Performance Plan /  
Annual Performance Report: Part B  
For STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the Individuals with Disabilities  
Education Act  
– FFY 2018*

# Glenna Gallo

## Assistant Superintendent of Special Education

### Prepared by:

- **Tania May**, Director, Director of Special Education  
[taniamay@k12.wa.us](mailto:taniamay@k12.wa.us) | 360-725-6075
- **Tina Pablo-Long**, Director of Special Education Operations  
[tina.pablo-long@k12.wa.us](mailto:tina.pablo-long@k12.wa.us) | 360-125-6075
- **Jennifer Story**, Program Improvement Coordinator, Special Education  
[jennifer.story@k12.wa.us](mailto:jennifer.story@k12.wa.us) | 360-725-6075
- **Sandy Grummick**, Program Supervisor  
[sandy.grummick@k12.wa.us](mailto:sandy.grummick@k12.wa.us) | 360-725-6075

### Submission:

U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Special Education Programs  
January 31, 2020



Washington Office of Superintendent of  
**PUBLIC INSTRUCTION**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	2
Indicator Data.....	2
Executive Summary.....	2
General Supervision System.....	3
Technical Assistance System .....	4
Professional Development System .....	5
Stakeholder Involvement.....	6
Reporting to the Public .....	7
Prior FFY Required Actions .....	8
OSEP Response.....	9
Required Actions.....	10
Indicator 1: Graduation.....	10
Indicator 2: Drop Out .....	14
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs .....	17
Indicator 3C: Proficiency of Students with IEPs.....	22
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion .....	27
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion.....	34
Indicator 5: Education Environments (Children 6-21).....	38
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments (Children 3-5).....	41
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes (Children 3-5) .....	43
Indicator 8: Parent Involvement.....	50
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation.....	53
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation .....	57
Indicator 11: Child Find .....	61
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition.....	65
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition .....	70
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes.....	74
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions.....	81
Indicator 16: Mediation .....	83
Legal Notice .....	85

# INTRODUCTION

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

## Indicator Data

### Executive Summary

Efforts are focused on indicators leading to improved outcomes in post-secondary education, employment, and independent living, and incorporate activities that address the following six areas:

1. Leadership to support students with disabilities (including increased collaboration and ownership regarding students with disabilities of school administrators and staff) and coordinated efforts with community organizations to improve results and reduce disproportionality
2. Growth mindset and increasing expectations of students with disabilities (e.g., standards, instruction, graduation, assessments, and IEP-related decisions)
3. Evidence-based instruction/interventions/practices within a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework leading to increased access and progress in Washington grade-level learning standards
4. Common professional development (PD) for general educators, special educators, paraeducators, administrators, and parents/families (e.g., IEP team members) addressing all of the above
5. Resource allocation (braiding, consolidated application, reducing costs for administrative tasks, increasing direct support to students, data-based decision-making)
6. Teacher recruitment and retention (including teacher preparation programs for administrators, general educators, special educators, and related service providers) around instruction and support for students with disabilities, including all of the above

Stakeholders are ready and supportive of the system-wide changes needed and have suggested more rigorous targets for Indicators 5A-C, 6A-B, 7A-C, 8, 14A-C, and 15-16. Washington State's approved ESSA Plan specifically addresses the performance of students with disabilities and will result in the majority of identified schools due to the instruction provided to, and outcomes resulting from, students with disabilities. As a result, and for the first time ever, coordinated efforts across OSPI divisions are actively analyzing the root cause of the current data as well as resulting impacts on other student groups, and creating a comprehensive plan that is specifically targeting improvement efforts regarding the outcomes of students with disabilities.

Washington State is committing more resources to address areas in which there was slippage or targets were not met, including least restrictive environment for ages 3-5 (Indicator 6A-B), early childhood outcomes (Indicator B7A-C), and rates of students with disabilities enrolled in higher education (Indicator B14A). This also aligns with the new graduation pathways in the state, effective 2020.

The June 20, 2019 Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Determination Letter states that Washington State needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), for more than two years, and directs Washington State to report with this FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission on two elements - Technical Assistance (TA) sources accessed and actions taken as a result. Washington continues to work with multiple national TA Centers, including the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII), and Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) (to support the Indicator B17 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) efforts), the Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID), the IDEA Data Center (IDC) (to support data integration, analysis, and accuracy efforts across the agency), and the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR) (to ensure IDEA funds are used efficiently, appropriately, and in collaboration with other improvement efforts, when appropriate). Additionally, our OSEP-assigned TA has provided frequent technical assistance, resulting in practice and policy shifts.

As a result of the TA received, Washington State was able to complete an in-depth analysis of data specific to students with disabilities, review research and policy, and begin efforts to identify root causes of the current outcomes, as well as implement the SSIP, which is resulting in a reduction of the early literacy gap between kindergartners with disabilities and typically-developing peers. These efforts are continuing and ramping up with additional resources during FFY 2019.

**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 work groups. The Operations (i.e., Data and Fiscal Management) Work Group has responsibilities for data collection and analysis, Safety Net, and all aspects of fiscal oversight including allocation and regulation of federal funding. The Integrated Program Improvement Work Group is responsible for implementation of the Washington Integrated System of Monitoring (WISM), an outcome-based, data-driven monitoring framework which has significantly increased the potential for improving student outcomes with emphasis on consistency between a sufficient evaluation, an appropriate Individualized Education Program (IEP), and the delivery of specially designed instruction (SDI) for each eligible student. The

Dispute Resolution Work Group has responsibility for dispute resolution, including activities such as IEP facilitation, citizen complaint investigations, resolution sessions, mediations, and oversight of due process hearings. Planning and provision of universal professional development, technical assistance, and early childhood oversight are integrated across all aspects of the General Supervisory System. There has been a continued focus on engaging stakeholders involved in, or affected by, special education services and outcomes for students with disabilities to review, analyze, and plan for system improvements and celebrate successes.

Additional information and data may be located at <https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education>.

## Technical Assistance System

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

The data included in this report, as well as other available data, have been analyzed at the state level, and analyses with school district staff are held at least annually as part of comprehensive improvement efforts, including those under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Washington continues to see progress in the graduation rates of students with disabilities, participation in statewide assessments, proficiency in the statewide reading assessment in all grades and in math in grades 3-5, increasing rates of time spent with general education peers for students ages 6-21 (as appropriate), percentage of parents who report that the school facilitated their involvement, and substantial rates of compliance.

The State has several mechanisms in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and professional development support as part of its formal Technical Assistance System. Facilitation for direct school district access to technical assistance and professional development resources designed to improve educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities has continued to be enhanced during FFY 2018. As noted in last year's submission, an online Resource Library was developed and added to the OSPI special education website that includes research-based and evidence-based practices related to increasing and sustaining educational results for all students (<http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/ResourceLibrary/default.aspx>). The State continues to add to the Resource Library website as new resources are identified that delineate the role of school leaders (principals, vice-principals, administrators, etc.) for ensuring the provision of the free, appropriate public education (FAPE) for students with disabilities. The online Resource Library is an example of the State's facilitation of special education improvement efforts to expand dissemination of evidence-based and promising practices for the development of academic, health, and post-school outcomes for students eligible under IDEA Part B. In addition to the online Resource Library, the State Needs Project eLearning for Educators

(<http://www.evergreen.edu/elearningforeducators>) continues to expand the online course catalog with technical assistance and professional development opportunities for all educators from paraeducators through master educators.

Technical assistance resources continue to be allocated through Coordinated Service Agreements (CSAs) with the nine regional Educational Service Districts (ESDs) and through seven State Needs Projects. The ESDs provide extensive technical assistance directly aligned with each of the indicators in the State Performance Plan based on regional performance profiles routinely updated in accordance with the APR cycles. The State Needs Projects collectively assist with statewide capacity for enhancing student outcomes through professional development opportunities, targeted and intensive technical assistance, and consultation and training for parents, families, and educators. Areas of expertise include, but are not limited to, sensory disabilities, secondary transition, assistive technology, and specially designed instruction provided within a continuum of placement options. More information may be located at <https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education>.

## Professional Development System

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

Professional Development Systems are in place to ensure service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities. Professional development systems, including regional and Local Education Agencies (LEAs), are designed to address state and local needs as determined by data analyses, stakeholder input, and state and local priorities. Professional Development activities are designed to support professional learning that will engage leaders in the work of developing effective system processes and support structures to create a culture of collaboration that will positively impact teacher knowledge and skills to improve student learning. Examples of recommendations consistent with special education priorities and needs identified include:

- Use of evidence-based approaches to making decisions about the design of professional learning opportunities;
- System-wide use of the Standards for Professional Learning as a means to communicate priorities and distributive leadership;
- Increase data literacy at all levels;
- Seek to understand and recognize the pressures associated with standardized assessment and leverage test results as a useful tool for examining data on student learning and progress;
- Link professional learning activities directly to teachers' content knowledge and support teachers as they teach that content to students;
- Scale-up support systems state-wide in order to build high quality professional learning; and
- Explore strategies to address the specific elements identified by ESSA in its definition of professional development which emphasizes the importance of "...sustainability (not

stand-alone, 1-day, and short-term workshops), intensity, collaboration, job-embedded, data-driven, and classroom focused..." characteristics.

