

# Washington State Special Education Monitoring Activities

## Special Education Monitoring Activities Conducted Annually for All Districts

- All local education agencies (LEAs) submit annually, and OSPI reviews:
  - District budgets and spending plans for federal special education funds.
  - Special education data reports (least restrictive environment (LRE), child count, post-secondary outcomes, early childhood outcomes, timely initial evaluations, timely Part C to B transition, discipline, restraint and isolation, private school participation, and more; see the [OSPI-Special Education-Data Collection](#) webpage for more information).
  - Annual/monthly expenditure reports.
  - Fiscal excess cost reports.
  - Private school consultations and provision of proportionate share.
  - Changes to district special education policy/procedures, if any.
  - Impact reports – describing impact of district’s use of IDEA funds on student outcomes.
  - Washington State Auditor’s (SAO) audit of special education funds.
- All districts receive an annual [Determination Level](#) (from 1 (meets requirements) to 4 (needs substantial intervention)) that evaluates their compliance with the basic requirements of IDEA. These are assigned annually based on OSPI’s review of:
  - (1) audit findings,
  - (2) correction of previously-identified non-compliance,
  - (3) district-submitted data reports,
  - (4) timely initial evaluations,
  - (5) timely Part C to B transition,
  - (6) secondary transition individualized education program (IEP) components,
  - (7) compliance related to disproportionate identification/discipline,
  - (8) post-school outcomes (including engagement rates and survey response rates, and
  - (9) significant disproportionality status and progress made.

Sanctions are applied if districts do not meet requirements two or more years in a row.

- Technical Assistance Liaison assigned from OSPI Special Education, to respond to questions and concerns from/about the district special education activities, as well as an Educational Service District (ESD) Special Education Director (funded by OSPI).
- Risk assessment, based on fiscal, compliance, and student outcome data for each district, as well as information available to OSPI regarding family and staff concerns, staff turnover, media reports, etc. Districts may be flagged during this risk assessment for additional monitoring activities (such as those below).



## Special Education Monitoring Activities Conducted Annually for Selected Districts (not all)

- Review of annual fiscal documentation and student IEPs submitted for [Safety Net](#) (approximately 120 districts annually).
- Review of annual documentation as part of a [citizen complaint](#) (approximately 100–120 investigations annually).
- District correction of identified non-compliance, including identification of root cause and how it was addressed, as well as verification reviews conducted by special education partners at the district's local ESD (approximately 80–100 districts annually).
- District completion, and OSPI review, of an annual Disproportionality Workbook completed by districts with identified disproportionality in regard to the identification, discipline, or placement of students with disabilities (60–80 districts annually). Districts are notified each May if they have disproportionality or significant disproportionality. In the Disproportionality Workbook, districts document a review of policies, procedures, and practices in the identified area(s); describe the potential root cause(s) of the disproportionality; and outline the steps they will take to address the disproportionality in the coming year.
- Bi-monthly/quarterly fiscal and program collaboration with districts identified as having significant disproportionality to assist in identifying root causes and developing plan for provision of comprehensive, coordinated early intervening services (CCEIS), and to ensure the implementation of CCEIS activities (approximately 20 districts per year).
- District self-assessments across different topical program areas (e.g., inclusionary practices, secondary transition, discipline, disproportionality) with approximately 20 districts annually.
- Fiscal and program [systems analysis](#) desk reviews and on-site visits with approximately 40–50 districts annually.

Additional information: [Washington Integrated System of Monitoring \(WISM\)](#)