



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

*Washington State
Performance Plan
(SPP)/Annual Performance
Report (APR) Part B: For
Reporting on FFY 2021*

2023

WASHINGTON STATE SPP/APR PART B

For Reporting on Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2021

2023

Dr. Tania May
Assistant Superintendent of Special Education

Prepared by:

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

Submission:

U. S. Department of Education
Office of Special Education Programs
February 1, 2023



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	4
Indicator 1: Graduation.....	19
Indicator 2: Drop Out	23
Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs.....	26
Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)....	31
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards).....	36
Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)	42
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion.....	47
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion	53
Indicator 5: Education Environments (Children Five (Kindergarten)–21)	59
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments.....	63
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes.....	67
Indicator 8: Parent involvement	74
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation	81
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories.....	86
Indicator 11: Child Find.....	91
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition.....	97
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition.....	104
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes.....	109
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions	118
Indicator 16: Mediation	121
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan	125
Abbreviations Glossary	159
Certification.....	163
Legal Notice	171

INTRODUCTION

Instructions

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

Intro—Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Washington state continues to co-design efforts with invested partners, including families, focused on indicators leading to improved outcomes for students with disabilities in PreK to 12 and post-secondary education, employment, and independent living, incorporating activities that address the following strategic priority areas:

1. Partnering for equity by co-designing improvement efforts with students, families, community organizations and statewide professional development providers. Supports focus on culturally responsive communications and interactions, language access and accommodations, and diversifying special education staff and advisory group participants.
2. Shaping inclusionary outcomes by aligning practices across statewide initiatives, including social emotional learning, multi-tiered systems of supports, and positive behavioral interventions and supports. Supports include resources and training to disrupt disproportionality, increased access to core instruction in general education settings from PreK to 12, and equity in evaluation and provision of services.
3. Leading with intention to model, across all levels of the educational system including the SEA, intentional connections among fiscal, data, program, and dispute resolution in support of improved special education outcomes.
4. Fostering excellence by identifying positive exemplars across fiscal, program, and dispute resolution. Supports include on-site visits and community conversations, cross-agency collaborative efforts, and data collection, analysis, and reporting to move beyond admiring the problem and shine a light on promising practices.

Invested partners acknowledge the improvements currently in process and share that additional systemic changes are urgently needed. In a co-design process with the Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), partners have focused on increasing inclusionary practices over the past four years, with visible improvements in student data. Washington's approved Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Plan specifically addresses the performance of students with disabilities, and the intentional design of the identification process has resulted in a majority of schools identified for supports due to the instruction provided to, and outcomes resulting from, students with disabilities. As a result, coordinated efforts across OSPI divisions continue to actively analyze root causes of the current data as well as resulting impacts on other student groups through a comprehensive plan specifically targeting improvement efforts regarding

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

The June 23, 2022, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Determination Letter, which is publicly available, states that Washington state continues to require assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA for more than two years and directs Washington state to report with this federal fiscal year (FFY) 2021 state performance plan (SPP) / annual performance report (APR) submission on two elements: (1) TA sources accessed and from which the state received assistance, and (2) actions taken by the state as a result of the TA. Washington continues working with multiple national TA centers, including the:

- National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI);
- National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII);
- National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations (NCPMI);
- National Center on Deaf-Blindness (NCDB);
- National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT);
- Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA);
- Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy);
- Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID);
- IDEA Data Center (IDC) to support data integration, analysis, and accuracy efforts across the agency;
- TIES Center: Increasing Time, Instructional Effectiveness, Engagement, and State Support for Inclusive Practices for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities;
- CEEDAR Center: Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform Center;
- Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE); and
- Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR) to ensure IDEA funds are used efficiently, appropriately, and in collaboration with other improvement efforts, when appropriate.

Additionally, our OSEP-assigned TA continues to provide frequent technical assistance, resulting in increased capacity of SEA special education leadership in addition to practice and policy shifts. TA efforts have been focused on the priority areas and areas of the SPP/APR showing slippage, not meeting targets, and/or needing improvement, such as preschool LRE and outcomes, post-school outcomes, disproportionality and equity, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Theory of Action and evaluation plan, along with revisions to discipline data collection and reporting and closer alignment of statewide improvement efforts with our Part C counterpart. As a result of the TA received, Washington state deepened analysis specific to outcome data for students with disabilities, reviewed additional research and policy, discussed promising practices and ongoing barriers, and continued efforts to address root causes of outcomes.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

In FFY 2021, Washington state moved to a new calculation for identifying a significant discrepancy in the rate of out-of-school suspensions for students with IEPs, shifting from comparing LEA discipline data to statewide special education discipline data (a single state bar) to comparison of LEA discipline data for students with and without disabilities within the LEA (rate difference). See Indicator B-4 for additional information.

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

287

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 continues to expand efforts to integrate systems across the educational system to drive improved developmental, functional, and academic outcomes for students with disabilities while simultaneously ensuring that the requirements of IDEA Part B are met. The state's comprehensive General Supervisory System includes several key components implemented across three primary agency/division work groups:

- 1. *The Program Improvement Work Group*** is responsible for design and implementation of the Washington Integrated System of Monitoring (WISM) for both Special Education Programming and Fiscal, in collaboration with the Operations Work Group. WISM is an outcome-based, data-driven monitoring framework, which has significantly increased the potential for improving student outcomes. The Program Improvement Work Group collaborates across all levels of the educational system to co-design special education oversight and improvement activities in alignment with other support structures, including federal monitoring, system and school improvement, regional supports, and sovereign tribal partners. In recognition of this critical work, the Program Improvement Work Group was restructured and expanding to include a Special Projects Lead in support of students with disabilities served in non-traditional settings, including alternative learning environments, charters, and tribal compact schools. This Lead role also serves as a special education liaison across SEA program offices such as Native Education, Multilingual Education, Highly Capable, and Learning Options.
- 2. *The Operations (i.e., Data and Fiscal Management) Work Group*** has responsibilities for data collection and analysis, Safety Net, and all aspects of fiscal oversight, including allocation, monitoring, and regulation of federal funding. In alignment with Washington state's strategic priority of leading with Intention, the Operations Work Group has increased collaboration with CIFR to improve fiscal policies and protocols and engaged in collaborative efforts across content areas in Washington state, including program, instruction, and educator growth and development, to provide jointly-developed fiscal presentations, guidance, and technical assistance to school, district, and community partners.
- 3. *The Dispute Resolution Work Group*** holds responsibility for dispute resolution, including activities such as IEP facilitation, alternative dispute resolution activities, conducting community complaint investigations, resolution sessions, mediations, and oversight of due process hearings. In response to invested partner (stakeholder) input, the work group has been restructured to add additional complaint investigator contractors, expand work group leadership to support both dispute resolution activities along with policy and community engagement efforts, additional disaggregation of dispute resolution data, and oversight of non-public agencies (NPAs). To ensure equity of access and outcomes, the dispute resolution work group meets regularly with the state's Office of Administrative Hearings, the state Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), and the state's contracted vendor for mediation and IEP facilitation.

Planning and provision of universal and targeted 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 invested educational partners (stakeholders) involved in, and impacted by, special education services and outcomes for students with disabilities to review, analyze, and plan for system improvements and celebrate successes over the past years, including the engagement of diverse families and community members, to ensure that the intersectional needs of each student with an IEP are considered during improvement planning.

Technical Assistance System:

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

The data included in this report, as well as other available data, have been analyzed at the state and regional levels and with national TA providers, and analyses with school district staff, SEAC, and other education partners are held at least annually as part of comprehensive improvement efforts, including those under the ESSA. The state has several mechanisms in place to ensure the timely delivery of high-quality, evidence-based technical assistance and professional development support as part of its formal Technical Assistance System. Facilitation for direct school district access to technical assistance and professional development resources designed to improve educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities has continued to evolve over FFY 2021.

Technical assistance and supports are provided to LEAs as part of the Washington Integrated System of Monitoring (WISM) through a number of activities, including, but not limited to:

- (a) Review and feedback on LEA self-assessments,
- (b) Focus groups, individual interviews, and management work sessions as part of on-site monitoring reviews and remote desk review,
- (c) Recommendations and resources included in monitoring reports,
- (d) Quarterly meetings with districts implementing Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS), and
- (e) Guidance briefs/tips included in OSPI's Special Education Monthly Update.

The state gathers timely and current special education research and information from state and federal partners to develop a monthly update for school and district partners, advocates, and family and community members, including over 6,000 monthly subscribers. In FFY 2021, video summaries of the monthly update content were incorporated to increase accessibility and understanding across partner groups. Additionally, division staff members are assigned as special education liaisons to each of the 9 ESDs and meet monthly with all of the district special education directors and leadership for their assigned regions to review key points from the monthly update and other sources.

To provide greater direct access to SEA leadership, the division also hosts semimonthly office hours for school and district leadership several times a month, for both special education programming and fiscal and data questions. Cross-content experts join the office hours as specific questions and areas of need arise, including preschool funding, graduation and transition barriers, students

served in NPAs, and navigating local bargaining agreements.

Technical assistance resources are also distributed through Coordinated Service Agreements (CSAs) with the 9 regional ESDs and through State Needs Projects. The ESDs provide extensive technical assistance directly aligned with each of the indicators in the State Performance Plan based on regional performance profiles routinely updated in accordance with the APR cycles. In response to concerns raised about increasing student mental health and behavioral needs, state-level activity funds were leveraged to expand partnerships with ESDs to augment therapeutic programs as alternatives to NPAs with a focus on intensive behavioral and mental health supports for students and job-embedded capacity building for staff in students' resident school districts.

Additionally, the State Needs Projects collectively assist with statewide capacity for enhancing student outcomes through professional development opportunities, targeted and intensive technical assistance, and consultation and training for parents, families, and educators. Areas of expertise include, but are not limited to, sensory disabilities, secondary transition, assistive technology, and specially designed instruction provided within a continuum of placement options. More information may be located at <https://www.k12.wa.us/state-needs-projects>.

Professional Development System:

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

Professional Development Systems continue to ensure service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve access and results for students with disabilities. Professional development structures, including regional Educational Service Districts (ESDs) and Local Education Agencies (LEAs), are designed to address state and local needs as determined by data analyses, education partners (stakeholder) input, and state and local priorities. 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 to communicate priorities and distributive leadership;
- Increase data literacy across all levels and partnerships of the educational system;
- 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 support systems statewide in order to build high-quality professional learning that is responsive, relevant, and provides all partners an entry point at their level of readiness to benefit; 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.

Washington's State Needs Projects contribute significantly to professional development delivery in the state of Washington, and ESDs also provide professional development services to school districts statewide, based on locally-identified needs. A primary focus includes the provision of both online and in-person workshops and coursework for educators designed specifically to improve academic, behavioral, and social emotional outcomes for students with disabilities. Topical examples include inclusionary practices within a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) framework, universal design for learning (UDL), literacy, math, science, early childhood, provision of specially designed instruction (SDI), social emotional and positive behavioral supports, multilingual and migrant support, as well as culturally-affirming and representative curriculum selection and adoption.

The statewide Inclusionary Practices Professional (IPP) Development Cadre provides job-embedded professional development to a variety of education partners, including school board members, district teams, school teams, educators, families, and community partners. IPP is focused on fostering a culture of inclusion in Washington, and in 2021 OSPI partnered with 12 statewide professional development (PD) providers. Examples of how organizations engaged with communities include:

- The Association of Educational Service Districts (AESD) provided professional development on inclusionary practices to 140 school district teams, in over 61 school districts, and had a statewide reach, including the school leadership teams of over 10,100 educators and 93,180 hours of PD.
- Family Engagement Collaborative (FEC) trainings included sessions with over 300 participants, spanning parents, educators, and community stakeholders. The content of the trainings aligned with evidence-based family engagement and inclusive education practices, along with embedded accessibility supports and accommodations for various adult learning styles.
- The University of Washington IPP demonstration sites team collaborated with the FEC to support their work on gathering case studies around family engagement across IPP demonstration sites coordinating leadership in family engagement as part of their inclusive workgroups and with family navigators. The IPP Demonstration sites have an operating waitlist for visitors and have welcomed educators from around Washington state, national partners, and international visitors who are coming to engage in a transformational learning experience.

IPP priorities for 2021-2022 included centering racial equity and intersectionality, engaging families as decision-makers and co-designers, and including student voice with opportunities for self-advocacy. These priorities and the intentional collaboration among IPP Cadre organizations demonstrate the efficacy of building a statewide network that utilizes lived experiences and different perspectives and expertise to create sustainable and systemic inclusive education change. IPP is paving the way for future work that focuses on inclusive education outcomes for all students occurring within an MTSS framework. As Washington state works together to consider new ways to measure impact and use data to inform systems change, it will include examining inclusive

leadership across all levels of the PreK-12 system within an MTSS framework and developing a technical assistance network that accounts for the interdependence required to create a robust educational system.

Since 2021, Washington state has been partnering as an intensive technical assistance state with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) on the Advancing Inclusive Principal Leadership (AIPL) project. This project is focused on improving the skills and leadership of Principals to implement inclusive education across the state. This is another multi-organizational professional development collaboration that includes involvement from OSPI leadership within and beyond special education, family representatives, community-based partners, district leadership, university partners, and collaborators from professional organizations across the state. This group is preparing materials and goals for professional development and technical assistance for practicing principals and to inform principal preparation programs.

Aligned with the above priorities are professional development provided in partnership with the CEEDAR Center to increase capacity of both pre-service and in-service learning. CEEDAR stands for "Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform." The mission of CEEDAR is to support students with disabilities in achieving college- and career-ready standards by building the capacity of state personnel preparation systems to prepare teachers and leaders to implement evidence-based practices within multi-tiered systems of support. There are several committees that drive this work and provide professional development to the community, which include OSPI representation and leadership. These committees included: Policy and planning, High Leverage Practices (HLP), Universal Design for Learning (UDL), Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), and Knowledge and Mobilization. The CEEDARs team has also been drafting a syllabi protocol to map current scope and sequence for inclusive practices for educator preparation programs.

For school district Special Education Directors in Washington state, with support from OSPI, the Washington Association of School Administrators (WASA) Special Education Director Academy (SPEDA) was developed to support those who have administrative responsibilities of Special Education. Session modules are designed in partnership with OSPI to support leaders with relevant and timely topics, presented by local experts and practitioners. Some topics in 2021 included: Communicating with families, UDL and Inclusive Practices, and Effective Professional Development for Teachers.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

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

Special Education State Design Team (SDT):

For Indicators B-1 through B-14 and B-17, OSPI issued an invitation in April 2021 for individuals who were interested in joining a Special Education State Design Team (SDT). Individuals were directed to complete an invitation survey (<https://survey.alchemer.com/s3/6323118/Invitation-to-Serve-2021-22-Special-Education-State-Design-Team>) that was translated into the 13 most

commonly spoken languages in Washington state. The survey identified the individual's contact information, age group(s) representing, county/school district representing, race/ethnicity (optional), role/position, focus area(s) of interest, and any accommodations or language access considerations needed. The invitation was disseminated statewide through multiple methods, including but not limited to GovDelivery communications, OSPI's Special Education Monthly Updates, ESD meetings, Spanish and English radio and newspaper advertisements, and collaboration with statewide professional organizations, including diverse community-based organizations (CBOs) and the state Parent Training and Information (PTI) Centers.