The State Needs Projects also contribute significantly to the professional development systems in the State of Washington. For example, the eLearning for Educators State Needs Project has successfully launched a new ground-breaking course titled "Washington State Consistency Index Initiative". The Washington State Special Education Consistency Index (SECI) is a measure of the congruency between (a) the student's sufficient evaluation for special education services, (b) the development of a properly formulated IEP, and (c) the provision of specially designed instruction (SDI) and related services to that student. A fundamental premise for the application of the Consistency Index is the greater the consistency between these three elements, the greater the likelihood that coordinated and intentional instructional efforts will positively influence student outcomes. Course completion leads to certification as a Certified Scorer and access to the companion Data Collection & Reporting Platform developed and maintained by the Center for Change in Transition Services State Needs Project.

Educational Service Districts also provide professional development services to member districts based on locally-identified needs. A primary focus includes the provision of workshops and coursework for educators designed specifically to improve academic results for students with disabilities. Topical examples include universal design for learning (UDL), literacy, math, science, early childhood, provision of specially designed instruction, migrant and bilingual, as well as curriculum selection and adoption.

## **Stakeholder Involvement**

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

Washington State continues to benefit from broad and extensive stakeholder input on all aspects of its State Performance Plan, including the setting of, and if needed, the revision of performance targets. The overarching external stakeholder group is the Washington State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC). This stakeholder group typically includes a roster of members from IDEA-required multi-disciplinary fields including K-12 education, mental health, parent advocacy, early childhood, secondary transition, vocational rehabilitation, juvenile justice, and higher education.

Washington State engaged in several comprehensive planning and development activities which continued throughout FFY 2018 to review trend data for both compliance and results indicators and to study the impact of improvement activities implemented as a result of the previous State Performance Plan cycle. Both internal and external stakeholders representing parents, local districts, regional educational agencies, vocational and rehabilitation providers, early childhood professionals, and community partners were actively involved in these ongoing planning and development activities. Input and feedback mechanisms included video conferencing, Zoom webinars, Regional LEA Director Meetings, community/agency visits, and individualized conference calls.



As a direct result of the stakeholder recommendations solicited during the planning and development activities, targets were set for the results indicators and data trends were reviewed for compliance indicators. OSPI is strategically positioned to leverage resources, reduce duplication of efforts, and maximize efforts to increase educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities as we continue to solicit input and implement respective recommendations from key stakeholders, including stakeholder input currently embedded in Washington State's ESSA Plan.

## Reporting to the Public

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 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 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.**

The State continued to publicly post and report on both SEA and LEA performance on the original FFY 2012 (and adjusted) SPP targets. The FFY 2017 data were posted (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection>) in February 2019. Complete copies of the Washington SPP and APR are located at on the same web page.

The APR is disseminated throughout the state via OSPI's website (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection>) and the agency's social media accounts (Twitter, RSS feeds, Facebook). This information was also distributed in the February 2019 special education monthly update, through the Partnerships for Action Voices for Empowerment (PAVE – parent training and information center), to stakeholder committees who gave substantial input and feedback to the development of this document, and to the SEAC. This information will also be presented at regional ESD meetings and various conferences throughout the state.

Data showing the performance of each LEA in the state on the SPP and APR indicators are posted on the data profiles at <https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection> (Indicators 1 through 14, and timely reporting status). Districts enter their unique county-district number on the data profile, and their district's performance data can be compared to statewide data at a glance. Districts also use these data to complete their LEA federal fund applications.

Accommodations Data for State and District: <https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/state-special-education-data-collection-summaries> then scroll down the page to "Part B Assessments".

Statewide Smarter Balanced Assessment:  
<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for Washington State", choose Diversity Report, then choose Student Performance by Student

Program and Characteristic.

Statewide Alternate Assessment:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for Washington State", scroll down the page, then choose "Assessment" in the Student Performance Section, and then choose "Details".

District Smarter Balanced Example:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Spokane School District" and click "GO", choose Diversity Report, then choose Student Performance by Student Program and Characteristic.

District Alternate Assessment Example:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Seattle School District" and click "GO", scroll down the page, then choose "Assessment" in the Student Performance Section, and then choose "Details".

School Level Smarter Balanced Example:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Ballard High School" and click "GO", choose "Diversity Report", then choose "Student Performance by Student Program and Characteristic".

School Alternate Assessment Example:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Maya Angelou Elementary School, Pasco School District" and click "GO", scroll down the page, then choose "Assessment" in the Student Performance Section, and then choose "Details".

## Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2018 and 2019 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2019 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 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, 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. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP.

Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term

outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

### **Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

The June 20, 2019 Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Determination Letter states that Washington State needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), for more than two years, and directs Washington State to report with this FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission on two elements - Technical Assistance (TA) sources accessed and actions taken as a result. Washington continues to work with multiple national TA Centers, including the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII), and Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) (to support the Indicator B17 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) efforts), the Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID), the IDEA Data Center (IDC) (to support data integration, analysis, and accuracy efforts across the agency), and the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR) (to ensure IDEA funds are used efficiently, appropriately, and in collaboration with other improvement efforts, when appropriate). Additionally, our OSEP-assigned TA has provided frequent technical assistance, resulting in practice and policy shifts.

- The State will report on the SSIP progress and activity.

As a result of the TA received, Washington State was able to complete an in-depth analysis of data specific to students with disabilities, review research and policy, and begin efforts to identify root causes of the current outcomes, as well as implement the SSIP, which is resulting in a reduction of the early literacy gap between kindergartners with disabilities and typically-developing peers. These efforts are continuing and ramping up with additional resources during FFY 2019.

- The SSIP data and activities will be reported in April 2020.

### **OSEP Response**

The State's determinations for both 2018 and 2019 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 20, 2019 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, 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.

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

## Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

The State must report, with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

## Indicator 1: Graduation

### *Instructions and Measurement*

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

### **Instructions:**

- Sampling is not allowed.
- Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

- Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.
- Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.
- States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

#### Indicator 1: Historical Data

Baseline:		2017			54.90%
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	85.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	54.90%
Data	54.55%	55.84%	57.97%	58.74%	59.41%

#### Indicator 1: Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	58.10%	61.30%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In Washington's revised and approved ESSA Consolidated Plan dated January 12, 2018, the on-time (four year) adjusted cohort graduation rate for 2016–17 was used as the baseline year. The annual increment was calculated by dividing the total graduation gap by 10 years. As a result, 3.2% will be the increment used to determine the annual improvement targets for each school year, from 2017–18 through 2027–28. Baseline is 54.9% in FFY 2017 with a 10-year goal to achieve 90% for all students and all student groups by 2027-28.

For the FFY 2017 submission: Targets for this indicator are set in Washington's Consolidated Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Plan, most recent version dated January 2018, located at: Washington's ESSA Consolidated Plan (<https://www.k12.wa.us/policy-funding/grants-grant-management/every-student-succeeds-act-essa-implementation>).

The State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) approved these recommendations at the October 2018 meeting. Information regarding the stakeholders included and minutes of the meeting are posted at Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) (<https://www.k12.wa.us/about-ospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisory-council-seac>).

#### Indicator 1: Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	6,517
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	9,328
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	69.86%

#### Indicator 1: FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

# of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	# of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
6,517	9,328	59.41%	58.10%	69.86%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:** Not applicable

**Graduation Conditions:**

**Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:** 4-year ACGR

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.** Washington State Requirements for the Class of 2018:

**Total credits required:** 20

Subject	# of Credits Req'd	Additional Information
<a href="#">English</a>	4	
<a href="#">Math</a>	3	Algebra 1 or Integrated Math 1 Geometry or Integrated Math 2 Algebra 2 or Integrated Math 3, or a 3rd credit of math*
<a href="#">Science</a>	2	At least one lab
<a href="#">Social Studies</a>	3	U.S. History and Government Contemporary World History, Geography, and Problems .5 credits of <a href="#">Civics</a> .5 credits of Social Studies Elective
<a href="#">Arts</a>	1	Performing or visual arts
<a href="#">Health and Fitness</a>	2	.5 credits of Health 1.5 credits of Fitness Students must earn credit for physical education unless excused per <a href="#">RCW 28A.230.050</a>
<a href="#">Occupational Education</a>	1	A CTE course, or a course that meets the definition of an exploratory course as described in the <a href="#">CTE program standards</a>
<a href="#">Electives</a>	4	

\*A student may elect to pursue a 3rd credit of math other than algebra 2 or integrated math 3 if the elective choice is based on a career oriented program of study identified in the student's High School and Beyond Plan, and the student, parent or guardian, and a school representative meet, discuss the plan, and sign a form ([WAC 180-51-067](#)).