As of the date of this report, the SDT includes 27 OSPI cross-divisional staff, 23 ESD representatives from all nine regions, 15 representatives from other state agencies, 291 external participants, and representatives of the NCSI. Of the total 356 SDT members, 12 are students, 30 are individuals with disabilities, and 141 are parents or family members of an individual with a disability.

Participants were assigned to one of seven focus groups based on their identified areas of interest and role. Each of the groups contained 45–55 participants with a representative mix of race/ethnicity, geographic location, background, and role. The demographics of each focus group was carefully monitored by the Special Education Program Improvement Coordinator to ensure maximum representativeness of each group given the pool of applicants.

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

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

*The work of two of the seven focus groups, Monitoring & Educational Benefit and Exploring a Statewide IEP, did not include target-setting and is, therefore, not included in this description of partner input on the SPP indicators.

The full SDT kickoff meeting was held via Zoom on September 14, 2021, in collaboration with NCSI staff. Diversity, equity, and inclusion was emphasized as the foundation for the work of the SDT and all the focus groups. The individual focus groups, facilitated by OSPI staff, met in October through December 2021 to analyze indicator data and collaboratively develop recommendations for indicator targets. The full SDT was brought together for a second virtual meeting on January 11, 2022, to review the work of the focus groups and the recommended targets, prior to presenting the targets to the state Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) for review and approval on January 20, 2022. All focus group materials, including slide decks, indicator guides, discussion protocols, participant guidelines, meeting recordings/transcripts, and participant input were maintained in a shared Google Docs folder (<https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/15Oq1HOpS7OyB49zMCQa-hV1i23gErdud>) for all participants to access. Additional opportunities to provide input included a parking lot document, homework assignments, and email. Updates on the work of the SDT and focus groups were posted publicly on OSPI's Special Education Family Engagement and Guidance webpage (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/family-engagement-and-guidance>). Summaries of SEAC meetings and decisions are posted on OSPI's SEAC webpage

<https://www.k12.wa.us/about-ospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisory-council-seac>).

During the 2022-23 school year, the SDT will continue to meet to discuss and provide feedback on indicator data, participate in conversations around emerging issues and priorities, and receive updates on the equity audit implementation.

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

State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) State Design Team:

The SSIP Evaluation Plan lays out the long term, intermediate, and short-term outcomes to meet the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR) over the course of the five-year implementation cycle. The Evaluation Plan also identifies the associated targets and performance indicators, who is responsible for each action step, the frequency of actions taken, and data collection tools used. Opportunities to engage CPs have varied in an effort to be responsive to the needs at the state, regional, and local levels, offering monthly network meetings (PIC Network), bi-weekly OSPI ECSE updates on hot topics (ECSE Coordination Team meetings) editing and writing sessions for upcoming guidance (ESIT and EHDDI), access to statewide advisories, including the ECSE Focus Group, Coordinated Recruitment and Enrollment (CRE), and Integrated Early Childhood Programming in partnership with DCYF, as well as the Office Hours for LEA Special Education Directors.

Family and Community Engagement with Statewide Technical Assistance Partners:

In addition to SEAC, SDT, and SSIP activities that were explicit to family and community input into special education oversight, activities, targets, and outcomes, IPP priorities for 2021-2022 focused on centering racial equity and intersectionality, engaging families as decision-makers and co-designers, and including student voice with opportunities for self-advocacy. All 12 IPP Professional Development Cadre partners engaged in outreach efforts to families and community members and collected and reported data on family and community engagement. During FFY 2021, IPP Cadre partners engaged over 300 family and community members, along with an additional 140 student participants.

Did you apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators?

(Yes / No):

YES

Number of Parent Members:

456

Parent Members Engagement:

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

As previously described, 141 of SDT participants were parents/family members of individuals with disabilities, each assigned to one of seven focus groups based on their identified interests. The individual focus groups, facilitated by OSPI staff, met in October through December 2021 to analyze indicator data and collaboratively develop recommendations for indicator targets. The full SDT was brought together for a second virtual meeting on January 11, 2022, to review the work of the focus groups and the recommended targets, prior to presenting the targets to the state SEAC for review and approval on January 20, 2022. The SDT met again in May 2022 to review and discuss OSEP's clarification window feedback and OSPI's response to the feedback. SEAC includes an additional 10 members who are parents of individuals with disabilities.

All SDT focus group materials, including slide decks, indicator guides, discussion protocols, participant guidelines, meeting recordings/transcripts, and participant input was maintained in a shared Google Docs folder (<https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/15Oq1HOpS7OyB49zMCQa-hV1i23gErdud>) for all participants to access. Additional opportunities to provide input included a parking lot document, homework assignments, and email. Updates on the work of the SDT and focus groups were posted publicly on OSPI's Special Education Family Engagement and Guidance webpage (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/family-engagement-and-guidance>).

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

Family and Community Engagement with Statewide Technical Assistance Partners:

In addition to directly serving a majority of families from diverse communities, the IPP Cadre Family Engagement Collaborative provided direct input and coaching for the other 11 IPP Cadre projects, including strategies and capacity building for engaging in authentic community conversations, co-designing initiatives with family and community members, and including families and community members in shared decision making. Toward these goals, the IPP Cadre continued to interrogate their beliefs aligned with inclusive culture, philosophy, and practices. This included making sure that staff learning occurred alongside families, representative of their school and community partners. Some of the questions the IPP Cadre grappled with included: What are the stories, experiences, and events that shape the meaning of inclusion and why it matters to staff, students, and families? How are we creating space to engage in discussions around inclusion and equity? How are we honoring the diverse cultures and identities represented in the school community, as

well as examining how the ways we view, engage, and value students and families can be shaped by implicit bias and our own positionality?

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

Special Education State Design Team (SDT):

As described previously, multiple efforts were made to ensure the diversity of the SDT participants. Interested individuals were directed to complete an invitation survey (<https://survey.alchemer.com/s3/6323118/Invitation-to-Serve-2021-22-Special-Education-State-Design-Team>) that was translated into the 13 most commonly spoken languages in Washington state. The survey identified the individual's contact information, age group(s) representing, county/school district representing, race/ethnicity (optional), role/position, focus area(s) of interest, and any accommodations or language access considerations needed. The invitation was disseminated statewide through multiple methods, including but not limited to GovDelivery communications, OSPI's Special Education Monthly Updates, ESD meetings, Spanish and English radio and newspaper advertisements, and collaboration with statewide professional organizations and diverse CBOs and PTI Centers. The Spanish radio and newspaper advertisements were initiated upon review of the demographics of the preliminary participants and determining that individuals identified as Hispanic were underrepresented on the SDT.

Participants were assigned to one of seven focus groups based on their identified areas of interest and role. Each of the groups contained 45–55 participants with a representative mix of race/ethnicity, geographic location, background, and role. The demographics of each focus group was carefully monitored by the Special Education Program Improvement Coordinator to ensure maximum representativeness of each group given the pool of applicants and their area(s) of interest.

Family and Community Engagement with Statewide Technical Assistance Partners:

The IPP Cadre prioritized the following principles and practices to expand and sustain diverse family and community engagement:

1. Trust is established with families by showing care for others' well-being, demonstrating integrity of word and action, through open communication, by showing reliability, and by inviting families to be co-designers in their child's education.
2. Communication is framed so it is solution centered and partners communicate regularly with families about things that are going well.
3. Leaders connect with families who historically have not been included or in leadership roles in the education community and invite them to be part of leadership teams.
4. Partners elicit feedback from families' preferred ways of two-way communication (email, phone, school apps, etc.) and use a variety of formats to communicate.
5. Communication is available across modalities to reach everyone (email, voicemail, website, family portal systems, paper).

6. Communication is presented in all primary languages reflective of the group population.
7. All partner activities include interpreters (multiple languages, including ASL) and virtual meetings include closed captioning.
8. When scheduling meetings with family members and community events, event times are reflective of diverse family schedules to allow full participation.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

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

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

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

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

(<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/family-engagement-and-guidance>). Summaries of SEAC meetings and decisions are posted on OSPI's SEAC webpage (<https://www.k12.wa.us/about-ospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisory-council-seac>).

All IPP Cadre materials, including evaluation results and data updates, are posted to the project pages for the individual Cadre partners. Each of the IPP Cadre partners are featured and hyperlinked on the main webpage for the statewide IPP (<https://www.k12.wa.us/policy-funding/special-education-funding-and-finance/inclusionary-practices-professional-development-project>).

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 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 2020 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/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2020 APR in 2022, is available.

The state continues to publicly post and report on both SEA and LEA performance on the state performance plan (SPP)/annual performance report (APR) indicators. The FFY 2020 data were posted (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection>) in March 2022. Complete copies of the Washington SPP and APR are located on the same webpage.

The APR is disseminated throughout the state via OSPI's website (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection>) and the agency's social media accounts (Twitter, RSS feeds, Facebook) and available to the media and families. This information was also distributed in the February 2021 special education monthly update, through the Partnerships for Action Voices for Empowerment (PAVE) PTI Center, to stakeholder committees who gave substantial input and feedback to the development of this document, and to the SEAC. This information is also presented at regional ESD meetings and various conferences throughout the state.

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

State assessment data links are below:

Accommodations Data for State and District:

<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/state-special-education-data-collection-summaries> (scroll down the page to "Part B Assessments").

Statewide Smarter Balanced Assessment:

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

Statewide Alternate Assessment:

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

District Smarter Balanced Example:

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

District Alternate Assessment Example:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Seattle School District No. 1" and click "GO", scroll down the page, then choose "Assessment" in the Student Performance Section, and then choose "Details".

School Level Smarter Balanced Example:

<https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard>, choose "I Want to See Data for a school or school district" and type in "Ballard High School, Seattle School District No. 1" and click "GO", scroll down the page, then choose "Assessment" in the Student Performance Section, and then choose "Details".

School Alternate Assessment Example:

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

Intro—Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The June 23, 2022, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Determination Letter, which is publicly available, states that Washington state continues to require assistance in implementing the

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

- National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI);
- National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII);
- National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations (NCPMI);
- National Center on Deaf-Blindness (NCDB);
- National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT);
- Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA);
- Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy);
- Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID);
- IDEA Data Center (IDC) to support data integration, analysis, and accuracy efforts across the agency;
- TIES Center: Increasing Time, Instructional Effectiveness, Engagement, and State Support for Inclusive Practices for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities;
- CEEDAR Center: Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform Center;
- Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE); and
- Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR) to ensure IDEA funds are used efficiently, appropriately, and in collaboration with other improvement efforts, when appropriate.

Additionally, our OSEP-assigned TA continues to provide frequent technical assistance, resulting in increased capacity of SEA special education leadership in addition to practice and policy shifts. TA efforts have been focused on the priority areas and areas of the SPP/APR showing slippage, not meeting targets, and/or needing improvement, such as preschool LRE and outcomes, post-school outcomes, disproportionality and equity, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Theory of Action and evaluation plan, along with revisions to discipline data collection and reporting and closer alignment of statewide improvement efforts with our Part C counterpart. As a result of the TA received, Washington state deepened analysis specific to outcome data for students with disabilities, reviewed additional research and policy, discussed promising practices and ongoing barriers, and continued efforts to address root causes of outcomes.

Intro—OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2021 and 2022 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2022 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

Intro—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 1: GRADUATION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

1—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2018	68.21%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	100.00%	54.90%	58.10%	61.30%	71.00%
Data	58.74%	59.41%	69.86%	62.24%	73.91%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 10–12 above for a detailed description.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,921
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	0
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	18
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,838

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
5,921	7,777	73.91%	72.00%	76.13%	Met target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

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

Washington State Requirements for the class of 2021: Total credits required = 24

Subject, number of credits required and additional information:

- English (4)
- Math (3), Algebra 1 or Integrated Math 1, Geometry or Integrated Math 2 Algebra 2 or Integrated, Math 3, or a 3rd credit of math*
- Science (3): At least two labs, a 3rd credit of science*
- Social Studies (3): 1.0 U.S. History and Government, 0.5 Contemporary World History, Geography, and Problems, 0.5 credits of Civics, 1.0 credits of Social Studies Elective (may include 0.5 credits of a second semester of Contemporary World History or the equivalent)
- Arts (2): Performing or visual arts, one credit may be a Personalized Pathway Requirements**
- World Language (2): Both credits may be a Personalized Pathway Requirements**
- Health and Fitness (2): 0.5 credits of Health, 1.5 credits of Fitness, Students must earn credit for physical education unless excused per Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 28A.230.050
- Career and Technical Education (CTE) (1), may be an Occupational Education course that meets the definition of an exploratory course as described in the CTE program standards
- Electives (4)

*The 3rd credit of science and the 3rd credit of math are chosen by the student based on the student's interest and High School and Beyond Plan (HSBP), and approved by the parent or guardian, or if the parent or guardian is unavailable or does not indicate a preference, the school counselor or principal. (See Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 180-51-068).

**Personalized Pathway Requirement are related courses that lead to a specific post high school career or educational outcome chosen by the student based on the student's interests and HSBP, that may include CTE and are intended to provide a focus for the student's learning.

Non-Credit Requirements:

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

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

1—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

Response

None

1—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 2: DROP OUT

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

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

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

Data Source

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

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

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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.

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

out for students with IEPs.

2—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2018	31.93%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	5.55%	5.50%	5.45%	5.45%	31.00%
Data	6.74%	6.43%	6.61%	6.81%	25.75%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	30.50%	29.00%	27.50%	26.20%	25.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 10–12 above for a detailed description.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,921
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	0
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	18
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,838

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14–21)	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
1,838	7,777	25.75%	30.50%	23.63%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

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

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

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

NO

2—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

Response

None

2—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 3A: PARTICIPATION FOR CHILDREN WITH IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school (HS). The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the website where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, and HS. Account for **all** children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and HS, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A—Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 10–12 above for a detailed description.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source:

SY 2021–22 Assessment Data Groups—Reading (ED*Facts* file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

12/21/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	12,702	11,796	10,697
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	8,654	7,874	6,647
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2,228	1,783	1,175
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	808	658	691

Data Source: School Year (SY) 2021–22 Assessment Data Groups—Math (ED*Facts* file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date: 12/21/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	12,702	11,798	10,700
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	7,224	4,779	4,729
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	3,623	4,832	2,892
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	801	655	689

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs participating	Number of children with IEPs	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	11,690	12,702	89.76%	95.00%	92.03%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	10,315	11,796	79.81%	95.00%	87.44%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	8,513	10,697	76.46%	95.00%	79.58%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs participating	Number of children with IEPs	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	11,648	12,702	89.44%	95.00%	91.70%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	10,266	11,798	79.39%	95.00%	87.01%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	8,310	10,700	75.75%	95.00%	77.66%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The State Educational Agency (SEA) [or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, Local Educational Agency (LEA)] must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate

achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.160(f)].

Public Reporting Information

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

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

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

Choose Student Enrollment >> Assessment for details on the statewide assessment data.

Students with disabilities taking the statewide assessment using an accommodation information is located at: <https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/special-education-data-collection-summaries>.

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

The change in baseline for this indicator is due to the federal change in the indicator. The grades reported in previous SPP/APRs were grade bands 3-5, 6-8 and high school, and in this new SPP/APR the grades to report are now 4, 8 and high school.

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic no statewide assessment was administered for 2019-20 and the 2020-21 statewide assessment was administered in the Fall of 2021, therefore our partners (stakeholders) recommended that we use the FFY 2018 test results as the baseline data for this SPP/APR.

It should be noted that the FFY 2020 data for Reading Participation was not prepopulated into this platform. The Washington State Data Manager submitted tickets addressing this issue, but PSC was unable to resolve the issue. Washington's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) liaison (Keesha Blythe) recommended adding the missing data in this section.

FFY 2020 Reading Participation data for

Grade 4: 89.76 -- no slippage FFY 2021: 92.03

Grade 8: 79.81 -- no slippage FFY 2021: 87.44

Grade HS: 76.46 -- no slippage FFY 2021: 79.58

To address Section 3A -- OSEP Response of this APR:

Washington's Part B Data for Indicator 3A-Reading from FFY 2020 was not prepopulated in the APR Data Platform. Partner Support was unable to open the platform and add the prior year's data. The email from Partner Support instructed us to put the actual data from FFY 2020 in the "additional information" text field. We followed these instructions, which enabled us to analyze the current data for this APR.

3A—Prior FFY Required Actions

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

OSEP notes that the State submitted verification that the attachment(s) complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the Indicator 3A attachment(s) included in the State's FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The change in baseline for this indicator is due to the federal change in the indicator. The grades reported in previous SPP/APRs were grade bands 3-5, 6-8 and high school, and in this new SPP/APR the grades to report are now 4, 8 and high school. The proficiency indicator (previously Indicator 3C) also changed. Instead of reporting grade level achievement standards and alternate achievement standards together in one indicator, they are now two separate indicators (3B and 3C).

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic no statewide assessment was administered for 2019-20 and the 2020-21 statewide assessment was administered in the Fall of 2021, therefore our partners (stakeholders) recommended that we use the FFY 2018 test results as the baseline data for this SPP/APR.

The entire FFY 2020 SPP/APR has been posted on Washington's Special Education website. This document includes the reference attachment above. The entire document is Section 508 compliant. The document is located at: <https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection>.

3A—OSEP Response

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

3A—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 3B: PROFICIENCY FOR CHILDREN WITH IEPS (GRADE LEVEL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

See [Indicator 3A Results Indicator](#) above on page 26.

Data Source

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

Measurement

- B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school (HS). The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the website where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR) must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and HS, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B—Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 10–12 above for a detailed description.

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2021 Data Disaggregation from

EDFacts

Data Source:

School Year (SY) 2021–22 Assessment Data Groups—Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

12/21/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	10,882	9,657	7,822
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,179	1,183	1,717
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	302	147	194

Data Source: SY 2021–22 Assessment Data Groups—Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date: 12/21/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	10,847	9,611	7,621
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,057	578	355
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	278	102	49

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,481	10,882	20.61%	57.10%	22.80%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,330	9,657	16.65%	57.10%	13.77%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,911	7,822	22.70%	57.10%	24.43%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

Due to ongoing impacts related to the COVID-19 pandemic, proficiency rates in FFY 2021, although higher than those from the 2020–2021 administration, were not as high as those in a typical, pre-pandemic administration year. Several factors, including possible disrupted learning during previous and current school years, differences in instructional delivery methods (e.g., online, in-person, or hybrid model), and higher absence rates for both students and staff contributed to the slippage in proficiency rates.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,335	10,847	14.81%	55.20%	21.53%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	680	9,611	4.80%	55.20%	7.08%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	404	7,621	4.45%	55.20%	5.30%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

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

Choose Student Enrollment >> Assessment for details on the statewide assessment data.

Students with disabilities taking the statewide assessment using an accommodation information is located at: <https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/special-education-data-collection-summaries>.

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

The change in baseline for this indicator is due to the federal change in the indicator. The grades reported in previous SPP/APRs were grade bands 3-5, 6-8 and high school, and in this new SPP/APR the grades to report are now 4, 8 and high school. The proficiency indicator (previously Indicator 3C) also changed. Instead of reporting grade level achievement standards and alternate achievement standards together in one indicator, they are now two separate indicators (3B and 3C).

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic no statewide assessment was administered for 2019-20 and the 2020-21 statewide assessment was administered in the Fall of 2021, therefore our partners (stakeholders) recommended that we use the FFY 2018 test results as the baseline data for this SPP/APR.

3B—Prior FFY Required Actions

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

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The change in baseline for this indicator is due to the federal change in the indicator. The grades reported in previous SPP/APRs were grade bands 3-5, 6-8 and high school, and in this new SPP/APR the grades to report are now 4, 8 and high school. The proficiency indicator (previously Indicator 3C) also changed. Instead of reporting grade level achievement standards and alternate achievement standards together in one indicator, they are now two separate indicators (3B and 3C).

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic no statewide assessment was administered for 2019-20 and the 2020-21 statewide assessment was administered in the Fall of 2021, therefore our partners (stakeholders) recommended that we use the FFY 2018 test results as the baseline data for this SPP/APR.

The FFY 2025 targets for Indicator 3B all reflect improvement over the baseline (of FFY 2018).

3B—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

Response

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

3B—Required Actions

None

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

See [Indicator 3A Results Indicator](#) above on page 26.

Data Source

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

Measurement

- C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) scoring at or above proficient against 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 for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school (HS). The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.160(f) (i.e., a link to the website where these data are reported).

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR) must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and HS, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C—Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 10–12 above for a detailed description.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

School Year (SY) 2021–22 Assessment Data Groups—Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

12/21/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	808	657	691
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	317	267	261

Data Source: SY 2021–22 Assessment Data Groups—Math (ED Facts file spec FS185; Data Group: 583)

Date: 12/21/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	801	654	689
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	338	234	358

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards	Number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	317	808	41.51%	57.10%	39.23%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	267	657	46.22%	57.10%	40.64%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	261	691	40.08%	57.10%	37.77%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

It should be noted that due to ongoing impacts related to the COVID-19 pandemic, participation rates in the 2021–2022 alternate state assessment (WA-AIM), although higher than those from the 2020–2021 administration, were not as high as those in a typical, pre-pandemic administration year [see more details about the student participation in Section 6.1, Chapter 6 (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/testing/state-testing/assessment-students-cognitive-disabilities-wa-aim/access-point-frameworks-and-performance-tasks>)]. In addition to lower than typical test participation rates, aggregated test performance results from the 2021–2022 WA-AIM should be interpreted in the context of several factors, including possible disrupted learning during previous and current school years, differences in instructional delivery methods (e.g., online, in-person, or hybrid model), and higher absence rates for both students and staff, contributing to the slippage in proficiency rates.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

See information provided in Group A.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

See information provided in Group A.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards	Number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	338	801	41.65%	55.20%	42.20%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	234	654	44.00%	55.20%	35.78%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	358	689	58.70%	55.20%	51.96%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

It should be noted that due to ongoing impacts related to the COVID-19 pandemic, participation rates in the 2021–2022 alternate state assessment (WA-AIM), although higher than those from the 2020–2021 administration, were not as high as those in a typical, pre-pandemic administration year [see more details about the student participation in Section 6.1, Chapter 6 (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/testing/state-testing/assessment-students-cognitive-disabilities-wa-aim/access-point-frameworks-and-performance-tasks>)]. In addition to lower than typical test participation rates, aggregated test performance results from the 2021–2022 WA-AIM should be interpreted in the context of several factors, including possible disrupted learning during previous and current school years, differences in instructional delivery methods (e.g., online, in-person, or hybrid model), and higher absence rates for both students and staff, contributing to the slippage in proficiency rates.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

It should be noted that due to ongoing impacts related to the COVID-19 pandemic, participation

rates in the 2021–2022 alternate state assessment (WA-AIM), although higher than those from the 2020–2021 administration, were not as high as those in a typical, pre-pandemic administration year [see more details about the student participation in Section 6.1, Chapter 6 (<https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/testing/state-testing/assessment-students-cognitive-disabilities-wa-aim/access-point-frameworks-and-performance-tasks>)]. In addition to lower than typical test participation rates, aggregated test performance results from the 2021–2022 WA-AIM should be interpreted in the context of several factors, including possible disrupted learning during previous and current school years, differences in instructional delivery methods (e.g., online, in-person, or hybrid model), and higher absence rates for both students and staff, contributing to the slippage in proficiency rates.

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

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

Choose Student Enrollment >> Assessment for details on the statewide assessment data.

Students with disabilities taking the statewide assessment using an accommodation information is located at: <https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection/special-education-data-collection-summaries>.

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

The change in baseline for this indicator is due to the federal change in the indicator. The grades reported in previous SPP/APRs were grade bands 3-5, 6-8 and high school, and in this new SPP/APR the grades to report are now 4, 8 and high school. The proficiency indicator (previously Indicator 3C) also changed. Instead of reporting grade level achievement standards and alternate achievement standards together in one indicator, they are now two separate indicators (3B and 3C). Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic no statewide assessment was administered for 2019-20 and the 2020-21 statewide assessment was administered in the Fall of 2021, therefore our partners (stakeholders) recommended that we use the FFY 2018 test results as the baseline data for this SPP/APR.

3C—Prior FFY Required Actions

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

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The change in baseline for this indicator is due to the federal change in the indicator. The grades reported in previous SPP/APRs were grade bands 3-5, 6-8 and high school, and in this new SPP/APR the grades to report are now 4, 8 and high school. The proficiency indicator (previously Indicator 3C) also changed. Instead of reporting grade level achievement standards and alternate achievement standards together in one indicator, they are now two separate indicators (3B and 3C).

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic no statewide assessment was administered for 2019-20 and the 2020-21 statewide assessment was administered in the Fall of 2021, therefore our partners (stakeholders) recommended that we use the FFY 2018 test results as the baseline data for this SPP/APR.

The FFY 2025 targets for Indicator 3C all reflect improvement over the baseline (of FFY 2018).

3C—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

Response

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

3C—Required Actions

None

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

See [Indicator 3A Results Indicator](#) above on page 26.

Data Source

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

Measurement

- D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021–2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021–2022 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school (HS). The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the website where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR) must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021–2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021–2022 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and HS, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D—Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 10–12 above for a detailed description.

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2021 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source: School Year (SY) 2021–22 Assessment Data Groups—Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date: 12/21/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	75,340	79,048	73,947
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	10,882	9,657	7,822
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	37,765	41,162	51,004
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	417	236	313

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,179	1,183	1,717
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	302	147	194

Data Source: SY 2021–22 Assessment Data Groups—Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 583)

Date: 12/21/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	75,271	78,783	72,667
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	10,847	9,611	7,621
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	35,224	26,935	25,356
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	364	151	83
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,057	578	355
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	278	102	49

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	22.80%	50.68%	28.42 pp	24.70 pp	27.88 pp	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	13.77%	52.37%	37.44 pp	36.50 pp	38.60 pp	Did not meet target	Slippage

Group	Group name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	24.43%	69.40%	40.54 pp	40.50 pp	44.97 pp	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

The reasons for slippage in this indicator correspond to the reasons for slippage in Indicator 3C. Due to ongoing impacts related to the COVID-19 pandemic, proficiency rates in FFY 2021, although higher than those from the 2020–2021 administration, were not as high as those in a typical, pre-pandemic administration year. Several factors, including possible disrupted learning during previous and current school years, differences in instructional delivery methods (e.g., online, in-person, or hybrid model), and higher absence rates for both students and staff, contributed to the slippage in proficiency rates.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The reasons for slippage in this indicator correspond to the reasons for slippage in Indicator 3C. Due to ongoing impacts related to the COVID-19 pandemic, proficiency rates in FFY 2021, although higher than those from the 2020–2021 administration, were not as high as those in a typical, pre-pandemic administration year. Several factors, including possible disrupted learning during previous and current school years, differences in instructional delivery methods (e.g., online, in-person, or hybrid model), and higher absence rates for both students and staff, contributed to the slippage in proficiency rates.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	21.53%	47.28%	22.91 pp	24.30 pp	25.75 pp	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	7.08%	34.38%	24.53 pp	30.80 pp	27.31 pp	Met target	No Slippage

Group	Group name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	5.30%	35.01%	25.60 pp	29.90 pp	29.71 pp	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The reasons for slippage in this indicator correspond to the reasons for slippage in Indicator 3C. Due to ongoing impacts related to the COVID-19 pandemic, proficiency rates in FFY 2021, although higher than those from the 2020–2021 administration, were not as high as those in a typical, pre-pandemic administration year. Several factors, including possible disrupted learning during previous and current school years, differences in instructional delivery methods (e.g., online, in-person, or hybrid model), and higher absence rates for both students and staff, contributed to the slippage in proficiency rates.

3D—Prior FFY Required Actions

OSEP notes that the State submitted verification that the attachment(s) complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the Indicator 3D attachment(s) included in the State’s FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education’s IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The entire FFY 2020 SPP/APR has been posted on Washington's Special Education website. This document includes the reference attachment above. The entire document is Section 508 compliant. The document is located at: <https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection>.

3D—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

Response

None

3D—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 4A: SUSPENSION/EXPULSION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

[20 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22)]

Data Source

State discipline data, including state's analysis of state's discipline data collected under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the state.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the state has established a minimum "n" and/or cell size requirement, the state may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that state-established "n" and/or cell size. If the state used a minimum "n" and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the

rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2019	3.41%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	6.25%	2.50%	2.50%	2.25%	3.16%
Data	2.51%	0.72%	1.79%	3.19%	0.71%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 10–12 above for a detailed description.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

1

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the state's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
0	283	0.71%	2.91%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring [34 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.170(a)]:

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA.

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

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

1. 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.
2. Calculate each district's rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for students without IEPs (total number of students without IEPs who were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in the district divided by the total number of students without IEPs in the district). This process will result in each district's rate of suspensions/expulsions for students without IEPs.
3. Subtract the district rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for students without IEPs from the district rate of suspension/expulsions for students with IEPs. The result is the rate difference for each district.
4. Districts with a rate difference of 2.0 or greater are identified as having a significant discrepancy.
5. Districts must have a minimum 'n' size of at least two out-of-school disciplinary incidents of more than 10 days and a minimum of 10 students with IEPs is required in order to be considered for significant discrepancy.
6. One district was excluded from the FFY 2020 calculation as a result of not meeting this minimum "n" size requirement. This district's data was included in the state-level calculations.

Beginning in 2020-21, Washington's description of significant discrepancy is calculated using a rate difference, which is the difference between the rate of out-of-school suspensions of more than 10 days for students with disabilities, and the rate for students without disabilities in the same LEA. A minimum "n" size of 10 total students with IEPs in the district is applied—districts with fewer than 10 total students with IEPs in the district are not included in the denominator of the Indicator B-4A calculation.

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

As previously described, Washington is using a new method for calculating a significant discrepancy for Indicator B-4. The new calculation will use a rate difference, which is the difference between the rate of out-of-school suspensions of more than 10 days for students with disabilities, and the rate for students without disabilities in the same LEA.

This is a new method for calculating Indicator B-4A, therefore Washington is resetting its baseline in this FFY 2021 APR. The 2019-20 school year was not a complete year of data due to the COVID school facility closures. Therefore, after a review and discussion of the preliminary data for the new calculation through stakeholder meetings, the State Design Team and SEAC recommended using the discipline data from 2018-19 to establish the new baseline for this indicator beginning with the FFY 2021 APR submission. The 2018-19 data were recalculated using the new calculation

methodology, which is why the new baseline does not match the 2018-19 data reported in last year's SPP/APR.