### Non-Credit Requirements

- [High School and Beyond Plan](#)
- Washington State History

### Assessments

(See [OSPI testing webpage](#). For more information on state-approved alternative assessments see [OSPI graduation alternatives webpage](#).)

- High school grade English language arts Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC)\* (or state-approved alternative)
- One math End-of-Course Exam (EOC) in Algebra 1/Integrated Math 1 **or** Geometry/Integrated Math 2 **or** high school math Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC) (or state-approved alternative)
- Students will take a high school science exam, the WCAS (Washington Comprehensive Assessment of Science) aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards, in 11th grade. It is not a graduation requirement and students will not need to pass the test to graduate.

\*Students need to meet a [graduation score](#), set by the State Board of Education in August 2015,

to meet graduation requirements. The graduation score is different from the [college- and career-ready score](#) (Level 3 on the Smarter Balanced assessments).

Districts may have local requirements. The requirements for the Class of 2018 are described in WAC 180-51-067 (<http://app.leg.wa.gov/wac/default.aspx?cite=180-51-067>).

**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 Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) approved these recommendations at the October 2018 meeting. Information regarding the stakeholders included and minutes of the meeting are posted at <https://www.k12.wa.us/about-osp/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisory-council-seac>.

**Indicator 1: Prior FFY Required Actions:** None

**Indicator 1: OSEP Response:** The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**Indicator 1: Required Actions:** None

## **Indicator 2: Drop Out**

### *Instructions and Measurement*

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

**Instructions:**

- Sampling is not allowed.
- Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.
- If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.
- Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of



the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

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

## Indicator 2: Historical Data

Baseline		2005			5.70%
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	5.70%	5.65%	5.60%	5.55%	5.50%
Data	8.18%	4.93%	6.34%	6.74%	6.43%

## Indicator 2: Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	5.45%	5.45%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In conjunction with stakeholder input (i.e., SEAC) on January 7, 2020, the FFY 2019 target was determined to be rigorous, yet achievable based on historical data trends and current performance under this indicator. See introduction for more information regarding ongoing stakeholder participation and input.

## Indicator 2: Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,880
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	288
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	23
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	2,904
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	27

## Indicator 2: FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

# of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total # of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,904	43,901	6.43%	5.45%	6.61%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:** Washington state has increased the requirement for credits for graduation from 20 to 24 beginning for the Class of 2019 and beyond, and local school districts may have additional requirements, as well. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, OSPI, in collaboration with stakeholders, the State Board of Education, and the Washington Legislature, has examined and revised graduation requirements further in 2019 to equitably address the needs of all students. Comprehensive Technical Assistance (TA) and Professional Development (PD) are being provided to school district staff and leadership regarding equity, planning for graduation, and aligning IEP transition plans with state-required High School and Beyond Plans. IEP teams are being supported with additional TA and PD, including an increased emphasis on accessing CTE pathways and coursework for students with disabilities. This is a multi-year plan that coincides with drastic changes to the state graduation requirements.

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

Dropouts are defined as any student who leaves school for any reason, except death, before completing school with a high school diploma or transferring to another school with a known exit reason. A student is considered a dropout regardless of when dropping out occurs (i.e., during or between regular school terms). A student who leaves during the year but returns during the reporting period is not considered a dropout.

Dropouts include those students who provide a reason for dropping out, those who leave school to attempt/obtain a GED, and those students who have an unconfirmed transfer or who were enrolled but stopped attending and no further information could be found for these students.

There is no differentiation of the definition of dropout between students with or without disabilities.

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

**Indicator 2: Prior FFY Required Actions:** None

**Indicator 2: OSEP Response:** The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**Indicator 2: Required Actions:** None

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### *Instructions and Measurement*

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A)):

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

**Data Source:** Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

**Measurement:** Participation rate percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs participating in an assessment}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window})]$ . Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### **Instructions:**

- Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.
- Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.
- Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs.
- Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
- Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### Indicator 3B: Data Indicator

#### Reporting Group Selection

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

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

### Indicator 3B: Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3-5	2009	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Grade 3-5	97.53%	Actual	95.53%	93.02%	93.10%	93.06%	94.26%
B	Grade 6-8	2009	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
B	Grade 6-8	96.36%	Actual	94.05%	91.12%	91.90%	92.46%	93.00%
C	HS	2009	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
C	HS	85.42%	Actual	87.72%	45.49%	58.65%	53.66%	87.23%

### Indicator 3B: Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3-5	2009	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Grade 3-5	97.42%	Actual	95.37%	92.47%	92.81%	92.76%	94.01%
B	Grade 6-8	2009	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
B	Grade 6-8	96.33%	Actual	93.63%	90.39%	91.29%	91.89%	92.47%
C	HS	2009	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
C	HS	87.19%	Actual	78.80%	40.33%	51.70%	50.56%	84.37%

**Indicator 3B: Targets:** Targets for all areas of participation is 95% or greater as set by the Office of Special Education Programs.

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets for this indicator are set in Washington's Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, most recent version dated January 2018, located at: <https://www.k12.wa.us/policy-funding/grants-grant-management/every-student-succeeds-act-essa-implementation>.

**Indicator 3B:** FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

**Data Source:** SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589), **Date:** 04/08/2020

### Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	Gr 3	Gr 4	Gr 5	Gr 6	Gr 7	Gr 8	Gr 9	Gr 10	Gr 11	Gr 12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	13,141	13,478	13,461	12,510	11,599	11,113		10,364			
b. IEPs in regular assessment w/ no accommodations	9,600	9,584	9,385	8,740	8,001	7,806		7,351			
c. IEPs in regular assessment w/accommodations	1,954	2,361	2,608	2,298	2,120	1,760		1,020			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	870	858	837	792	758	727		789			

**Data Source:** SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 04/08/2020

### Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	Gr 3	Gr 4	Gr 5	Gr 6	Gr 7	Gr 8	Gr 9	Gr 10	Gr 11	Gr 12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	13,139	13,479	13,464	12,510	11,599	11,112		10,364			
b. IEPs in regular assessment w/ no accommodations	10,066	8,589	7,759	6,802	6,047	5,743		6,082			
c. IEPs in regular assessment w/accommodations	1,464	3,344	4,215	4,220	3,999	3,762		2,114			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	868	853	834	784	763	728		782			

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	# of Children with IEPs	# of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
<b>A</b>	Grade 3-5	40,080	38,057	94.26%	95.00%	94.95%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
<b>B</b>	Grade 6-8	35,222	33,002	93.00%	95.00%	93.70%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

<b>C</b>	HS	10,364	9,160	87.23%	95.00%	88.38%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
----------	----	--------	-------	--------	--------	--------	---------------------	-------------

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	# of Children with IEPs	# of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
<b>A</b>	Grade 3-5	40,082	37,992	94.01%	95.00%	94.79%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
<b>B</b>	Grade 6-8	35,221	32,848	92.47%	95.00%	93.26%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
<b>C</b>	HS	10,364	8,978	84.37%	95.00%	86.63%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:** Not applicable for this indicator.

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

#### Public Reporting Information:

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

Accommodations Data for State and District: <https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/state-special-education-data-collection-summaries>, then scroll down the page to "Part B Assessments".

Statewide Smarter Balanced Assessment:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for Washington State", choose Diversity Report, then choose Student Performance by Student Program and Characteristic.

Statewide Alternate Assessment:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for

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

District Smarter Balanced Example:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Spokane School District" and click "GO", choose Diversity Report, then choose Student Performance by Student Program and Characteristic.

District Alternate Assessment Example:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Seattle School District" and click "GO", scroll down the page, then choose "Assessment" in the Student Performance Section, and then choose "Details".

School Level Smarter Balanced Example:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Ballard High School" and click "GO", choose Diversity Report, then choose Student Performance by Student Program and Characteristic.

School Alternate Assessment Example:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Maya Angelou Elementary School, Pasco School District" and click "GO", scroll down the page, then choose "Assessment" in the Student Performance Section, and then choose "Details".

### **Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**Indicator 3B: Prior FFY Required Actions:** None

**Indicator 3B: OSEP Response:** The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**Indicator 3B:** Required Actions: None

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency of Students with IEPs

### *Instructions and Measurement*

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A)):

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

**Data Source:** Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

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

#### **Instructions:**

- Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.
- Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.
- Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
- Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.