Since the State Design Team and SEAC had access to the preliminary data for this new calculation as part of the stakeholder meetings, this information factored in to the target-setting process for this SPP submission. The State Design Team and SEAC also assisted the State in determining the new definition of significant discrepancy described in this section.

OSPI acknowledges that the identification of zero districts meeting the definition of significant discrepancy for 2020-21 under the new calculation and methodology is of note. The 2020-21 school year, the year that these data were collected, was not a typical school year as many of the districts in Washington were engaged in remote learning a majority of the school year. This resulted in a much smaller number of disciplinary removals of more than 10 days for both students with and without IEPs. OSPI, in conjunction with the State Design Team and SEAC, will continue to review the data to determine the reasonableness of the State's methodology and make potential revisions to ensure the state is using a statistically sound methodology for identifying a significant discrepancy.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020–2021 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", no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2021 (using school year 2020-2021 data).

If a district had been identified, OSPI would review 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.

Identified districts would be required to complete a disproportionality self-assessment, which would include a review of policies, procedures, and practices; identification of potential root causes for the significant discrepancy; and a description of their plan for addressing the discrepancy in the upcoming school year. If revisions were made to the district's policies, procedures, or practices as a result of this review, the district would be required to describe those revisions in the self-review. Revisions to formal, written special education policies and procedures are required to be submitted to OSPI. The state would also complete a student record review from the discrepant cells in designated districts.

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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

4A—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A—OSEP Response

None

4A—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 4B: SUSPENSION/EXPULSION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Compliance Indicator

Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

[20 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22)]

Data Source

State discipline data, including state's analysis of state's discipline data collected under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the state.

Measurement

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

Include state's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the state has established a minimum "n" and/or cell size requirement, the state may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that state-established "n" and/or cell size. If the state used a minimum "n" and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B—Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2019	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.66%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

2

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the state's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status
0	0	282	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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

1. Calculate each district's rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for students with IEPs for each race/ethnicity group (total number of students with IEPs from that race/ethnicity group who were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in the district divided by the total number of students with IEPs from that race/ethnicity group in the district). This process will result in each district's rate of suspensions/expulsions for students with IEPs for each race/ethnicity group.
2. Calculate each district's rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for students without IEPs (total number of students without IEPs who were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in the district divided by the total number of students without IEPs in the district). This process will result in each district's rate of suspensions/expulsions for students without IEPs.
3. Subtract the district rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for all students without IEPs from the district rate of suspension/expulsions for students with IEPs for each race/ethnicity group. The result is the rate difference.
4. Districts with a rate difference of 2.0 or greater for any race/ethnicity group are identified as having a significant discrepancy.
5. Districts must have a minimum 'n' size of at least two out-of-school disciplinary incidents of more than 10 days, and a minimum of 10 students with IEPs is required in order to be considered for significant discrepancy.
6. Two districts were excluded from the FFY 2020 calculation as a result of not meeting this minimum "n" size requirement. The data from these two districts were included in the state-level calculations.

Washington's description of significant discrepancy is calculated using a rate difference, which is the difference between the rate of out-of-school suspensions of more than 10 days for students with disabilities, and the rate for students without disabilities in the same LEA. A minimum "n" size of 10 total students with IEPs in the district is applied—districts with fewer than 10 total students with IEPs in the district are not included in the denominator of the Indicator B-4B calculation.

Rate difference = (# SWD from a specific race/ethnicity group with out of school suspensions for >10 days divided by all SWD from that race/ethnicity group in the district) minus (# Students without disabilities with out of school suspensions >10 days divided by all students without disabilities in the district)

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

minimum of two disciplinary incidents (out of school suspensions of more than 10 days) that year.

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

As previously described, Washington is using a new method for calculating a significant discrepancy for Indicator B-4. The new calculation will use a rate difference, which is the difference between the rate of out-of-school suspensions of more than 10 days for students with disabilities, and the rate for students without disabilities in the same LEA.

This is a new method for calculating Indicator B-4A, therefore Washington is resetting its baseline in this FFY 2021 APR. The 2019-20 school year was not a complete year of data due to the COVID school facility closures. Therefore, after a review and discussion of the preliminary data for the new calculation through stakeholder meetings, the State Design Team and SEAC recommended using the discipline data from 2018-19 to establish the new baseline for this indicator beginning with the FFY 2021 APR submission. The preliminary data were used by the State Design Team and SEAC to assist the State in determining the new definition of significant discrepancy described in this section.

OSPI acknowledges that the identification of zero districts meeting the definition of significant discrepancy for 2020-21 under the new calculation and methodology is of note. The 2020-21 school year, the year that these data were collected, was not a typical school year as many of the districts in Washington were engaged in remote learning a majority of the school year. This resulted in a much smaller number of disciplinary removals of more than 10 days for both students with and without IEPs. OSPI, in conjunction with the State Design Team and SEAC, will continue to review the data to determine the reasonableness of the State's methodology and make potential revisions to ensure the state is using a statistically sound methodology for identifying a significant discrepancy.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020–2021 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", no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2021 (using FFY 2020 data).

If a district had been identified, OSPI would review 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.

Identified districts would be required to complete a disproportionality self-assessment, which would include a review of policies, procedures, and practices; identification of potential root causes for the significant discrepancy; and a description of their plan for addressing the discrepancy in the upcoming school year. If revisions were made to the district's policies, procedures, or practices as a result of this review, the district would be required to describe those revisions in the self-review. Revisions to formal, written special education policies and procedures are required to be submitted to OSPI. The state would also complete a student record review from the discrepant cells in

designated districts.

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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

4B—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B—OSEP Response

None

4B—Required Actions

None

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

Percent of children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) aged five who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged six through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the state’s data reported under Section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2020	Target >=	52.25%	52.35%	55.00%	57.00%	60.00%
A	59.99%	Data	55.21%	56.01%	56.63%	57.73%	59.99%
B	2020	Target <=	13.16%	13.06%	12.96%	12.75%	12.20%
B	12.15%	Data	13.13%	13.13%	12.83%	12.43%	12.15%
C	2020	Target <=	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
C	0.98%	Data	0.86%	0.86%	0.89%	0.95%	0.98%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	61.70%	63.40%	65.10%	66.80%	68.50%
Target B <=	12.13%	12.06%	11.99%	11.92%	11.85%
Target C <=	1.00%	.99%	.99%	.98%	.97%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 10–12 above for a detailed description.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	137,186
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	85,563
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15,980
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	952
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	196
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	165

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

NO

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	85,563	137,186	59.99%	61.70%	62.37%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15,980	137,186	12.15%	12.13%	11.65%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. Calculation: [c1+c2+c3]	1,313	137,186	0.98%	1.00%	0.96%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

Washington state revised the baseline line for Indicators 5A, 5B, and 5C to the FFY 2020 data as required by OSEPs response in the FFY 2020 SPP.

5—Prior Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Washington state revised the baseline for Indicators 5A, 5B, and 5C to the FFY 2020 data per the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) required action noted above, and the FFY 2025 targets for Indicator B5 all reflect improvement over the baseline (of FFY 2020).

5—OSEP Response

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

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 6: PRESCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

Percent of children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) aged three, four, and five years who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

For Indicator 6C: states are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the state chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages three, four, and five years, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, states are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR).

For Indicator 6C: states may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75–85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

6—Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data—6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	Target >=	28.90%	29.05%	29.20%	29.20%	21.04%
A	Data	24.81%	23.80%	25.29%	26.39%	21.04%
B	Target <=	38.20%	38.00%	37.80%	37.80%	53.50%
B	Data	40.96%	41.85%	40.71%	39.03%	53.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 10–12 above for a detailed description.

Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

Inclusive Targets—6A, 6B

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

Inclusive Targets—6C

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

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

School Year (SY) 2021–22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data Group 613)

Date:

07/06/2022

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5—Total
Total number of children with IEPs	3,281	5,018	1,266	9,565
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	703	1,378	378	2,459
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,682	2,217	533	4,432
b2. Number of children attending separate school	116	140	33	289
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	2	2	1	5
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	19	28	9	56

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

NO

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data—Aged Three through Five

Preschool environments	Number of children with IEPs aged three through five served	Total number of children with IEPs aged three through five	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and	2,459	9,565	21.04%	23.24%	25.71%	Met target	No Slippage

Preschool environments	Number of children with IEPs aged three through five served	Total number of children with IEPs aged three through five	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
related services in the regular early childhood program							
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,726	9,565	53.50%	51.40%	49.41%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	56	9,565	0.53%	0.90%	0.59%	Met target	No Slippage

6—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response

None

6—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 7: PRESCHOOL OUTCOMES

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

Percent of preschool children aged three through five with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Data Source

State-selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

- **Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.
- **Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.
- **Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.
- **Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of children for assessment is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. states will use the progress categories for each of the three outcomes to calculate and report the two summary statements. states have provided targets for the two summary statements for the three outcomes [six numbers for targets for each federal fiscal year (FFY)].

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

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

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

7—Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A1	2020	Target >=	83.40%	83.50%	83.60%	83.70%	87.00%
A1	87.01%	Data	91.19%	90.79%	91.00%	89.59%	87.01%
A2	2020	Target >=	50.80%	51.00%	51.20%	51.20%	38.10%
A2	38.14%	Data	48.91%	47.12%	47.89%	44.43%	38.14%
B1	2020	Target >=	82.40%	82.50%	82.60%	82.70%	86.00%
B1	86.01%	Data	89.93%	88.46%	88.97%	88.77%	86.01%
B2	2020	Target >=	51.80%	52.00%	52.20%	52.20%	37.56%
B2	37.56%	Data	49.67%	48.26%	48.74%	44.77%	37.56%
C1	2020	Target >=	81.40%	81.50%	81.60%	81.70%	86.65%
C1	86.65%	Data	91.20%	89.61%	89.50%	88.91%	86.65%
C2	2020	Target >=	65.80%	66.00%	66.20%	66.20%	48.06%
C2	48.06%	Data	62.81%	61.72%	60.43%	54.74%	48.06%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 10–12 above for a detailed description.

FFY 2021 State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR) Data

Number of preschool children aged three through five with IEPs assessed

4,618

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

Outcome A progress category	Number of children	Percentage of children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	92	1.99%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	437	9.46%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,210	47.86%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,422	30.79%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	457	9.90%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$</i>	3,632	4,161	87.01%	87.40%	87.29%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$</i>	1,879	4,618	38.14%	39.30%	40.69%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B progress category	Number of children	Percentage of children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	86	1.86%

Outcome B progress category	Number of children	Percentage of children
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	479	10.37%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,280	49.37%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,406	30.45%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	367	7.95%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	3,686	4,251	86.01%	86.50%	86.71%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,773	4,618	37.56%	38.80%	38.39%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C progress category	Number of children	Percentage of children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	89	1.93%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	435	9.42%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,835	39.74%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,613	34.93%

Outcome C progress category	Number of children	Percentage of children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	646	13.99%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 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 six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$</i>	3,448	3,972	86.65%	87.10%	86.81%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$</i>	2,259	4,618	48.06%	49.30%	48.92%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

YES

Sampling question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the ECO Center COS Form process? (Yes / No)

YES

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

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

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

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

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

7—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

Response

None

7—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 8: PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

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

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

Data Source

State-selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a state using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR).

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

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

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8—Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 10–12 above for a detailed description.

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2011	21.10%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	21.90%	22.10%	22.30%	22.50%	33.10%
Data	28.68%	28.03%	30.27%	32.34%	41.99%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
775	2,570	41.99%	33.80%	30.16%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

OSPI staff examined the survey results and had discussions in an attempt to determine reasons for the identified slippage. Below is a description of the potential contributing factors.

First, the survey results for 2021-22 included the state's largest school district, which resulted in the performance of a single district having a disproportionate impact on the statewide results. This single district represented 35.2% of the total surveys sent out, and 40.1% of the responders statewide. This single district's response rate (14.5%) was higher than the total response rate for all other districts (12.8%), and the single district's results for the survey (26.3%) was lower than the state's total results (30.2%), resulting in a disproportionately larger impact on the statewide data. This district participated in an onsite program review in the spring of 2022. Parent involvement was an area of review during this visit, and recommendations were included as part of the final report to the district.

Additionally, review of the FFY 2021 data for the state's performance for Indicator B8 confirm anecdotal data shared across educational partners (stakeholders), reflecting a shift away from trends observed in 2019-20 and 2020-21 regarding family expectations. As communities adjusted to the ongoing reality and impact of the pandemic and shift to endemic conditions, expectations from families and community members rose related to provision of services, including compensatory education (or recovery services). In other words, public perception shifted away from a feeling of "we are all in this together" to a mindset that additional delays and shortages were having an outsized impact on students with disabilities.

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

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

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

20,149

Percentage of respondent parents

12.75%

Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response rate	16.34%	12.75%

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

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

During in the 2021-22 school year, Washington convened a Parent Engagement Focus Group, part of the State Design Team (SDT), which engaged in work related to Indicator B-8. The Parent Engagement Focus Group consisted of 51 participants, including three individuals with disabilities and 30 parents/family members of individuals with disabilities. The group also included representatives from all seven federal race/ethnicity groups, tribal partners, advocates, general and special education teachers and administrators, state agency staff, and professional and community organizations. The group's work was focused on the development of the new parent survey tool, as well as methods for implementing the new survey process. This work included analyzing survey data and response rates and identifying methods for increasing response rates particularly for underrepresented groups.

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

The Parent Engagement Group's work resulted in a set of survey questions which was shared and discussed with the state's Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) in May 2022. The survey content was finalized at the end of the 2021-22 school year.

During the 2022-23 school year, OSPI is contracting with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) center to discuss and determine the process for implementing the new parent survey, using the recommendations provided by the Parent Engagement Focus Group. This work will involve the review of other state's processes, including strategies for increasing response rate and representativeness. OSPI anticipates the new parent survey tool and process, the culmination of this work, will be fully implemented during the 2024-25 school year.

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

The data for all cohort districts were reviewed and disaggregated by geographical location [regional review by Educational Service District (ESD)] and district size. Other factors considered during the analysis included a review of the response rates, the degree of representativeness of the survey respondents (by race/ethnicity, grade level, least restrictive environment (LRE) placement,

disability category, and school type), and the potential for non-response bias. The review considered the results to be statistically representative of the target population if the response rate was +/- 3.0% of the target population for each characteristic.

The analyses for the FFY 2021 survey data suggest that the results of the survey are statistically representative of the target population with variance noted within three race/ethnicity groups and two disability categories. Two race/ethnicity groups were slightly under-represented: parents of students identified as Black/African American (representing 12.25% of the survey population but 8.3% of the responders) and Hispanic/Latinx (representing 18.6% of the population but 12.7% of the responders). One race/ethnicity group was slightly over-represented: parents of students identified as White/Caucasian (representing 51.8% of the survey population but 59.6% of the responders). With the exception of the 2021-22 results, this variance is similar to the survey results seen in previous years.

Similar to the prior year's results, parents of students qualifying for special education under the category of Autism are slightly over-represented, while parents of students qualifying for special education under the category of Specific Learning Disability are somewhat underrepresented. Parents of students eligible under the category of Autism are 13.5% of the sample but 20.3% of the respondents. Conversely, parents of students eligible under the category of Specific Learning Disability are 30.3% of the sample but 22.0% of the respondents. The results were found to be representative across all of the other areas of analysis (i.e., grade level, LRE placement, and school type).

The state continues to conduct analyses to determine strategies for statewide technical assistance and guidance to help ensure progress and movement toward the targets for this indicator, as well as to reduce identified biases and increase responses from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities. As previously described, Washington worked with the Parent Engagement Focus Group in 2021-22, and the TAESE center in 2022-23, to improve both the parent survey tool and the process for implementing the parent surveys. This work continues to include the analyzing of survey data and identifying methods for increasing response rates, particularly for underrepresented groups.

OSPI is also continuing to participate in a collaborative systemic equity review with the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) to ensure that diversity, equity, and inclusion are the foundation for our work, including the development and implementation of the new parent survey tool and process.

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. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The data for all cohort districts were reviewed and disaggregated by geographical location (regional review by ESD) and district size. Other factors considered during the analysis included a review of the response rates, the degree of representativeness of the survey respondents (by

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

As described above, the analyses for the FFY 2021 survey data suggest that the results of the survey are statistically underrepresented for two race/ethnicity groups (parents of students with IEPs identified as Black/African American and Hispanic/Latinx) and one disability category (students eligible under the category of Specific Learning Disability). The results were determined to be over-representative of parents of students identified as White/Caucasian and students eligible under the disability category of Autism. The results were found to be representative across all of the other disability categories as well as the other areas of analysis (i.e., race/ethnicity, grade level, LRE placement, and school type).

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

NO

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

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

During in the 2021-22 school year, Washington convened a Parent Engagement Focus Group, part of the State Design Team (SDT), which engaged in work related to Indicator B-8. The Parent Engagement Focus Group consisted of 51 participants, including three individuals with disabilities and 30 parents/family members of individuals with disabilities. The group also included representatives from all seven federal race/ethnicity groups, tribal partners, advocates, general and special education teachers and administrators, state agency staff, and professional and community organizations. The group's work was focused on the development of the new parent survey tool, as well as methods for implementing the new survey process. This work included analyzing survey data and response rates and identifying methods for increasing response rates particularly for underrepresented groups.

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

The Parent Engagement Group's work resulted in a set of survey questions which was shared and discussed with the state's Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) in May 2022. The survey content was finalized at the end of the 2021-22 school year.

During the 2022-23 school year, OSPI is contracting with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) center to discuss and determine the process for implementing the new parent survey, using the recommendations provided by the Parent Engagement Focus Group. This work will involve the review of other state's processes, including strategies for increasing response rate and representativeness. OSPI anticipates the new parent survey tool and process, the culmination of this work, will be fully implemented during the 2024-25 school year.

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

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

Sampling question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

The survey has not changed; therefore, a survey instrument is not attached. Washington is currently working with partners to develop a new parent survey tool for gathering data for this indicator, as described in the Description of Stakeholder Input section of this indicator. A copy of the new instrument will be submitted with the state's Annual Performance Report (APR) after the new survey tool is implemented.

8—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8—OSEP Response

None

8—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 9: DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Disproportionality.

Compliance Indicator

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

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

Data Source

State's analysis, based on state's child count data collected under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9—Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2020	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum “n” and/or cell size requirement? (Yes / No)

YES

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

24

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the state's minimum “n” and/or cell size	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
8	0	263	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

The state has a process in place for reviewing all districts and educational service agencies in the state each year with regard to disproportionate representation. The first step of this process includes a data analysis of all districts conducted by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). The state utilizes risk ratios or alternate risk ratios (RR) for the purpose of determining whether the district has met the state-defined threshold for disproportionate representation:

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

The source data used to calculate the RRs for FFY 2021 were the Total Enrollment Report submitted by every district in the state in October 2022, and the November 2022 Federal Special Education Child Count and Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Report submitted by every district in the state.

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

Using the criteria established above, the state determined that eight districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation under Indicator 9. A total of 24 districts were excluded from the calculation due to not meeting the minimum "n" size requirement.

The state analyzed the eight districts identified through the FFY 2021 data review as having disproportionate representation to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. The identified districts were required to complete a self-review as part of the Local Educational Agency (LEA) federal fund application. The state provided feedback and technical assistance to districts and asked for further clarification as needed in this review.

As part of the self-review, districts were required to review their policies, procedures, and practices related to child find, referral, evaluation and eligibility. The self-review also included an analysis of potential causal factors for the identified disproportionality and a description of the district's plan to address the disproportionality in the upcoming school year.

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

As a result of this process, the state found that all of the eight identified districts were in compliance with child find, eligibility, and evaluation requirements. In these eight 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 2020

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

9—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9—OSEP Response

None

9—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 10: DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION IN SPECIFIC DISABILITY CATEGORIES

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Disproportionality.

Compliance Indicator

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

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

Data Source

State's analysis, based on state's child count data collected under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# 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 the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in 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 specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

Provide the number of districts that met the state-established “n” and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10—Indicator Data

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2020	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum “n” and/or cell size requirement? (Yes / No)

YES

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

70

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the state’s minimum “n” and/or cell size	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
64	0	217	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

The state has a process in place for reviewing all districts and educational service agencies in the state each year with regard to disproportionate representation. The first step of this process

includes a data analysis of all districts conducted by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). The state utilizes risk ratios (RR) or alternate risk ratios (ARR) for the purpose of determining whether the district has met the state-defined threshold for disproportionate representation.

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

The source data used to calculate the RRs for FFY 2021 were the Total Enrollment Report submitted by every district in the state in October 2022, and the November 2022 Federal Special Education Child Count and Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Report submitted by every district in the state.

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

Using the criteria established above, the state determined that 64 districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation under Indicator 10. A total of 70 districts were excluded from the calculation due to not meeting the minimum "n" size requirement.

The state analyzed the 64 districts identified through the FFY 2021 data review as having disproportionate representation to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. The identified districts were required to complete a self-review as part of the Local Educational Agency (LEA) federal fund application. The state provided feedback and technical assistance to districts and asked for further clarification as needed in this review.

As part of the self-review, districts were required to review their policies, procedures, and practices related to child find, referral, evaluation and eligibility. The self-review also included an analysis of potential causal factors for the identified disproportionality and a description of the district's plan to address the disproportionality in the upcoming school year.

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

As a result of this process, the state found that all of the 64 identified districts were in compliance with child find, eligibility, and evaluation requirements. In these 64 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 2020

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

10—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10—OSEP Response

None

10—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 11: CHILD FIND

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find.

Compliance Indicator

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

If data are from state monitoring, describe the method used to select Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) for monitoring. If data are from a state database, include data for the entire reporting year.

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2005	98.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.27%	99.30%	99.36%	99.37%	99.72%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
28,403	28,103	99.72%	100%	98.94%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

300

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

A review of both the range of days beyond the timeline the evaluation was completed and the reason(s) for the delay(s) was conducted.

For those 300 children whose evaluations were not completed on time or under federal exception:

- 56.33% (169) were late due to district scheduling and/or staffing issues with no agreement to extend;
- 19.00% (57) agreement to extend did not meet requirements;
- 18.00% (54) were late due to other issues not specified by the district; and
- 6.67% (20) were due to data/tracking errors

With regard to the range of days for the 54 students reported above, a total of 67.33% (202) were delayed 15 school days or less and 32.67% (98) 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).

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of noncompliance identified	Findings of noncompliance verified as corrected within one year	Findings of noncompliance subsequently corrected	Findings not yet verified as corrected
11	11	0	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The districts identified root causes of the noncompliance, and reviewed policies, procedures, and/or practices that contributed to the noncompliance. Actions were taken by the district to address the identified root causes and were reported to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) through the IDEA Compliance Package.

In order to verify that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1), a review of updated data, conducted by regional Educational Service District (ESD) representatives and validated by OSPI, was completed. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. This review verified 100% compliance; all 11 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1).

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

The identified districts corrected and accounted for all individual instances of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. Special education representatives from the regional ESDs and OSPI verified that the 11 districts’ corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. Regional ESD representatives reviewed data to verify that the noncompliance was corrected. All 11 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 2020 for Indicator 11 was corrected within one year of identification.

11—Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2020 for Indicator 11 was corrected within one year of identification as per OSEP Memo 09-02.

The districts identified root causes of the noncompliance, and reviewed policies, procedures, and/or practices that contributed to the noncompliance. Actions were taken by the district to address the identified root causes and were reported to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) through the IDEA Compliance Package.

In order to verify that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1), a review of updated data, conducted by regional Educational Service District (ESD) representatives and validated by OSPI, was completed. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. This review verified 100% compliance; all 11 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1).

The identified districts corrected and accounted for all individual instances of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. Special education representatives from the regional ESDs and OSPI verified that the 11 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. Regional ESD representatives reviewed data to verify that the noncompliance was corrected. All 11 districts were found to have completed the evaluation, although late, for every student whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district.

11—OSEP Response

None

11—Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the

status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

INDICATOR 12: EARLY CHILDHOOD TRANSITION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition.

Compliance Indicator

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in IDEA Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be **not** eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under IDEA Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a state's policy under 34 C.F.R. §303.211 or a similar state option.

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

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

Instructions

If data are from state monitoring, describe the method used to select Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) for monitoring. If data are from a state database, include data for the entire reporting year.

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

used to collect these data, and if data are from the state’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category “f” is to be used only by states that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday under 34 C.F.R. §303.211 or a similar state option.

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

If the state reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the state did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the state did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12—Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2005	83.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.65%	98.31%	97.53%	97.93%	98.43%

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in IDEA Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,473
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

b. Number of those referred determined to be not eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	406
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,594
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 C.F.R. §300.301(d) applied.	199
e. Number of children who were referred to IDEA Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	61
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a state's policy under 34 C.F.R. §303.211 or a similar state option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by IDEA Part C prior to age three who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,594	2,807	98.43%	100%	92.41%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

OSPI staff examined the Indicator B12 results and had discussions with districts and other educational partners (stakeholders) to identify potential reasons for the identified slippage. Below is a description of the contributing factors that were identified.

The largest barrier for districts appears to be data management systems. First, districts report that the Part C lead agency data management system has not been consistently alerting staff of potentially eligible children, leading to greater difficulties accessing student-level information to support the intent to evaluate, along with difficulties engaging families to gain consent and access the child for the evaluation. In addition, a new data application for collecting the data for this indicator was fully implemented starting in FFY 2021. Districts received guidance and training when the new application was first launched in FFY 2020, but the newness of the application, in addition to staff turnover and ongoing impacts of the pandemic, may have contributed to confusion. For example, 100 of the transitions that were not completed on time were reported under the reason code "other", with no additional information provided. The OSPI special education data team engaged with districts in multiple rounds of data quality checks, but some districts did not respond to multiple requests for additional information to describe the "other" category. OSPI had no information regarding these 100 students to assist in determining that the reason was an allowable exception, and therefore counted the students as late without an allowable exception.

Second, in the 2019-20 and 2020-21 data collections for Indicator B12, the state implemented an additional allowable exception related to the COVID pandemic. As of the 2021-22 data collection, this was no longer included as an allowable exception. It is possible that some of the late transitions in 2021-22 were the result of the COVID pandemic and were not considered to have an

allowable exception. However, as described above, OSPI staff were unable to determine the reason for 100 of the late transitions, even after multiple rounds of data quality checks with LEAs, and therefore are unable to confirm the impact of this factor on the 2021-22 data for this indicator.

In response to this slippage, OSPI has revised the reporting instructions to include clearer instructions for identifying the reason for a transition not occurring by the third birthday. These will be in effect for the 2022-23 data collection for Indicator B12. In addition, OSPI special education staff met with all nine regional Educational Service District (ESD) special education directors to share the results of this review of the Indicator B12 data and discuss next steps, including sharing the data and the reporting clarifications during the monthly regional LEA special education director meetings. OSPI has also engaged in ongoing trainings conjunction with the Part C lead agency to ensure school districts in Washington state receive, in a timely manner, information on students who are potentially eligible for Part B.

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

213

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

A review of both the range of days beyond the timeline that the evaluation was determined and the IEP developed (if found eligible) and the reason for the delay was completed.

For those 213 children whose evaluations were not completed on time or under federal exception:

- 46.95% (100) were due to issues for which districts did not provide explanations;
- 19.72% (42) were because the student was referred late to IDEA Part B;
- 18.78% (40) were due to district scheduling or staffing issues;
- 7.51% (16) were due to the family and district agreeing to extend the timeline;
- 6.10% (13) were due to the transition meeting not occurring at least 90 days prior to the student's third birthday; and
- 0.94% (2) were due to data entry or tracking errors; and

With regard to the range of days for the 213 students reported above:

- 19.25% (41) were completed 1–15 calendar days beyond the child's third birthday;
- 14.08% (30) were completed 16–29 calendar days beyond the child's third birthday; and
- 66.67% (142) 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 2020. All districts continue to report evaluation and eligibility data on all children referred to IDEA Part B for initial eligibility determination but at the student level using the statewide student database. District staff review and verify each student record submitted for the reporting time period. This indicator is then calculated using the student level data verified by district staff to determine the statewide percentage of on-time initial evaluations.

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

To address concerning data trends observed for Indicator B12 in FFY 2021, OSPI special education staff worked with staff from the Part C lead agency to begin revising the existing interagency agreement for Part C to Part B Transition. Priorities include clarifying roles and responsibilities for OSPI, the Part C lead agency, Part C providers, and school districts. This process will be completed in FFY 2022.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of noncompliance identified	Findings of noncompliance verified as corrected within one year	Findings of noncompliance subsequently corrected	Findings not yet verified as corrected
11	11	0	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the state verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

The districts identified root causes of the noncompliance, and reviewed policies, procedures, and/or practices that contributed to the noncompliance. Actions were taken by the district to address the identified root causes and were reported to OSPI through the IDEA Compliance Package.

In order to verify that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 C.F.R. §300.124(b), a review of updated data, conducted by regional Educational Service District (ESD) representatives and validated by OSPI, was completed. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. This review verified 100% compliance; all 11 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.124(b).

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

Special education representatives from the regional ESDs and OSPI verified that the 11 districts’ corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. Regional ESD representatives reviewed data to verify that the noncompliance was corrected. All 11 districts were found to have completed the evaluation and

implemented the IEP (if eligible), although late, for every student whose transition was not timely, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district.

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2020 for Indicator 12 was corrected within one year of identification.

12—Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2020 for Indicator 12 was corrected within one year of identification as per OSEP Memo 09-02.

The districts identified root causes of the noncompliance, and reviewed policies, procedures, and/or practices that contributed to the noncompliance. Actions were taken by the district to address the identified root causes and were reported to OSPI through the IDEA Compliance Package.

In order to verify that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 C.F.R. §300.124(b), a review of updated data, conducted by regional Educational Service District (ESD) representatives and validated by OSPI, was completed. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. This review verified 100% compliance; all 11 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.124(b).

Special education representatives from the regional ESDs and OSPI verified that the 11 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. Regional ESD representatives reviewed data to verify that the noncompliance was corrected. All 11 districts were found to have completed the evaluation and implemented the IEP (if eligible), although late, for every student whose transition was not timely, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district.

12—OSEP Response

None

12—Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

INDICATOR 13: SECONDARY TRANSITION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition.