### Indicator 3C: Data Indicator

#### Reporting Group Selection

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

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

#### Indicator 3C: Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3-5	2015	Target >=	88.10%	100.00%	17.50%	24.10%	30.70%
A	Grade 3-5	25.99%	Actual	38.07%	23.85%	25.99%	24.76%	26.97%
B	Grade 6-8	2015	Target >=	82.50%	100.00%	17.50%	24.10%	30.70%
B	Grade 6-8	17.14%	Actual	29.79%	14.35%	17.14%	17.47%	19.03%
C	HS	2017	Target >=	87.20%	100.00%	17.50%	24.10%	30.70%
C	HS	52.44%	Actual	41.72%	13.88%	52.44%	37.73%	24.26%

#### Indicator 3C: Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3-5	2015	Target >=	79.00%	100.00%	13.80%	20.70%	27.60%
A	Grade 3-5	26.20%	Actual	34.28%	24.65%	26.20%	25.43%	25.97%
B	Grade 6-8	2015	Target >=	79.30%	100.00%	13.80%	20.70%	27.60%
B	Grade 6-8	14.02%	Actual	23.04%	11.52%	14.02%	14.43%	15.03%
C	HS	2017	Target >=	81.20%	100.00%	13.80%	20.70%	27.60%
C	HS	21.29%	Actual	31.44%	7.29%	21.29%	13.76%	11.29%

#### Indicator 3C: Targets:

Content Area	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Grade 3-5	37.30%	43.90%
Reading	A >=	Grade 3-5	37.30%	43.90%
Reading	B >=	Grade 6-8	37.30%	52.54%
Math	B >=	Grade 6-8	34.50%	41.40%
Math	C >=	HS	34.50%	41.40%
Math	C >=	HS	34.50%	41.40%

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

As reported in FFY 2017, Washington State's ESSA Plan uses 2015–16 data as the baseline year, which is 17.5 percent for ELA and 13.8 percent for Math. Stakeholder groups brought together for ESSA and IDEA assisted with the development of the revised baseline and targets.

See introduction for information regarding stakeholder participation and input. Targets for this indicator are set in Washington's Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, most recent version dated January 12, 2018, located at: <https://www.k12.wa.us/policy-funding/grants-grant-management/every-student-succeeds-act-essa-implementation>

## FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

**Data Source:** SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 04/08/2020

## Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	Gr 3	Gr 4	Gr 5	Gr 6	Gr 7	Gr 8	Gr 9	Gr 10	Gr 11	Gr 12	HS
a. Children w/ IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	12,424	12,803	12,830	11,830	10,879	10,293		9,160			
b. IEPs in regular assessment w/ no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,831	2,708	2,552	1,655	1,562	1,314		1,885			
c. IEPs in regular assessment w/ accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	294	337	401	244	281	175		194			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	492	481	443	451	432	424		265			

**Data Source:** SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 04/08/2020

## Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	Gr 3	Gr 4	Gr 5	Gr 6	Gr 7	Gr 8	Gr 9	Gr 10	Gr 11	Gr 12	HS
a. Children w/ IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	12,398	12,786	12,808	11,806	10,809	10,233		8,978			
b. IEPs in regular assessment w/ no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,326	2,659	1,900	1,212	1,064	831		464			
c. IEPs in regular assessment w/ accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	186	243	188	164	160	118		55			
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	479	498	510	438	436	356		473			

## FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

		Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned		Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Group	Group Name								
<b>A</b>	Grade 3-5	38,057		10,539	26.97%	37.30%	27.69%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
<b>B</b>	Grade 6-8	33,002		6,538	19.03%	37.30%	19.81%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
<b>C</b>	HS	9,160		2,344	24.26%	37.30%	25.59%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

## FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
<b>A</b>	Grade 3-5	37,992	9,989	25.97%	34.50%	26.29%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
<b>B</b>	Grade 6-8	32,848	4,779	15.03%	34.50%	14.55%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
<b>C</b>	HS	8,978	992	11.29%	34.50%	11.05%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:** Not applicable for this indicator.

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

### Public Reporting Information:

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

Accommodations Data for State and District: <https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/state-special-education-data-collection-summaries>, then scroll down the page to "Part B Assessments".

Statewide Smarter Balanced Assessment:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for Washington State", choose Diversity Report, then choose Student Performance by Student Program and Characteristic.

Statewide Alternate Assessment:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for Washington State", scroll down the page, then choose "Assessment" in the Student Performance Section, and then choose "Details".

District Smarter Balanced Example:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Spokane School District" and click "GO", choose Diversity Report, then choose Student Performance by Student Program and Characteristic.

District Alternate Assessment Example:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Seattle School District" and click "GO", scroll down the page, then choose "Assessment" in the Student Performance Section, and then choose "Details".

School Level Smarter Balanced Example:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Ballard High School" and click "GO", choose Diversity Report, then choose Student Performance by Student Program and Characteristic.

School Alternate Assessment Example:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Maya Angelou Elementary School, Pasco School District" and click "GO", scroll down the page, then choose "Assessment" in the Student Performance Section, and then choose "Details".

## **Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**Indicator 3C:** Prior FFY Required Actions: None

**Indicator 3C: OSEP Response:** The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**Indicator 3C:** Required Actions: None

## **Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

### *Instructions and Measurement*

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

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

**Measurement:** Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of districts that meet the State-established } n \text{ size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs)}}{\text{(\# of districts in the State that meet the State-established } n \text{ size (if applicable))}} \right] \text{ times } 100$ . Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

#### Indicator 4A: Historical Data

Baseline:		2016			2.51%
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	7.50%	7.00%	6.50%	6.25%	2.50%
Data	3.37%	3.70%	3.33%	2.51%	0.72%

#### Indicator 4A: Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	2.50%	2.25%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) approved the FFY 2019 recommendation for target revisions at the January 7, 2020 meeting. Information regarding the stakeholders included and minutes of the meeting are posted at <https://www.k12.wa.us/about-ospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisory-council-seac>.

Based on a review of trend data indicating a performance of less than 4% for multiple consecutive years the State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) discussed and recommended to decrease the target based on an annual review of data demonstrating improved performance by LEAs. In addition, there is a new agency focus on proactive school-wide and multi-tiered system of supports in an effort to reduce the need for disciplinary action. SEAC recommends the continuation of a gradual reduction in targets towards zero.

#### FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established *n* size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement:** 2

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	# of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
5	280	0.72%	2.50%	1.79%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:** Not applicable for this indicator.

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

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

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

Although Washington collects suspension/expulsion data for all students, the data definitions for the 'all students' collections are not comparable to the definitions in the IDEA 618 federal data, which is required to be used for this indicator. Therefore, data comparing all students to students with IEPs who are suspended and expelled do not exist for the State at this time. Washington will be comparing rates among districts within the State.

Washington identifies districts with significant discrepancies in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for students with IEPs through the following steps:

Calculate the State-level suspension/expulsion rate for students with IEPs for FFY 2018 (using 2017-18 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 2018 was 1.11%.

The Single State Bar is defined as the State suspension/expulsion rate plus two percent. Therefore, the Single State Bar for FFY 2018 was 3.11%.

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.

The rate of suspensions/expulsions of students with IEPs for each district is compared to the Single State Bar.

Districts that are above the Single State Bar are identified as having a significant discrepancy.

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 2018 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 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 (5) 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 ([www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection](http://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection)).

All districts are required to report special education discipline data through the Education Data System Behavior and Weapons application. A copy of the data collection instructions is located at [www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/federal-data-collection-forms](http://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/federal-data-collection-forms). Built into this online application are checks and balances ensuring that the logic of the reported data is verified prior to a district finalizing the data submission to OSPI. These logic checks are the same as those used by the Data Accountability Center's Data Transmission Sheets. The Behavior and Weapons application will not allow Districts to submit data with logic errors and will give the User an error message to correct the data. Errors must be fixed in order to allow the submission to be completed. Users will receive an immediate message informing them of a successful submission.

### **Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using FFY17- FFY18 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", five districts were identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

For all five of the districts that the State identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, OSPI reviewed and, if appropriate, required the affected district to revise the policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

All of the identified districts were required to complete a self-review of child find, evaluation, eligibility, discipline, and other related policies, procedures, and practices. If revisions were made as a result of this review, districts were required to describe those revisions in the self-review.

Revisions to formal, written special education policies and procedures were also required to be submitted to OSPI. The identified districts used the self-review process embedded in the LEA federal fund application. In addition, data collections conducted through the general supervisory system were analyzed to verify district-reported results. The State also completed a comprehensive student record review from the discrepant cells in designated districts.

The State did not identify any noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review. Although no revisions were required, the five districts identified as having a significant discrepancy under this indicator revised their policies, procedures, and/or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), and/or procedural safeguards in order to improve district performance under this indicator. The types of changes made by these five districts included, but were not limited to, the following:

Provided staff development for teachers, administrators, and paraeducators related to PBIS and other similar systems; Whole Child; trauma-informed practices, cognitive behavioral therapy, behavior data analysis, and more.

- Implemented PBIS; both tiered and universal methods, including evidence-based practices.
- Implemented the Whole Child Initiative.
- Review and revision of district's discipline policy/procedures.
- Created a Professional Learning Community to review and implement "Addressing the Root Causes of Disparities in School Discipline" from the Office of Equity & Civil Rights.

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

**The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.** Not applicable for this indicator.

**Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.** Not applicable for this indicator.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017:** Not applicable for this indicator.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017:** Not applicable for this indicator.

**Indicator 4A: Prior FFY Required Actions:** None

**Indicator 4A: OSEP Response:** The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**Indicator 4A: Required Actions:** None

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### *Instructions and Measurement*

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

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

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

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies. Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance. Targets must be 0% for 4B.