Compliance Indicator

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

If data are from state monitoring, describe the method used to select Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) for monitoring. If data are from a state database, include data for the entire reporting year.

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2009	83.70%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.22%	95.81%	96.99%	97.47%	99.08%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
1,252	1,277	99.08%	100%	98.04%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

OSPI staff examined the Indicator B13 results, both aggregated and disaggregated, and had discussions in an attempt to determine reasons for the identified slippage. The number of IEPs of students turning 16 and above in 2021-22 was 15% more than the number of IEPs included in the prior year's data for this indicator. In addition, IEPs reviewed in 2021-22 were more likely than those reviewed in 2020-21 to be found non-compliant in the areas of postsecondary goals and course(s) of study. No significant patterns were identified when disaggregating the data by district or region.

To address the slippage, OSPI will continue to collaborate with the Center for Change in Transition Services, a Washington State Needs Project, to collect, develop, and disseminate resources, guidance, and professional development to assist secondary staff, students, and families in creating and implementing effective secondary transition IEPs. These resources will cover all areas of transition IEP development, including postsecondary goals and course(s) of study, the two areas found to have non-compliance in the 2021-22 data collection.

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

State monitoring

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

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

During the monitoring review, a comprehensive student file review is conducted which includes IEPs of students turning 16 and above to determine whether the elements described below are appropriately documented in the IEP:

- a. Evidence that the measurable post-secondary goal(s) were based on age-appropriate transition assessment(s).
- b. Measurable post-secondary goal(s) that are updated annually and address education, training, employment, and if appropriate, independent living skills.
- c. Transition services that focus on improving academic and functional achievement of the student to facilitate their movement from school to post-school settings.
- d. Course(s) of study needed to assist the student in reaching the identified postsecondary goal(s).
- e. Annual IEP goal(s) that will reasonably enable the student to meet the identified post-secondary goal(s).
- f. Evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed.
- g. For transition services that are likely to be provided or paid for by other agencies, evidence that, with parent consent, representatives of the agency(ies) were invited to the IEP meeting.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of noncompliance identified	Findings of noncompliance verified as corrected within one year	Findings of noncompliance subsequently corrected	Findings not yet verified as corrected
8	8	0	0

FFY 2020 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 99.08% compliance in FFY 2020. Eight districts were determined to be noncompliant with the requirements of 34 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.320(b) and 300.321(b). The districts were notified in writing of the identified noncompliance and were required to correct this noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.

In order to verify that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, a review of updated data, conducted by regional Educational Service District (ESD) representatives and validated by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), was completed. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, observations, etc. This review verified 100% compliance; the 8 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.320(b) and 300.321(b).

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

The 8 identified districts corrected and accounted for all individual instances of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. The correction of each individual case of noncompliance was summarized and reported by the district to OSPI through the IDEA Compliance Package.

Special education representatives from the regional ESDs and OSPI verified that the 8 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, observations, etc. All 8 districts were found to have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district.

13—Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2020 for Indicator 13 was corrected within one year of identification.

The state reported 99.08% compliance in FFY 2020. Eight districts were determined to be noncompliant with the requirements of 34 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §300.320(b) and 300.321(b). The districts were notified in writing of the identified noncompliance and were required to correct this noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.

In order to verify that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, a review of updated data, conducted by regional Educational Service District (ESD) representatives and validated by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), was completed. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, observations, etc. This review verified 100% compliance; the 8 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.320(b) and 300.321(b).

The 8 identified districts corrected and accounted for all individual instances of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. The correction of each individual case of noncompliance was summarized and reported by the district to OSPI through the IDEA Compliance Package.

Special education representatives from the regional ESDs and OSPI verified that the 8 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, observations, etc.

13—OSEP Response

13—Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

INDICATOR 14: POST-SCHOOL OUTCOMES

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition.

Results Indicator

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

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

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

Data Source

State-selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population.

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under "competitive employment":

- Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2015 State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR), i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.
- Option 2: States report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, 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 must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another

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

14—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2013	Target >=	25.90%	26.00%	26.10%	26.20%	19.75%
A	23.74%	Data	21.79%	21.31%	20.45%	19.50%	16.74%
B	2013	Target >=	49.55%	49.75%	49.95%	52.21%	54.00%
B	52.11%	Data	57.13%	56.08%	56.64%	52.95%	43.91%
C	2013	Target >=	67.33%	67.43%	67.53%	70.00%	73.00%
C	65.13%	Data	72.21%	72.19%	74.68%	72.04%	69.93%

FFY 2020 Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 10–12 above for a detailed description.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	7,938
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	6,261
Response rate	78.87%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,056
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1,925
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)	245
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	1,424

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education.	1,056	6,261	16.74%	20.50%	16.87%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.	2,981	6,261	43.91%	55.40%	47.61%	Did not meet 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.	4,650	6,261	69.93%	74.00%	74.27%	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.

Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response rate	78.16%	78.87%

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

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

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

response rates.

There were 57 (a 50% decrease over prior year) eligible leavers that were not contacted by school district personnel for the 2022 survey. Surveys for these youth were never started, and they are not included in the total count of non-respondents or as part of the Indicator B-14 calculation. CCTS is continuing to work with school districts to reduce the number of students who are not contacted for the 2023 survey.

CCTS made improvements to the TSF2 data collection platform and 2022 training materials and saw an increase in the representativeness of students that dropped out. All categories are now representative.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Washington state conducted the Post-School Survey census to collect post-school outcome data from all 2020–2021 school-year leavers one year after they exited high school. Districts utilized administrative records to generate a list of all leavers (who had not re-enrolled in school and were alive at the time of data collection). School district personnel attempted to contact leavers using informal student exit survey information and student records. Surveys were conducted between June 1, 2022, and November 1, 2022. The majority of districts recorded at least three attempts to contact each of their leavers during this timeframe and during different times of the day and week. Staff conducting the calls reported any reason for being unable to conduct the survey with each former student or their designated family member (e.g., parent or grandparent). All survey data are recorded online in the TSF2.

The overall response rate continues to be high with 78.87% for the 2020–2021 leavers, exceeding the target of 70%.

Non-Respondents

Although post-school outcome data could not be collected for the 1,617 non-respondents, the demographic information on record indicates that the majority of these youth are categorized as white (51.89%), male (62.65%), with a specific learning disability (49.72%) or other health impairment (27.77%). For non-respondents, the dropout rate is 21.34% (for respondents, 10.41%).

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

Representativeness

After the census was conducted, a Response Calculator from the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) was used to measure the representativeness of the respondent group. Calculations were made on the characteristics of disability type, race/ethnicity, gender, English language proficiency, and exit status 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 2020-21 (see Figure 5).

According to the NTACTION Response Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of $\pm 3\%$ are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representativeness of the group and positive differences indicate over-representativeness. In the Response Calculator, a red highlight is used to indicate a difference exceeding the $\pm 3\%$ interval.

The NTACTION Response Calculator includes eight categories of respondents for measuring representativeness: Specific Learning Disability, Emotional Behavioral Disability, Intellectual Disability, All Other Disabilities, Female, Non-white, English Learner, and Drop-out. Washington state gathered representative data from all groups.

Target Leaver Difference

- Specific Learning Disability = -0.31%
- Emotional/Behavioral Disability = -0.35%
- Intellectual Disability = 0.17%
- All Other Disabilities = 0.50%
- Female = -0.06%
- Non-white Race/Ethnicity = -0.36%
- Limited English Proficiency = 0.07%
- Dropped out = -2.36%

Selection Bias

As in previous years, post-school outcome data collection shows representativeness in areas of disability, gender, and ethnicity. Based on data collected since FFY 2013, this is the first-time data were also representative of students who dropped out. Representativeness among these former students increased by 1.74 percentage points from FFY 2020 to FFY 2021 (-4.10 to -2.36).

The increase in representativeness among students who drop out is likely due to updates in the TSF2 data collection platform related to deleting leavers from the system. Based on informal observations, CCTS was concerned that students who drop out were being deleted from the system, rather than contacted for the survey, but did not have a mechanism to track that information. With updates to the TSF2 platform for the FFY 2021 survey, TSF2 users must now provide a reason when deleting leavers from the system (e.g., student returned to school and is no longer considered a leaver). CCTS reviewed the deleted leaver records and followed-up with TSF2 users for further information as needed. There were 28 leavers who dropped out, were deleted from the TSF2 due to user error, then added back to the system. If those 28 leavers were permanently deleted for the FFY 2021 survey, students who dropped out would be underrepresented in the data.

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

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

the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

Post-school outcome data collection continues to show representativeness in areas of disability, gender, and ethnicity. There was a significant increase in representativeness among students who dropped out from 2019–20 (-4.10%) to 2020–21 (-2.36%). These youth continue to be the least represented in the current response group. There were no groups +/- the 3% category. All groups were representative.

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

YES

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

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

Sampling question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on K-12 schools, postsecondary education, employment, and community began in Washington state in March 2020. Schools closed across the state, moving to virtual instruction with various degrees of knowledge and expertise. Businesses, particularly those in the service industry, moved to online services or closed (temporarily or permanently).

Although there is not rigorous research to draw correlation between the effects of the pandemic on Washington state’s post-school outcomes, statewide engagement decreased by 4.75 percentage points from FFY 2018 to FFY 2020 (74.68% to 69.93%). In FFY 2020, the rates of Competitive Employment and Higher Education decreased, and the rate of Other Employment increased.

Despite concerns about the impact the pandemic might have on the survey response rate, statewide there was a small increase in the percentage of former students who were contacted and responded to the survey. FFY 2020 response rate was 78.16, up by 1.07 percentage points from FFY 2019. This was the highest response rate in Washington state since FFY 2017.

For the FFY 2021 survey, engagement rates increased to levels that align more closely with rates prior to the start of the pandemic. From FFY 2020 to FFY 2021, Any Engagement increased by 4.34 percentage points, with a notable increase in Competitive Employment. The survey response rate increased by 0.71 percentage points and is the highest it’s been since FFY 2016.

14—Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2021 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

As in previous years, post-school outcome data collection shows representativeness in areas of disability, gender, and ethnicity. Based on data collected since FFY 2013, this is the first-time data were also representative of students who dropped out. As reported previously, representativeness among these former students increased by 1.74 percentage points from FFY 2020 to FFY 2021 (-4.10 to -2.36).

The increase in representativeness among students who dropped out was likely due to updates in the post-school data collection platform related to deleting leavers from the system. Informal observations revealed that students who dropped out were being deleted from the system, rather than contacted for the survey, and there was previously no mechanism to track that information. With updates to the data collection platform for the FFY 2021 survey, users were required to provide a reason when deleting leavers from the system (e.g., student returned to school and is no longer considered a leaver). Deleted leaver records were reviewed and followed-up on for further information as needed. Washington state continues to make improvements to the data collection platform and training materials in hopes that representativeness will continue to increase among the most difficult to reach students.

14—OSEP Response

None

14—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 15: RESOLUTION SESSIONS

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision.

Results Indicator

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

States are not required to report data at the Local Educational Agency (LEA) level.

15—Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges.

Target Range not used.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021–22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	95
SY 2021–22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	25

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 10–12 above for a detailed description.

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2013	27.66%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	26.00%	26.25%	26.50%	26.75%	27.69%
Data	30.77%	32.14%	38.89%	27.14%	26.58%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
25	95	26.58%	28.63%	26.32%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

15—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

Response

None

15—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 16: MEDIATION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision.

Results Indicator

Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR).

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

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

States are not required to report data at the Local Educational Agency (LEA) level.

16—Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges.

Target Range not used.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021–22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	29
SY 2021–22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2
SY 2021–22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	17

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 10–12 above for a detailed description.

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2013	78.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	75.30%–85.30%	75.40%–85.40%	75.50%–85.50%	75.60%–85.60%	82.40%
Data	88.89%	95.59%	87.50%	81.40%	81.08%

Targets

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status
2	17	29	81.08%	83.40%	65.52%	Did not meet target

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

OSPI staff and mediation partners reviewed the Indicator 16 data and had discussions in an attempt to determine reasons for the identified slippage. Following is a description of the potential contributing factors. First, upon review of the data, the state's rates of mediation resulting in agreement were higher in 2020 than 2021, 2020 reflecting the largest impact of the COVID-19

pandemic with school facility shutdowns and a transition to remote learning.

Review of the FFY 2021 data for the state's performance for Indicator B16 also confirmed anecdotal data shared across educational partners (stakeholders), reflecting a shift away from trends observed in 2019-20 and 2020-21 regarding family expectations. As communities adjusted to the ongoing reality and impact of the pandemic, expectations from families and community members rose related to provision of services, including compensatory education (or recovery services). In other words, public perception shifted away from a feeling of "we are all in this together" to a mindset that additional delays and shortages were having an outsized impact on students with disabilities.

Finally, in reflecting with mediation partners, the mediators report a sense that many broader cultural factors are impacting mediation from national trends toward polarization, to ever increasing fatigue with government mandates and limited access to their expectations of daily normal life. Mediators report a sense that increasingly participants entered mediation unprepared to mediate or not entering mediation in "good faith" due to heightened levels of stress, frustration, anxiety, and hostility; participants bringing issues that are not necessarily negotiable such as government mask mandates; and participants entering a mediation with decisions already made and an unwillingness to compromise. While difficult to pinpoint an exact of single cause, OSPI believes that all of these factors have influenced a climate in which participants in mediation are less willing to compromise and agree, elements necessary to reaching a written mediation agreement.

As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, there initially existed a stronger sense of togetherness, partnership, and flexibility, a "we are all in this together" mind-set, that contributed to higher rates of mediations resulting in written mediation agreements during those years. Second, in reflecting with mediation partners, the mediators report a sense that many broader cultural factors are impacting mediation from national trends toward polarization, to ever increasing fatigue with government mandates and limited access to their expectations of daily normal life. Mediators report a sense that increasingly participants entered mediation unprepared to mediate or not entering mediation in "good faith" due to heightened levels of stress, frustration, anxiety, and hostility; participants bringing issues that are not necessarily negotiable such as government mask mandates; and participants entering a mediation with decisions already made and an unwillingness to compromise. While difficult to pinpoint an exact of single cause, OSPI believes that all of these factors have influenced a climate in which participants in mediation are less willing to compromise and agree, elements necessary to reaching a written mediation agreement.

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

In response to concerns raised by partners regarding equitable access to dispute resolution including mediation, OSPI special education staff began in FFY 2020 to partner with family-focused community based organizations to explore family navigator supports embedded within LEAs and ESDs. Priorities identified for family partners included knowledge of IDEA, language access and accessibility supports, and access to district-sponsored professional development and training alongside LEA staff. This planning phase continued in FFY 2021 and will be implemented as a pilot starting in FFY 2022.

16—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response

None

16—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 17: STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

General Supervision.

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

- **Baseline Data:** The state must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage, and which is aligned with the state-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.
- **Targets:** In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.
- **Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages), and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR);

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

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

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

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

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

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

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, the state must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The state must report on whether the state met its target. In addition, the state may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The state must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the state's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 2022). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The state must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the state intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the state must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022–June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022–June 30, 2023).