#### Indicator 4B: Historical Data

Baseline:		2016			1.66%
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.87%	0.37%	0.37%	1.66%	0.00%

#### Indicator 4B: Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	0%	0%

#### FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established *n* size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement:** 35

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	# of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
30	0	247	0	0	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:** Not applicable for this indicator.

### State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Although Washington collects suspension/expulsion data for all students, the data definitions for the 'all students' collections are not comparable to the definitions in the IDEA 618 federal data, which is required to be used for this indicator. Therefore, data comparing all students to children with IEPs who are suspended and expelled does not exist for the State at this time. Washington will be comparing rates among districts within the State.

Washington identifies districts with significant discrepancies in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions, by race or ethnicity, through the following steps:

Calculate the State-level suspension/expulsion rate for students with IEPs for FFY 2018 (using 2017-18 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 2018 was 1.11%.

The Single State Bar is defined as the State suspension/expulsion rate plus two percent. Therefore, the Single State Bar for FFY 2018 was 3.11%.

Calculate each district's rates of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for each race/ethnicity group (total number of children with IEPs who were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days for each race/ethnicity divided by the total number of children with IEPs for that race/ethnicity in the district). This process will result in each district's rates of suspensions/expulsions for each race and ethnicity group.

The rates of suspensions/expulsions by race and ethnicity for each district are compared to the Single State Bar. Districts that are above the Single State Bar for any race or ethnicity group are identified as having a significant discrepancy.

Districts with fewer than 30 children with IEPs in the identified race/ethnicity group are not included in the analysis. A total of 35 districts were excluded from the FFY 2018 calculation as a result of not meeting this minimum "n" size requirement. These districts were not included in the denominator of this calculation but were included in the calculation of the Single State Bar.

The percentage of districts in Washington identified by OSPI as having a significant discrepancy, by race/ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs for greater

than 10 days in a school year is calculated by dividing the total number of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy (30) by the total number of districts in Washington State who met the minimum "n" size requirement (247).

This information is published in the district data profile on OSPI's special education data webpage ([www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection](http://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection)).

All districts are required to report special education discipline data through the Education Data System Behavior and Weapons application. A copy of the data collection instructions is located at [www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/federal-data-collection-forms](http://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/federal-data-collection-forms). Built into this online application are checks and balances ensuring that the logic of the reported data is verified prior to a district finalizing the data submission to OSPI. These logic checks are the same as those used by the Data Accountability Center's Data Transmission Sheets. The Behavior and Weapons application will not allow Districts to submit data with logic errors and will give the User an error message to correct the data. Errors must be fixed in order to allow the submission to be completed. Users will receive an immediate message informing them of a successful submission.

#### **Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using FFY17-FFY18 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", 30 districts were identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

For each of the 30 districts that the State identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, OSPI reviewed and, if appropriate, required the affected district to revise the policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

Each of the 30 identified districts was required to complete a self-review of child find, evaluation, eligibility, discipline, and other related policies, procedures, and practices. If revisions were made as a result of this review, districts were required to describe those revisions in the self-review. Revisions to formal, written special education policies and procedures were also required to be submitted to OSPI.

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

**The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.** Not applicable for this indicator.

**Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.** Not applicable for this indicator.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017:** Not applicable for this indicator.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017:** Not applicable for this indicator.

**Indicator 4B:** Prior FFY Required Actions: None

**Indicator 4B:** OSEP Response: None

**Indicator 4B:** Required Actions: None

## **Indicator 5: Education Environments (Children 6-21)**

### *Instructions and Measurement*

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

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

#### **Measurement:**

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

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

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



21 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions:** Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

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

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

#### Indicator 5: Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	51.65%	51.85%	52.05%	52.25%	52.35%
A	49.05%	Data	52.57%	53.49%	54.35%	55.21%	56.01%
B	2005	Target <=	13.46%	13.36%	13.26%	13.16%	13.06%
B	14.11%	Data	13.22%	13.27%	13.24%	13.13%	13.13%
C	2005	Target <=	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
C	1.09%	Data	0.81%	0.84%	0.83%	0.86%	0.86%

#### Indicator 5: Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	55.00%	57.00%
Target B <=	12.96%	12.75%
Target C <=	1.00%	1.00%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On January 7, 2020, based on a review of trend data and a comparison to national data, the State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) discussed and recommended a target of 60% for 2022 by annually increasing the percentage over the next four years for Indicator 5A. FFY 2019 = 57%; FFY 2020 = 58%; FFY 2021 = 59%; and FFY 2022 = 60%. These were suggested based on Washington's data not meeting or exceeding the national average.

For indicator 5B, based on a review of trend data and a comparison to national data, the SEAC discussed and recommended to decrease the target by .25% each year through the 2022 school year. FFY 2019 = 12.75%; FFY 2020 = 12.5%; FFY 2021 = 12.25%; and FFY 2022 = 12%. These were suggested based upon Washington's data already below the national average.

For indicator 5C, based on a review of trend data and a comparison to national data, the SEAC discussed and recommended that the target continue at 1%. This was suggested based upon Washington's data already below the national average.

#### Indicator 5: Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
--------	------	-------------	------

SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	130,488
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	73,892
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16,746
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	C1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	865
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	C2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	166
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	C3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	127

**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**

	# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. # of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	73,892	130,488	56.01%	55.00%	56.63%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. # of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16,746	130,488	13.13%	12.96%	12.83%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. # of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,158	130,488	0.86%	1.00%	0.89%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Indicator 5: Prior FFY Required Actions:** None

**Indicator 5: OSEP Response:** The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 5: Required Actions:** None

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments (Children 3-5)

### *Instructions and Measurement*

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

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

#### **Measurement:**

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

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

**Instructions:** Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

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

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

### **Indicator 6: Historical Data**

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	28.45%	28.60%	28.75%	28.90%	29.05%
A	27.80%	Data	26.99%	26.35%	24.88%	24.81%	23.80%
B	2011	Target <=	38.80%	38.60%	38.40%	38.20%	38.00%
B	39.40%	Data	40.85%	40.05%	40.51%	40.96%	41.85%

### **Indicator 6: Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	29.20%	29.20%
Target B <=	37.80%	37.80%

#### **Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

On January 7, 2020, the State Special Education Advisory Council reviewed trend data for the

state and nationally, and suggested that the targets for 6A and 6B be maintained at FFY 2018 levels. While stakeholders agreed that targets for this indicator should be rigorous, yet achievable, the need for caution was also stressed. The students they are seeing are being identified at an earlier age and have more involved disabilities and needs. Given the needs of this population, serving these students in regular early childhood settings could become more challenging.

#### Indicator 6: Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	17,140
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	4,334
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	6,613
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	363
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	2

	# of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	4,334	17,140	23.80%	29.20%	25.29%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	6,978	17,140	41.85%	37.80%	40.71%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

**Indicator 6: Prior FFY Required Actions:** None

**Indicator 6: OSEP Response:** The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 6:** Required Actions: None

## **Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes (Children 3-5)**

### *Instructions and Measurement*

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source:** State selected data source

#### **Measurement:**

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning =  $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers =  $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it =  $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers =  $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Instructions:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Indicator 7: Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2008	Target >=	83.10%	83.20%	83.30%	83.40%	83.50%
A1	82.70%	Data	89.85%	91.29%	90.17%	91.19%	90.79%
A2	2008	Target >=	50.20%	50.40%	50.60%	50.80%	51.00%
A2	49.40%	Data	51.17%	49.19%	47.60%	48.91%	47.12%
B1	2008	Target >=	82.10%	82.20%	82.30%	82.40%	82.50%
B1	81.10%	Data	88.30%	89.11%	88.78%	89.93%	88.46%
B2	2008	Target >=	51.20%	51.40%	51.60%	51.80%	52.00%
B2	50.20%	Data	53.73%	50.40%	50.51%	49.67%	48.26%
C1	2008	Target >=	81.10%	81.20%	81.30%	81.40%	81.50%
C1	80.80%	Data	89.43%	89.58%	89.56%	91.20%	89.61%
C2	2008	Target >=	65.20%	65.40%	65.60%	65.80%	66.00%

## Indicator 7: Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	83.60%	83.70%
Target A2 >=	51.20%	51.20%
Target B1 >=	82.60%	82.70%
Target B2 >=	52.20%	52.20%
Target C1 >=	81.60%	81.70%
Target C2 >=	66.20%	66.20%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

On January 7, 2020, the State Special Education Advisory Council reviewed trend data for the State and suggested that the targets for Indicator 7 be maintained (7A1, A2, A3) and increased slightly (7B1, B2, B3) above FFY 2018 levels. While stakeholders agreed that targets for this indicator should be rigorous, yet achievable, the need for caution was also stressed. The students they are seeing are being identified at an earlier age and have more involved disabilities and needs. Given the needs of this population, serving these students has become more challenging.

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed:** 5,653

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

	# of Children	% of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	74	1.31%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	379	6.70%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,493	44.10%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,089	36.95%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	618	10.93%



	Numerator	Denom- inator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: <math>(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</math></i>	4,582	5,035	90.79%	83.60%	91.00%	Met Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: <math>(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</math></i>	2,707	5,653	47.12%	51.20%	47.89%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

	# of Children	% of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	75	1.33%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	472	8.35%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,351	41.59%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,063	36.49%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	692	12.24%

	Numerator	Denom- inator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,414	4,961	88.46%	82.60%	88.97%	Met Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,755	5,653	48.26%	52.20%	48.74%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

	# of Children	% of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	97	1.72%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	379	6.70%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,761	31.15%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,295	40.60%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,121	19.83%

	Numerator	Denom- inator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	4,056	4,532	89.61%	81.60%	89.50%	Met Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	3,416	5,653	61.72%	66.20%	60.43%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C2	<p>Given the slippage represent less than a 1.5 percent slippage it is difficult to pinpoint potential root causes. A comprehensive review of data disaggregated by region size indicated the slippage was spread out within five regions across the state.</p> <p>Stakeholders recommended further exploration of a) the potential correlation between increases in more inclusive environments (as reported in Indicator 6B) and access to individualized instruction to support maintain or improve functioning as the level comparable to same-aged peers and b) the degree to which increased Kindergarten performance expectations may have impacted inter-rater reliability at the LEA level. Technical assistance will be provided to those regions where slippage was noted.</p> <p>To support statewide performance the State continues to update early childhood technical assistance resources (<a href="http://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/early-childhood-special-education">www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/early-childhood-special-education</a>).</p>

**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

	<b>Yes / No</b>
Was sampling used?	NO

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

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

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

ECTACenter.org: The Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center: Improving Systems, Practices and Outcomes for Young Children with Disabilities and their Families

Washington State adopted the instruments and instructions initially developed by the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center. The state continues to use the instrument (7-point scale) and training modules developed jointly by DaSy and the ECTA Center.

The Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process is a team process for summarizing information on a child's functioning in each of the three child outcome areas using a 7-point scale ([http://dasyonline.org/olms2/COS\\_Session4](http://dasyonline.org/olms2/COS_Session4)). With the COS process, a team of individuals who are familiar with a child (including parents) can consider multiple sources of information about his/her functioning, including parent/provider observation and results from direct assessment. Additionally, the COS process allows early intervention and early childhood special education programs to synthesize information about children across different assessment tools to produce data that can be summarized across programs in the state, as well as across states for a national picture. The ECTA Center developed a print resource providing an Overview of the COS Process (<http://dasyonline.org/olms2/435692>).

**Indicator 7: Prior FFY Required Actions:** None

**Indicator 7: OSEP Response:** The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 7: Required Actions:** None

## **Indicator 8: Parent Involvement**

*Instructions and Measurement*

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source:** State selected data source.

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

## Instructions:

- Sampling **of parents from whom response is requested** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)
- Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.
- Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.
- If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.
- While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.
- Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.
- Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.
- If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.
- States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

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

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In conjunction with stakeholder input (i.e., SEAC) on January 7, 2020, the FFY 2019 target was determined to be rigorous, yet achievable based on historical data trends and current performance under this indicator.

## Indicator 8: Historical Data

Baseline		2011			21.1%
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	20.40%	21.50%	21.70%	21.90%	22.10%
Data	25.77%	19.37%	27.32%	28.68%	28.03%

### Indicator 8: Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	22.3%	22.5%

### Indicator 8: FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
316	1,044	28.03%	22.30%	30.27%	Met Target	No Slippage

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed:** 8,188

**Percentage of respondent parents:** 12.75%

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:** Not applicable.

**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.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	XXX
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	YES

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

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

The State continues to conduct an analysis to determine possible strategies for statewide technical assistance and guidance to help ensure progress and movement towards the targets in this indicator. The data for all cohort districts were reviewed and disaggregated by geographical location (regional review by ESD) and district size. Other factors considered during the analysis included a review of the response rates, the degree of representativeness of the survey

respondents, 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 including race/ethnicity and student disability. The analyses suggest that the results of the survey are statistically representative of the target population with variance noted within two of the race/ethnicity groups, and across three of the disability groups. Parents of students identified as Hispanic/Latino are slightly under-represented, while parents of students identified as White are somewhat over-represented. Parents of students identified as Hispanic/Latino are 34% of the sample but 20% of the respondents; parents of students identified as White are 50% of the sample but 61% of the respondents. The variance represented in these two race/ethnicity groups has decreased slightly in comparison to prior year analyses. Similar to prior year results, parents of students qualifying for special education under the category of Autism and Other Health Impairments are slightly over-represented, while parents of students qualifying for special education under the category of Specific Learning Disability are somewhat under-represented. Parents of students eligible under the category of Autism are 9% of the sample but 15% of the respondents and parents of students eligible under the category of Other Health Impaired are 18% of the sample but 23% of the respondents; conversely parents of students eligible under the category of Specific Learning Disability are 33% of the sample but 23% of the respondents. All areas of disability category variance have improved from the prior year.

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

The survey has not changed for many years; therefore, a survey instrument is not attached.

**Indicator 8: Prior FFY Required Actions:** None

**Indicator 8: OSEP Response:** The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**Indicator 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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

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

**Measurement:** Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate}}{\text{\# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate}} \right] \times 100$

identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

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

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

**Instructions:** Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding



the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

#### Indicator 9: Historical Data

Baseline:		2016			0%
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.37%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Indicator 9: Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	0%	0%

**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.** 11

#### Indicator 9: FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data					Status	Slippage
			FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data				
15	0	273	0.00%	0%	0.00%			Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:** 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 OSPI. The State utilizes Risk Ratios or Alternate Risk Ratios (RR) for the purpose of determining whether the district has met the state-defined threshold for disproportionate representation:

Over-representation:  $RR = 2.0$  for 3 consecutive years in the same race/ethnicity group, with a minimum cell size (numerator) of 10 and a minimum "n" size (denominator) of 20.

The source data used to calculate the RRs for FFY 2018 were the Total Enrollment Report submitted by every district in the state in October 2018, and the November 2018 Federal Special Education Child Count and LRE Report submitted by every district in the State.

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

Using the criteria established above, the State determined that 15 districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation under Indicator 9. A total of 11 districts were excluded from the calculation due to not meeting the minimum "n" size requirement.

The State analyzed the 15 districts identified through the FFY 2018 data review as having disproportionate representation to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. The identified districts were required to complete a self-review as part of the LEA federal fund application. The State provided feedback and technical assistance to districts and asked for further clarification as needed in this review. As part of the review, the State required the districts to review their policies, procedures, and practices related to child find/referral, evaluation/eligibility, placement, and discipline.

The State examined the results of each district's self-review of child find/referral, evaluation/eligibility, placement, discipline, and other related policies, procedures, and practices submitted through the LEA federal fund application, as well as a review of each district's written special education policies and procedures. In addition, data collections conducted through the general supervisory system were analyzed to verify district-reported results. The State also completed a comprehensive student record review within the disproportionate cells across designated districts.

As a result of this process, the State found that all of the 15 identified districts were in compliance with child find, eligibility, and evaluation requirements. In these 15 districts, the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education was not the result of inappropriate identification.

## Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

**Indicator 9: Prior FFY Required Actions:** None

**Indicator 9: OSEP Response:** None

**Indicator 9: Required Actions:** None

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation

### *Instructions and Measurement*

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

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

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

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

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

education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

**Instructions:** Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

#### Indicator 10: Historical Data

Baseline:		2016			0%
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.49%	0.37%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Indicator 10: Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	0%	0%

**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.** 48

### Indicator 10: FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
62	0	236	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:** 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 OSPI. The State utilizes Risk Ratios or Alternate Risk Ratios (RR) for the purpose of determining whether the district has met the state-defined threshold for disproportionate representation:

Over-representation:  $RR = 2.0$  for 3 consecutive years in the same race/ethnicity group, with a minimum cell size (numerator) of 10 and a minimum "n" size (denominator) of 20.

The source data used to calculate the RRs for FFY 2018 were the Total Enrollment Report submitted by every district in the state in October 2018, and the November 2018 Federal Special Education Child Count and LRE Report submitted by every district in the state.

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

Using the criteria established above, the State determined that 62 districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation under Indicator 10. A total of 48 districts were excluded from the calculation due to not meeting the minimum “n” size requirement.

The State analyzed the 62 districts identified through the FFY 2018 data review as having disproportionate representation to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. The identified districts were required to complete a self-review as part of the LEA federal fund application. The State provided feedback and technical assistance to the districts and asked for further clarification as needed in this review. As part of the review, the State required the districts to review their policies, procedures, and practices related to child find/referral, evaluation/eligibility, placement, and discipline.