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

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17—Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Washington’s SiMR is designed to increase the social emotional learning (SEL) performance rates of students with disabilities entering Kindergarten programs. The method of data collection for the SiMR is the Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS) entrance assessment that is administered to all kindergarteners in the fall of each school year. The observational assessment tool used to collect the data is GOLD® by Teaching Strategies® (TSG) which evaluates six domain areas including cognition, literacy, language, physical development, SEL, and mathematics.

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

NO

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

YES

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

Washington’s SiMR is designed to increase the social emotional learning (SEL) performance rates of entering kindergartners with disabilities in nine Educational Service District (ESD) regions (112, 114, 123, 121, 101, 171, 105, 189, and 113), which represents nearly 100% of all preschoolers with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) statewide. This is an expansion of the project work first reported in the 2020 submission, which included five ESDs and represented 63% of all preschoolers with IEPs statewide. All local school districts recruited into the SSIP Implementation Project are contractors or subcontractors with the Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF) Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP), a State-funded preschool program; Head Start, a federally-funded preschool program; or a locally-funded community preschool program, which in most cases is also a licensed child care facility that enrolls children between 3 and 5 years of age with and without disabilities who have met specific enrollment criteria. To assess and monitor existing supports for children with disabilities within our Indigenous communities and to identify inequities that might exist within our current systems of support, intentional recruitment of Tribal ECEAP and Head Start programs was maintained within the expansion of the 2021 SSIP Implementation process.

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

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

Washington SSIP 2021–2022 Theory of Action

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

Progress toward the SiMR

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

NO

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2019	49.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

The # of students with IEPs entered K ready in SEL	The # of students with IEPs	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
2,074	4,294	50.71%	51.75%	48.30%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable.

Local school districts and early learning state agencies representing state and federal PreK, Developmental PreK, Part C, and Kindergarten, continue to see significant enrollment declines across the early learning landscape for the 2021 school year.

Notably, the number of students reported on the Kindergarten Readiness Report Card who participated in WaKIDS 2021 state assessment was found to be 5,412 less than the 2019 total children statewide, dropping from 79,326 to 73,914 total children. It is hypothesized that the decline in enrollment was, in part, due to the impacts of the pandemic, families' hesitance to place young children back into existing structures due to lack of access of coordinated care (established child care located beyond school boundaries), fears of COVID exposure, and shifts in school routines due to staff shortages. As was expected, this decline in enrollment, paired with the expansion of the SSIP Implementation cohort, resulted in slippage from the previous reporting year.

According to the Annual Federal Child Count and Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Data, for the 2019 school year, 18,256 children between the ages of 3 and 5 years were reported to have an IEP in Washington state. Over the course of the next two school years, the number of children found eligible for IDEA, Part B, and enrolled in an PreK program declined to 10,150 in 2020, and 9,565 in 2021. From 2019 to 2021, this is a decline in total PreK student enrollment of 8,691 or 47%.

Additionally, district staff reported significant social emotional impacts on young children due to the inability to assess structured learning environments in the 2020–21 school year. This barrier to

access was further compounded by guidance issued from the Washington state Department of Health and Centers for Disease Control (CDC) which resulted in:

Class size reductions within early childhood programs which limited or removed access to inclusive learning environments for children with disabilities.

Early childhood classrooms being reduced or closed in districts to accommodate elementary school efforts to meet current health guidance, which reduced or removed opportunities for young children to access high-quality learning environments.

Staff attrition within early childhood settings (state and federal preschool programs, child care, developmental PreK programs, and Transitional and traditional Kindergarten settings).

In some instances, programs reported that teachers were hired later in the school year and, as a result, missed the training window to implement the WaKIDS assessment, resulting in a lower n count.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

WaKIDS Fall Kindergarten Entry Assessment SEL Domain.

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

Each fall, from late August to October 31st, Kindergarten teachers, support staff, and Special Education teachers who provide specialized instruction to kindergarten students, observe and conduct formative and summative assessments based on children's everyday activities. These include their interactions with peers, their ability to successfully navigate their learning environment, and their ability to access adults facilitating their learning experiences to meet their personal and academic needs.

Once data is collected, teachers then enter student ratings into the Teaching Strategies GOLD® platform by the due date. OSPI data analysts process the data and provide each district with a score file that indicates kindergarten readiness for each child based on widely held expectations for 5-year-olds. The term widely held expectations describes the range of knowledge, skills, and abilities that children of a particular age or class/grade typically demonstrate over a year of life (birth through age 3) or from the beginning to the end of a program year (PreK 3, PreK 4, kindergarten, first grade, second grade, third grade).

The data are then shared with the OSPI Special Education Division by the OSPI Assessment Office, and are further disaggregated by race/ethnicity, gender, student program and characteristics (English language learner (ELL), low income, homeless, students with disabilities). Data are shared annually via the Washington state Report Card, and for purposes of this project, are further disaggregated for SSIP region and participating local districts. The data collected are then shared by early childhood special education (ECSE) Implementation Specialists for deeper analysis of student and program level outcomes to the participating SSIP Implementation program wide leadership team (PWLT) members. By creating this data review process, the SSIP State Leads (SLs) have ensured a mechanism for the development of data literacy nurtured at the local, regional, and state levels.

It is the intention of the SSIP SLs that the regional and local districts will align findings of the WaKIDS Fall Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA) with other local data, including but not limited to B6 Preschool (PreK) Environments data, B7 PreK Outcomes data, and other data metrics highlighted throughout this report and within the SSIP Evaluation Plan. Data findings elevated at the state, regional, and local levels are then leveraged for deeper reflection and inevitably create greater collaboration opportunities with community, tribal, and other essential cross sector partners strengthen the implementation process and to further efforts made to create system change utilizing implementation science.

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

YES

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

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

1. The State Infrastructure Leadership Capacity Assessment adapted from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA). This assessment, completed by individual State Design Team (SDT) members annually at the start of each calendar year, evaluates the impact of the state infrastructure related to collaboration, motivation and guidance, vision, and direction. This assessment includes SDT demographic data collection including gender, race, ethnicity, and dual language speaker SDT information.
2. The State Leadership Team Benchmark of Quality (SLT BoQ). This assessment, completed by the SDT annually at the start of each calendar year, is employed by the cross-agency leadership to assess progress and plan future actions to advance Pyramid Model evidence-based practices.
3. The Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT). This assessment tool evaluates and reinforces high-quality practices that support children's social-emotional development and behavior. TPOT assessments are conducted two times annually across program sites implementing Pyramid Model practices to measure progress and fidelity.
4. The Local District Preschool Inclusion Self-Assessment (LDPIISA). This self-assessment tool evaluates partnerships among schools, early care, and education providers to promote the inclusion of young children with disabilities. Programs are required to conduct an initial assessment to collect a baseline data within eight weeks of the start of the current school year and to then engage planning activities based upon the stage of implementation they are found to be in. Districts are asked to revisit the LDPIISA at the end of each school year to assess progress and to support strategic planning for the year to come.
5. The Early Childhood Program Wide PBS Benchmark of Quality (EC BoQ). This tool evaluates program progress towards implementing the Pyramid Model Program-Wide. This instrument is administered two times annually across program sites implementing Pyramid Model and engaged in Stage 3, Implementation, initial to full, activities. The assessment timeline will mirror that of the LDPIISA described above.
6. The Behavior Incident Report System (BIRS). This monthly data system collects and analyzes behavior incidents in programs to inform data-based decision-making with additional

analysis related to possible equity issues by calculating disproportionality. District teams are asked to ensure critical data is submitted by mid-December and mid-June.

7. The Parent Survey Instrument: Schools Efforts to Partner with Parent Scale: This nationally normed evaluation instrument was administered in correlation to the parent engagement strand of the theory of action annually across all participating programs. This data provides valuable information about the extent of parental involvement within the context of Indicator B-8 on the State Performance Plan. These results indicate the extent to which parents believe that school districts have facilitated their involvement in their child's education as a means of improving student outcomes. The Parent Survey has historically been shared to families of children with IEPs in the SSIP Implementation programs in the spring of each implementation cycle.
8. The Participant Survey Instrument. This post-training survey collects data related to quality, relevance, usefulness of professional development activities, and measures knowledge gained directly related to technical assistance provisions. This tool is shared with training participants following the completion of each training found within the WAPM training sequence, as well as program, practitioner, and Implementation Specialist Coaching calls.

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

NO

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

YES

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

1. A reduction in student enrollment continued to impact the data pool sample. Data may also have been impacted by teachers leaving the workforce, impacting the program's ability to conduct the assessment. In some instances, as was reported in the 2020 SSIP report, programs reported that teachers were hired later in the school year and, as a result, missed the training window to implement the assessment, resulting in a lower count. As was shared above, it is hypothesized that families' hesitancy to place young children back into existing structures due to lack of access to coordinated care (established child care located beyond school boundaries), fears of COVID exposure, and shifts in school routines due to staff shortages also played a factor in declined enrollment. As was expected, this decline in enrollment, paired with the expansion of the SSIP Implementation cohort, resulted in slippage from the previous reporting year. Notably, the number of kindergarten students reported on the Kindergarten Readiness Report Card who participated in WaKIDS 2021 state assessment was found to be 5,412 less than the 2019 total of children statewide, dropping from 79,326 to 73,914 total children.
2. The first confirmed COVID-19 case in the United States was identified on January 21, 2020, in Washington state. To ensure adherence to the Health Insurance Portability and

Accountability Act (HIPAA) of 1996, which guarantees protection of individual protected health information, restrictions were established to ensure the health and safety of staff and student were established in the 2020 school year and extended into the spring of 2021. Beginning in the fall of 2021, school districts resumed in-person school sessions with limited restrictions, though it was reported that SSIP Implementation local districts continued to require additional time to conduct baseline and progress monitoring program level self-assessments, as well as to convene staff to engage in professional learning and in-person technical assistance and coaching opportunities. It was reported by SSIP regional leads (RLs) that efforts were made to facilitate observations and program wide leadership team (PWLT) meetings via video recording, zoom conferencing, and later in person sessions as COVID restrictions were waived towards the closing of the 2021 school year.

3. Following the first school facility closure on March 12, 2020, the state detailed data collection mitigation strategies in the Reopening Washington Schools 2020: Special Education Guide aligned to health and safety guidelines from the Washington Department of Health (DOH) and the Department of Labor & Industries (L&I). Along with the OSPI Provisions of Services to Children with Disabilities in Early Childhood Programs During a School Facility Closure document, detailed ongoing communication and clear expectations around documentation and data collection processes were provided by the SSIP state leads (SLs) to the SSIP RLs. This guidance detailed ongoing technical assistance and support related to data collection processes, along with documentation related to assessment, observation, and referral methodology. Data quality concerns have been regularly addressed during SSIP Regional ECSE Implementation Specialist monthly calls, which include SSIP RLs SSIP state leads, DCYF ECEAP leadership, and national technical assistance partners. The SDT and RL discussion centered around identifying alternative implementation processes to further enhance data collection measures and teaming strategies by providing technical assistance and ongoing coaching calls related to data input, collection, and analysis. Activities included completing focused observations and debrief cycles; engaging in inter-rater reliability activities to ensure data reliability and fidelity in practice; and developing a cascading coaching structure to support fidelity in both implementation and data analysis processes (e.g., implementation specialists, program coaches, and practitioner coaches).

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

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

NO

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

Prioritization of the improvement strategies continue to be identified with the support of the SDT with direct input from the SSIP Regional Leads and National Technical Assistance State Leads representing the IDEA Data Center (IDC) and the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), including cross-divisional and cross-sector partners (CP, families, DCYF, ECEAP, Head Start, ESIT,

parent advocates, Higher education reps, and local districts).

Identified infrastructure improvement strategies include family and community partner engagement strategies, synchronous and asynchronous facilitated training, coaching, and efforts dedicated to sustainability and scale-up practices. The strategies focus on promoting state, regional, and local school district efforts to improve current communication and engagement strategies, with intentional efforts made to expand the framework to include community partners and families throughout the implementation process.

1. Family and community partner engagement strategies continue to focus on increasing access to inclusive EL setting and expanding the continuum of alternative placement options. The SSIP SLs have also taken care to introduce the frameworks of implementation science over the course of the project cycle. Implementation science is an essential component of the project work, laying out the necessary steps, stage-by-stage, to meet full implementation of evidence-based practices and sustainability of the program shifts made within regional and local programs. To further build sustainability of efforts, the SSIP SLs have established cross-divisional, collaborative opportunities funded by ESSER III Funds. This is based upon the identified problem of practice; lack of access to inclusive, high-quality early childhood learning experiences with integrated SEL infrastructures for children with disabilities contributes to opportunity gaps in social emotional development as these students enter kindergarten.
2. Deployment of synchronous and asynchronous facilitated training to support MTSS/WAPM knowledge increase related to inclusionary, race/equity, and trauma informed practices along with intentional data use to inform decision making remains a critical strategy within this reporting cycle. With the Early Learning Regional Coordinators, the SSIP Regional Leads and Washington Pyramid Model (WAPM) Implementation Specialists have collaborated with local school districts to achieve positive student outcomes with the deployment of inclusionary practices within school districts utilizing the Stages of Implementation. Associated activities continue to strengthen the capacity of early childhood programs to support the alignment of developmental preschool programs within local school districts with Inclusive Transitional Kindergarten Champions by building proficiency among coaches, specialists, and educators in the methods of Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) and the utilization of other evidence-based practices. School districts continue to engage in strategic partnership with the Educational Service Districts (ESDs) Regional Implementation Specialists to develop a system of progress monitoring, service, and supports, while continuing to prioritize data literacy to elevate collaborative teaming and data-informed decision making. Continued collaboration with SSIP Regional Leads to create and disseminate training opportunities relating to IDEA performance indicators (B6, B7) has supported the intermediate and long-term outcomes, resulting in an increase in children in general early childhood placements. Not only has the recruitment to early childhood special education (ECSE) initiatives increased year to year, but the data is supporting this finding as well. In the winter of 2021, Special Education SDT proposed that the B6 baseline and corresponding targets for B6a and B6b increase year to year with the duration of the implementation cycle by 1.5%. Upon release of the 2021 Federal Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) and Child Count Data, B6a data improved from 21% to 25.7% (4.7% increase) and B6b data decreased from 53.3% to 49.4% (3.9% decrease). These preliminary data illustrate the impacts of the SSIP Regional Leads' efforts to facilitate intensive technical

assistance, coaching (systems level and instructional), and professional development within identified regular early childhood programs (RECPs) to support IDEA performance indicators for programs participating at the implementation sites.

3. The statewide WAPM Implementation Specialists Training and Coaching Network in partnership with the University of Washington Haring Center, and in collaboration with DCYF, is a critical component in advancing the SSIP project work and the broader efforts of Early Learning advocates statewide to great inclusive high-quality learning experiences for children across Washington's complex mixed delivery system. School district and DCYF ECEAP preschool staff, under the direction of Program and Practitioner Coaches, continue to implement the essential social-emotional frameworks needed to ensure all students have access to high-quality learning environments with the establishment of pilot projects amongst licensed care facilities overseeing children 0–3 years of age.
4. Ongoing focus on sustainability and scale-up practices to support knowledge of systems change and leadership practices, aligning initiatives with internal and cross-sector partners and regional and local scale up and scale out efforts remains a top priority for the SSIP SL and Regional Leads (RLs). The engagement of SSIP (RLs) from three times per year to monthly meetings with IDC/NCSI TA, reinforced intentional collaboration to increase understanding of evaluation tools (logic model, evaluation plan, and theory of action), stages of implementation science, and defining roles and responsibilities of regional and local districts. The SDT hypothesizes that employing this infrastructure strategy to integrate aligned EBPs within agency cross-sector EL programs, 0–5 years, will result in increased knowledge of fidelity criteria and systems infrastructure, as well as increased knowledge of systems change and leadership practices. Though slippage has been reported for the SSIP SiMR, the SSIP State Leads have observed significant changes within the early learning landscape for the 2021–22 school year that support this hypothesis. Through the data collected by the SSIP implementation sites, the SSIP Leads have created a strong narrative outlining how, when data is used with intention, educational systems can be positively impacted and children farthest from opportunity can be elevated and offered access to learning environments never seen before and children farthest from opportunity can be intentionally provided access to richer learning environments.