The State examined the results of each district’s self-review of child find/referral, evaluation/eligibility, placement, discipline, and other related policies, procedures, and practices submitted 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 62 identified districts were in compliance with child find, eligibility, and evaluation requirements. In these 62 districts, the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was not the result of inappropriate identification.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

<b>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
0	0	0	0

**Indicator 10: Prior FFY Required Actions:** None

**Indicator 10: OSEP Response:** None

**Indicator 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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

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

**Measurement:**

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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

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

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of

policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

#### Indicator 11: Historical Data

Baseline:	2005			98%	
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.05%	99.26%	99.27%	99.27%	99.30%

#### Indicator 11: Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	100%	100%

#### Indicator 11: FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
30,431	30,235	99.30%	100%	99.36%	Did Not Meet	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:** Not applicable

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)** 196

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

Of the 50 LEAs not meeting the target, a review of both the range of days beyond the timeline the evaluation was completed and the reason(s) for the delay(s) was conducted.

For those 196 children whose evaluations were not completed on time or under federal exception:

- 76% (149) were late due to district scheduling and/or staffing issues with no agreement to extend;
- 10.2% (20) the evaluations were late due to other issues not specified by the district; 7.1% (14) were due to the agreement to extend did not meet requirements;
- 3.1% (6) family scheduling/child not available; and



- 2.0% (4) testing/evaluation delays; and
- 1.5% (3) data/tracking errors.

With regard to the range of days for the 196 students reported above, a total of 75% (147) were delayed 15 school days or less and 25% (49) were delayed more than 15 school days.

Further data analysis addressing the reasons for delay and an examination of the range of days by geographic region and district size groupings within each of the nine regions, was completed and discussed with stakeholders. There were no emerging patterns or trends identified in a specific LEA or region. Universal supports are provided for the correction of noncompliance to all LEAs not at 100% compliance through the designated regional professional development system.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

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

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

Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 392-172A-03005(3): When the student is to be evaluated to determine eligibility for special education services and the educational needs of the student, the school district shall provide prior written notice to the parent, obtain consent, fully evaluate the student, and arrive at a decision regarding eligibility within: (a) Thirty-five school days after the date written consent for an evaluation has been provided to the school district by the parent; or (b) Thirty-five school days after the date the consent of the parent is obtained by agreement through mediation, or the refusal to provide consent is overridden by an administrative law judge following a due process hearing; or (c) Such other time period as may be agreed to by the parent and documented by the school district, including specifying the reasons for extending the timeline. (d) Exception. The thirty-five school day time frame for evaluation does not apply if: (i) The parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (ii) A student enrolls in another school district after the consent is obtained and the evaluation has begun but not yet been completed by the other school district, including a determination of eligibility. (e) The exception in (d)(ii) of this subsection applies only if the subsequent school district is making sufficient progress to ensure a prompt completion of the evaluation, and the parent and subsequent school district agree to a specific time when the evaluation will be completed.

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year.

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

A statewide data collection process was implemented in FFY 2006. All districts continue to report evaluation and eligibility data on all children referred to Part B for initial eligibility determination. The data collection template and its instructions are located at <https://www.k12.wa.us/student->

[success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/federal-data-collection-forms](#). Built into this template are checks and balances ensuring that the logic of the reported data is verified prior to a district submitting the data to OSPI. Districts submitting data templates with logic errors receive an immediate email returning the report and requiring it to be fixed and resubmitted. Data are not considered submitted until those logic checks are passed.

This indicator was calculated using raw data submitted by local districts through a report form that was included in the State's required data reports as outlined in Bulletin No. 96-18 Federal Special Education Data Reporting Requirements.

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
48	48	0	0

### FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The State verified that the districts with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2017 APR: (a) corrected all individual cases of noncompliance, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008; and (b) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) based on a review of updated data.

In order to verify that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, a review of updated data, conducted by regional ESD representatives and validated by OSPI, was completed. Verification activities included on-site visits, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. This review verified 100% compliance; the districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).

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

The identified districts corrected and accounted for all individual instances of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. The districts identified root causes of the noncompliance, and reviewed policies, procedures, and/or practices that contributed to the noncompliance. The correction of identified noncompliance was summarized and reported to OSPI through the IDEA Compliance Package (see the iGrants Form Package 442 attachment).

Special education representatives from the regional ESDs and OSPI verified that the 48 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made.

Verification activities included on-site visits, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. Regional ESD representatives reviewed data to verify that the noncompliance was corrected. All 48 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.

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2017 for Indicator 11 was corrected within one year of identification.

**Indicator 11: Prior FFY Required Actions:** None

**Indicator 11: OSEP Response:** Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**Indicator 11: Required Actions:** None

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### *Instructions and Measurement*

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

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source:** Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data.

**Measurement:**

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less

than 90 days before their third birthdays.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## Indicator 12: Historical Data

Baseline:		2005			83%
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.89%	98.07%	97.65%	98.65%	98.31%

**Indicator 12: Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	100%	100%

**Indicator 12: FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	4,052
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	651
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	3,232
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	66
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	21
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and	3,232	3,314	98.31%	100%	97.53%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:** Not applicable

**Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f:** 82

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

Of the 35 LEAs not meeting the target, a review of both the range of days beyond the timeline that the evaluation was determined and the IEP developed (if found eligible), and the reason for the delay was completed.

For those 82 children whose evaluations were not completed on time or under federal exception:

- 65.9% (54) were late due to district scheduling and/or staffing issues;
- 13.4% (11) were because the student was referred late to Part B;

- 13.4% (11) were due to the family and district agreeing to extend the timeline;
- 3.7% (3) were due to data or tracking issues; and
- 3.7% (3) were due to the transition meeting not occurring at least 90 days prior to the student's third birthday.

With regard to the range of days for the 82 students reported above 56% (46) were delayed 15 calendar days or less, 22% (18) were delayed 16 to 29 calendar days beyond the child's third birthday, and 22% (18) were completed 30 or more calendar days beyond the child's third birthday.

Further data analysis addressing the reasons for delay and an examination of the range of days by geographic region and district size groupings within each of the nine regions, was completed and discussed with stakeholders. There were no emerging patterns or trends identified with one exception. In addition to the universal supports provided for the correction of noncompliance to all LEAs not at 100% compliance, targeted and/or intensive technical assistance will be provided to this LEA through the designated regional professional development system.

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year.

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

A statewide data collection process was implemented in FFY 2006. All districts continue to report evaluation and eligibility data on all children referred to Part B for initial eligibility determination. The data collection template and its instructions are located at <https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/federal-data-collection-forms>. Built into this template are checks and balances ensuring that the logic of the reported data is verified prior to a district submitting the data to OSPI. Districts submitting data templates with logic errors receive an immediate email returning the report and requiring it to be fixed and resubmitted. Data are not considered submitted until those logic checks are passed.

This indicator was calculated using raw data submitted by local districts through a report form that was included in the State's required data reports as outlined in Bulletin No. 96-18 Federal Special Education Data Reporting Requirements.

#### **Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

<b>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
24	24	0	0

#### **FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The State verified that the districts with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2017 APR: (a) corrected all individual cases of noncompliance, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09–02, dated October 17, 2008; and (b) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) based on a review of updated data.

In order to verify that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, a review of updated data, conducted by regional ESD representatives and validated by OSPI, was completed. Verification activities included on-site visits, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. This review verified 100% compliance; the districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 CFR §300.124(b).

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

The identified districts corrected and accounted for all individual instances of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. The districts identified root causes of the noncompliance, and reviewed policies, procedures, and/or practices that contributed to the noncompliance. The correction of identified noncompliance was summarized and reported to OSPI through the IDEA Compliance Package (see the iGrants Form Package 442 attachment).

Special education representatives from the regional ESDs and OSPI verified that the 24 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made.

Verification activities included on-site visits, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. Regional ESD representatives reviewed data to verify that the noncompliance was corrected. All 24 districts were found to have developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any student for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district.

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2017 for Indicator 12 was corrected within one year of identification.

**Indicator 12: Prior FFY Required Actions:** None

**Indicator 12: OSEP Response:** Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**Indicator 12: Required Actions:** None

## **Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

### *Instructions and Measurement*

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

**Compliance indicator:** Secondary transition: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source:** Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### **Measurement:**

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

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 SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's



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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

### Indicator 13: Historical Data

Baseline:		2009			83.7%
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	92.11%	95.79%	93.94%	95.22%	95.81%

### Indicator 13: Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	100%	100%

### Indicator 13: FFY 2018 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 2017	FFY 2018	FFY 2018	Status	Slippage
		Data	Target	Data		
1,159	1,195	95.81%	100%	96.99%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable:** Not applicable

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

State monitoring.

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

These data are collected from the State's monitoring activities, which include on-site visits, off-site desk reviews, and files submitted for Safety Net reimbursement.

During the monitoring review, a comprehensive student file review is conducted which includes

IEPs of students turning 16 and above to determine whether the elements described below are appropriately documented in the IEP:

- Evidence that the measurable post-secondary goal(s) were based on age appropriate transition assessment(s).
- Measurable post-secondary goal(s) that are updated annually and address education, training, employment, and if appropriate, independent living skills.
- Transition services that focus on improving academic and functional achievement of the student to facilitate their movement from school to post-school settings.
- Course(s) of study needed to assist the student in reaching the identified postsecondary goal(s).
- Annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable the student to meet the identified post-secondary goal(s).
- Evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed.
- 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.

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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 2017 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 95.81% compliance in FFY 2017. Twenty-nine districts were determined to be noncompliant with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b) and 300.321(b). The districts were notified in writing of the identified noncompliance and were required to correct this noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.

The State verified that the 29 districts with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2017 APR: (a) corrected all individual cases of noncompliance, unless the student was no longer within the

jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09–02, dated October 17, 2008; and (b) were correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.320(b) and 300.321(b) based on a review of updated data.

In order to verify that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, a review of updated data, conducted by regional Educational Service Districts (ESD) representatives and validated by OSPI, was completed. Verification activities included on-site visits, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, observations, etc. This review verified 100% compliance; the districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 CFR §300.320(b) and 300.321(b).

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

The 29 identified districts corrected and accounted for all individual instances of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. The districts identified root causes of noncompliance and reviewed policies, procedures, and/or practices that contributed to the noncompliance. The correction of identified noncompliance was summarized and reported to OSPI through the IDEA Compliance Package (see the iGrants Form Package 442 attachment).

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, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, observations, etc. All 29 districts were found to have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district.

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2017 for Indicator 13 was corrected within one year of identification.

**Indicator 13: Prior FFY Required Actions:** None

**Indicator 13: OSEP Response:** Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**Indicator 13: Required Actions:** None

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### *Instructions and Measurement*

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

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

- Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source:** State selected data source.

#### **Measurement:**

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

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

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school,

including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

## **I. Definitions**

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

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

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

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

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

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

## **II. Data Reporting**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Indicator 14: Historical Data**

	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
A	2013	Target >=	25.60%	25.70%	25.80%	25.90%	26.00%
A	23.74%	Data	23.74%	22.30%	22.13%	21.79%	21.31%
B	2013	Target >=	48.95%	49.15%	49.35%	49.55%	49.75%
B	52.11%	Data	52.11%	53.21%	55.56%	57.13%	56.08%
C	2013	Target >=	67.03%	67.13%	67.23%	67.33%	67.43%
C	65.13%	Data	65.13%	67.38%	70.46%	72.21%	72.19%

#### Indicator 14: Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	26.10%	26.20%
Target B >=	49.95%	52.21%
Target C >=	67.53%	70.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input:** In conjunction with stakeholder input (i.e., SEAC) on January 7, 2020, the FFY 2019 target was determined to be rigorous, yet achievable based on historical data trends and current performance under this indicator. See introduction for more information regarding ongoing stakeholder participation and input.

As noted in Washington's SPP Submission February 2015 (State Response to OSEP Review Notes: The State revised its FFY 2013 through FFY 2018 targets for 14B and 14C to reflect improvement from FFY 2009 baseline.)

#### Indicator 14: FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	6,825
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,396
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2,470
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)	275
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).	956

	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school						
	Number of respondent youth		FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,396	6,825	21.31%	26.10%	20.45%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	3,866	6,825	56.08%	49.95%	56.64%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	5,097	6,825	72.19%	67.53%	74.68%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

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

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	XXX

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



Washington state conducted the Post-School Survey census to collect post-school outcome data from all 2017-2018 school-year leavers one year after they exited high school. Districts utilized administrative records to generate a list of all leavers (who had not re-enrolled in school and were alive at the time of data collection). School district personnel attempted to contact all leavers using informal student exit survey information and student records. The majority of districts recorded at least three attempts to contact each of their leavers and reported any reason for being unable to conduct the survey with each former student or their designated family member (i.e., parent or grandparent). All survey data are recorded online in the Transition Systemic Framework 2.0 (TSF2).

### *Response Rate*

As generated using the Response Rate Calculator 8,901 youth left school during the 2017-2018 school year, had not re-enrolled in secondary school, and were alive at the time of data collection. Contact was made with 7,031 leavers or their designated family members and interviews were conducted with 6,825 individuals. The contact rate was 79.0% (7,031 divided by 8,901) and the response rate was 76.7% (6,825 divided by 8,901).

The overall response rate indicates that out of 8,901 students who left school last year, post-school outcome information for 23.3% (2,076) of former students was not obtained. Of the 2,076 leavers with no outcome data, 291 of these leavers did not have data because their surveys were never started (e.g., school district personnel did not reach out to the leavers). An additional 1 leaver had an incomplete survey as school district personnel attempted to contact the leaver but did not complete the survey.

This total number of leavers (291 not started/1 incomplete) was not included in the count of 1,784 non-responders. Of the 1784 non-responders, educators reported a variety of reasons for non-response, including poor or no contact information (30.3%), unable to reach after three attempts (54.7%), declined interview (11.5%), and other reasons (3.5%).

### *Representativeness*

After the census was conducted, the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) Response Calculator was used to measure the representativeness of the respondent group. Calculations were made on the characteristics of disability type, race/ethnicity, gender, and exit status in order to determine whether the leavers who responded to the interviews were similar, or different from, the total population of young adults with an IEP who exited school in 2017-18.

According to the NTACT 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.

Washington state was able to gather data from a representative group, meeting the recommendations provided by NTACT for all groups (excluding leavers who dropped out of school). Students who dropped out (didn't receive a diploma) continue to be under-represented

in the current response group (-5.61%).

#### *Selection Bias*

Post-school outcome data collection continues to show representativeness in areas of disability, gender, and ethnicity. Students who dropped out of school continue to be under-represented in the current response group (-5.61%). This slight increase in under-representation from the previous year is likely due to improved training and user permissions in the data collection platform. In an analysis of data collection from previous years, it was determined that some districts were deleting dropped-out students from the system. CCTS included additional emphasis in Post-School Survey trainings that dropped out students are considered leavers and must be included in the survey. In addition, new security permissions were added to the TSF2 that decreased the number of users who are able to delete students from the system. Students who drop are historically more difficult to contact as reported by districts and in the literature. Instead of deleting those leavers from the system as was done by some districts in prior years, they were included in this survey and counted as non-responders.

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

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

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

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

The survey has not changed for many years, therefore a survey instrument is not attached.

**Indicator 14: Prior FFY Required Actions:** In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2018 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 14: Response to Required Actions in FFY 2017 SPP/APR:** As seen in the NTACT Response Calculator – Representativeness table, students who dropped out of school continue to be under-represented in the current response group (-5.61%). This slight increase in under-representation from the previous year is likely due to improved training and user permissions in the data collection platform. In an analysis of data collection from previous years, it was

determined that some districts were deleting dropped-out students from the system. CCTS included additional emphasis in Post-School Survey trainings that dropped out students are considered leavers and must be included in the survey. In addition, new security permissions were added to the TSF2 that decreased the number of users who are able to delete students from the system. Students who drop are historically more difficult to contact as reported by districts and in the literature. Instead of deleting those leavers from the system as was done by some districts in prior years, they were included in this survey and counted as non-responders. These additional students may have negatively impacted the response data.

In addition to continued training and data collection platform improvements, CCTS will identify districts with the highest response rates for dropouts and gather information to determine specific strategies that may be additional to the strategies already included in trainings. CCTS will consider districts with a low response rate of dropouts and target those districts with additional training opportunities.

**Indicator 14: OSEP Response:** The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this Indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 14: Required Actions:** In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2019 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### *Instructions and Measurement*

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source:** Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (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, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

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

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

#### Indicator 15: Indicator Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	72
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	28

**Description of Stakeholder Input:** On January 7, 2020, based on a review of trend data and a comparison to national data, the State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) discussed and recommended increasing the target by 0.25% above FFY 2018 = 26.75%.

#### Indicator 15: Historical Data

Baseline:		2013		27.66%	
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	25.25%	25.50%	25.75%	26.00%	26.25%
Data	27.66%	18.75%	33.33%	30.77%	32.14%

#### Indicator 15: Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	26.50%	26.75%

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional):** Updated Baseline Year to reflect FFY 2013 as previously accepted by OSEP.

#### Indicator 15: FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements						
	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
28	72	32.14%	26.50%	38.89%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Indicator 15: Prior FFY Required Actions:** None

**Indicator 15: OSEP Response:** The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this Indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**Indicator 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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source:** Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (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 resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

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

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

### Indicator 16: Indicator Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	72
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	8
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	55

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. Yes

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input:** On January 7, 2020, based on a review of trend data and a comparison to national data, the State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) discussed and recommended increasing the target by 0.1% above FFY 2018 = a range between 75.6% and 85.6%.

#### Indicator 16: Historical Data

Baseline:		2013			78%
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	75.00%				75.4% - 85.40%
Data	78.00%	84.62%	77.50%	88.89%	95.59%

#### Indicator 16: Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	75.5-85.5%	75.6-85.6%

#### Indicator 16: FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status
8	55	72		95.59%	75.5-85.5%	87.5%	Met Target
							No Slippage

**Indicator 16: Prior FFY Required Actions:** None

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional):** Updated Baseline Year to reflect FFY 2013 as previously accepted by OSEP.

**Indicator 16: OSEP Response:** The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this Indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Indicator 16: Required Actions: None.

# LEGAL NOTICE



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

*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.*



**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