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

The short term and intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategies to further support system changes in support of the achievement of the SiMR include:

1. Ongoing focus on family and community partner engagement strategies, including agency cross-sector representation of State Work Groups, Washington Pyramid Model (WAPM) training and coaching materials for families, community partners, and programs, along with established family representation on Program-Wide Leadership Teams (PWLTS). Within this reporting cycle, these efforts continue to ensure an aligned message reflects the strong

working relationships built and sustained between leaders within the Special Education division at OSPI. Data indicates 43% (3% increase) of PWLTs have secured family and community representation for decision-making and leadership development activities. Note that the total N size for participating programs has increased from 9 to 23, further reinforcing sustainability in systems improvement efforts and actualizing scale up practices. The SSIP SDT convened in January 2023 to conduct the State BoQ assessment. Preliminary findings of the critical element "Leadership Team" were discussed and resulted in a request to reassess the process to which the assessment is facilitated with the intent of ensuring equitable engagement of all partners. The SSIP SLs will modify the self-assessment process to increase the engagement opportunities of SDT members and will use the findings to drive action planning for the upcoming SSIP cycle.

2. Employing facilitated synchronous and asynchronous training, including MTSS/WAPM training to increase trauma-informed practices has resulted in the increased knowledge of inclusionary, race and equity, and trauma-informed practices. During this reporting cycle, 53 individual participants completed 20 hours of asynchronous training focused on data-based decision making and evidence based coaching practices, yielding a total of 84 asynchronous training completions. Approximately 268 participants have completed state and regional synchronous training, yielding a total of 13,320 minutes. Additionally, deploying a certification process for implementation specialists to disseminate non-proprietary training yielded a total of 8 supplemental regional training offerings totaling 8,640 cumulative minutes. During this reporting cycle, 321 individual participants met fidelity in the prescribed training sequence, yielding a total of 76,920 professional development and training minutes recorded. Biannual training, monthly coaching, and ongoing technical assistance are in place to promote fidelity in implementation and best practice as it relates to EBPs for program coaches supporting all 23 participating programs.

Increased training opportunities related to IDEA performance indicators (B6 and B7) continue to support regional alignment of technical assistance provisions, creating opportunities for agency cross-regional collaboration across SSIP programs while leveraging current initiatives to help ensure successful execution, implementation, and continuous quality standard improvements within the SSIP. Employing this framework has bolstered accountability and monitoring of practice, as recorded through ongoing bi-monthly ECSE check-ins and current technical assistance modules (in development) related to Indicator 7. This infrastructure strategy informs current governance policy and practice, resulting in ongoing action planning to promote cross-agency work expanding access to general early childhood programs for young children/students with disabilities to expand access to students with disabilities across EL programs (as reflected in the DCYF Saturation Study, RFAs, and QRIS).

3. Focusing on coaching activities, including the continued utilization of evidence-based practices to support increased knowledge of fidelity criteria and systems infrastructure, increased knowledge of trauma-informed practices, increased knowledge of race and equity practices, and increased family and community provider engagement within local EL programs. Evidence-based practices include the deployment of a certification process for implementation specialists to serve both as coaches and trainers for the selection and

implementation of specific evidence-based practices (EBPs). Note that all 9 Educational Service Districts have an identified implementation specialist in which 77% of the participating implementation specialists have completed the WAPM implementation specialist certification process.

Employing a statewide network of coaches has resulted in a 33.3% increase (extensive) with a 66.70% moderate increase in overall practices knowledge gained collected via survey data. By providing varying dimensions related to the statewide network, the SSIP SDT is better equipped to provide both programmatic, fiscal, and governance recommendations to support future implementation. Preliminary data indicates 70% (a 30% increase) of participating programs having met fidelity per the prescribed training sequence. The SSIP RLs remain dedicated to the project work and embrace the benefits of actively engaging practitioners and leaders, including family partnerships and community partners (e.g., parent advocates, family voice listening group participants, PWLT family members, etc.). In the current SSIP implementation cycle period, SSIP RLs participated in 15 monthly core convenings, launched April 26, 2021, and extended through to November 28, 2022. RLs continue to employ the principles of implementation science to develop criteria related to quality standards in practice.

4. Centering sustainability and scale-up considerations, including documentation of alignment and collaboration within SSIP implementation and cross-sector work that integrates a comprehensive database, scale-up plan protocol, criteria for fidelity, and ongoing action planning. Implementation of this strategy has increased knowledge of fidelity criteria and systems infrastructure, along with knowledge of systems change and leadership practices. The scaling up of partnerships with external early learning content experts to support the integration and collaboration of new landmark initiatives with SSIP activities has been of particular benefit. With the ongoing utilization of tools such as the SSIP Evaluation Plan, Theory of Action, and Logic Model, the SSIP State Leads have successfully navigated both regional and local school district partners to leverage the frameworks of implementation science within their current infrastructures to identify the necessary steps, to meet full implementation of evidence-based practice across sites. Employing implementation science to guide practice resulted in 100% program self-identification across all 23 participating programs and alignment to the stages of implementation science of which 9 programs are engaging in initial and/or full implementation practices. During this reporting cycle, each implementation site developed a leadership team action plan to promote fidelity in practice aligned with the stages of implementation science with data markers to monitor progress and recalibrate as necessary. Note that in the prior reporting cycle, 22% of participating programs identified a comprehensive leadership team action plan. The implementation of this improvement strategy is imperative in supporting system sustainability necessary to achieving the SiMR, along with establishing and promoting intentional alignment of project practice related to accountability and monitoring.

With these continued measures in place, improvement in the performance rates in social-emotional development among students with and without disabilities is expected. Targeted improvements to the system infrastructure, intentional scale-up, and sustainability in practice will yield knowledge of both system change and leadership practice(s) as measured

through EBPs.

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

NO

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

The 2021 SSIP infrastructure improvement strategies will continue to focus on:

1. Increased family and community partner engagement strategies will continue to promote knowledge of regional and local early learning systems, including the continuum of LRE placements. As a result, intermediate outcomes to support both sustainability of improvement efforts and scale-up through strategic and intentional collaboration to enhance technical assistance provisions and fidelity in implementation to better meet the needs of community partners has become evident. It continues to be the hypothesis of the SSIP SDT, State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), and ECSE Coordination team that with intensive technical assistance in the area of social-emotional development, along with system-level coaching in MTSS infrastructure development for program staff in integrated early learning environments, there will be an increase in family/community partnerships across all participating SSIP sites, yielding, a 40% gain from baseline (100% PWLT parent/community representation as the terminal goal).
2. The SSIP SLs will continue to employ both asynchronous and synchronous facilitated training within targeted timelines specifically meant to target educational practitioners' access to professional learning related to trauma-informed practice, race and equity practices, and inclusionary practices to support ongoing quality standards. It remains the hypothesis of the SSIP SLs that ongoing facilitated training, completed to fidelity per the prescribed sequence, will yield fidelity in practice application directly correlated with TPOT and LDPIISA raw scores, resulting in 80% of programs meeting fidelity in the subsequent reporting cycle (13% of participating programs have met the fidelity criterion detailed above within this SSIP reporting period). By increasing training opportunities related to IDEA performance indicators, via intensive data analyses, accountability and monitoring, and broad community partner input, the SSIP SLs expect to see an increase in access to inclusive settings, improved academic settings, and a decrease in reported suspensions and expulsion rates of children, 3–5 years and beyond.
3. Ongoing investment in maintaining and enhancing the WAPM coaching, and training network is hypothesized to continue to support the effectiveness of SEL intensive technical assistance, and professional development associated with the implementation of inclusionary practices and the early learning MTSS framework, WAPM, to expand the continuum of placement options for children with IEPs within their local communities' early learning programs. Multiple early childhood initiatives (e.g., Washington Pyramid Model, Learning Experiences—An alternative Program for Preschoolers and Parents (LEAP), Preschool Inclusion Champions Network, and the University of Washington-Haring Center Demonstration Sites) led by the OSPI Special Education division are directly aligned to the SSIP and prioritize the intersection of social-emotional development and embedded inclusionary practices in early childhood programs for all students, paired with intensive technical assistance and systems level coaching for preschool staff in integrated early

learning environments. Data indicates that in employing the statewide network of coaches, an increase in inclusionary practice knowledge gained across the three tiers of coaching (e.g., implementation specialist, program coach, and practitioner coach) will likely continue. Coaching knowledge gain will continue to be collected and analyzed in subsequent reports to inform best practice. Intentional engagement with SSIP RLs in coordinating, disseminating, and employing EBP has resulted in increased rates of response (as evidenced via participant survey response rate, training attendance, and data submission) examples include:

- a. Scaling up the current WAPM Training and Coaching Network with support of University of Denver, PELE Center, to establish a Regional Learning Experiences -An alternative Program for Preschoolers and Parents (LEAP) Coaching Network.
 - b. Establishing a funding source for ECSE Implementation Specialists that have met fidelity within the WAPM training and coaching sequence) to collaborate with Regional Implementation Coordinators in the training, coaching, and technical assistance efforts to scale out multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS), P-21.
4. Intentional alignment with implementation science to support the phases of implementation, including sustainability and scale-up, have resulted in data-informed decision making related to the selection of EBPs. By utilizing these tools, local districts are increasing knowledge of systems change and leadership practices, which in turn is offering vital information from RLs and local districts relating to areas of strength and need. The SSIP SLs continue to expect maintained progress of 100% program identification in alignment with the phases of implementation science as the project continues to progress. The SSIP SLs continue to center on strategies for involving multiple divisions within OSPI to maximize the allocation of resources across multiple funding streams to support procedures and policies. The SLT BoQ informs current efforts to scale-up and sustain evidence-based practices, requiring intentional co-creation and collaboration with community partners. Examples related to intentional alignment of systems to promote scale-up and sustainability practices include:
- a. The deployment of a March 2022 contract with Pyramid Model Consortium (PMC), to access licenses to the Pyramid Model Implementation Database (PIDS). The acquisition of this license ensured that the SSIP SLs have a vetted data submission platform for all local districts engaging in inclusionary practice and MTSS project work. This also ensured that the SSIP state data manager had a streamlined tool for data submission and later data analysis. With this database in place, the SSIP SLs expect a continuous increase in data submissions across all eight prescribed data sources in the subsequent reporting period (note that there is an 87% data submission response reported in this period from the prior reporting period in which 67% of programs submitted data yielding, a 20% response rate increase).
 - b. Continued efforts on sustaining the ECSE Inclusion Champions cohort, a title designated to local school districts and program leads, who continue to demonstrate progress per their program-identified stage of implementation as demonstrated by their submitted action plan and qualitative and quantitative data sourcing (e.g., LDPISA, TPOT, EC BoQ, Coaching Log(s), BIRs).
 - c. Expansion of the PreK Inclusion Champions Network to include Inclusive Transitional Kindergarten grantees, bringing together school district leadership across Washington state that are committed to expanding the continuum of placement

options for all children through the implementation of inclusionary practices and MTSS frameworks.

- d. Expansion of partnership with DCYF ECEAP to integrate WAPM training and coaching practices into their existing coaching framework known as Early Achievers, which serves children ages 0–5 years enrolled in state and federal PreK programs, as well as licensed childcare.

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

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

1. Washington Pyramid Model (WAPM);
2. Learning Experiences and Alternative Program (LEAP) Replication;
3. Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS); and
4. Implementation science.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

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

1. The SSIP SLs continue to intentionally implement the Pyramid Model, a national innovation for equitable multi-level systems of support in participating SSIP programs, across Washington state’s complex mixed delivery system. This framework is tailored to meet state-specific needs, promote inclusionary practices, and enhance social and emotional competence in infants, toddlers, and young children. The application of this framework in Washington is WAPM. The WAPM vision is aligned with the commitment to increase opportunities for all children to receive high-quality, early learning services in integrated and inclusive environments. WAPM is not a curriculum package, but a collection of programs and evidence-based classroom practices, selected by experts in early childhood research, to support optimal development and prevent challenging behaviors.
2. The LEAP Preschool Model reflects both a behavioral and developmentally appropriate approach for teaching children with and without disabilities within an inclusive early childhood environment. In LEAP Preschool Models, typically developing peers are trained how to communicate and engage in reciprocal social relationships with their classroom peers with autism spectrum disorder (ASD). The LEAP PreK Model also uses an integrated curriculum approach (i.e., designing learning experiences that promote children’s skill development across multiple domains) to provide opportunities related to all areas of development (e.g., social/emotional, language, adaptive behavior, cognitive, and physical). OSPI has contracted with the University of Denver to implement LEAP PreK Models across Washington state and is currently being implemented in 4/9 ESD regions.
3. A MTSS is a framework for enhancing the adoption and implementation of a continuum of evidence-based practices through data-based decision making to achieve important outcomes for every student. The MTSS framework builds on a public health approach that is preventative and focuses on organizing the efforts of adults within systems to be more efficient and effective. MTSS helps to ensure students benefit from nurturing environments and equitable access to universal instruction and supports that are culturally and linguistically responsive, universally designed, and differentiated to meet their unique needs. MTSS integration involves coordination of tiered delivery systems, including

Academic Response to Intervention (RTI), Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), Washington Pyramid Model (WAPM), and Social and Emotional Learning (SEL).

4. The state continues to employ implementation science to build organizational commitment, capacity, and systems so that children, families, and communities' benefit from implementation practices and improved outcomes are sustained. The Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) identified five implementation stages to describe the implementation process: Exploration, Installation, Initial Implementation, Full Implementation, and Expansion and Scale-Up. Implementation stages identify specific activities, outcomes, and unique challenges associated with the implementation process. These stages help in the planning, communication, resource allocation, and evaluation of SSIP implementation.

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

The impact related to each EBP (i.e., WAPM, MTSS, Implementation Science, LEAP) includes improvements to the systems comprising the state infrastructure via the employment of family and community partner engagement strategies, synchronous and asynchronous facilitated training and coaching, data-based decision making, and sustainability and scale-up activities.

Data sources informing EBPs impact include the Local District Preschool Inclusion Self-Assessment (LDPIISA), Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT) and Early Childhood Program Wide PBS Benchmark of Quality (EC-BoQ). These sources continue to highlight program/district policies and practices for targeted increase and ongoing action planning to better inform current program/district practice and areas for improvement (e.g., family participation and monitoring and data-based decision-making). Through data aggregated over the last three years of implementation, continuous implementation of WAPM has supported Washington state in efforts to increase high-quality, integrated, and inclusive early learning settings for young children. The utilization of data-based decision-making and comprehensive training and coaching based on said data, are the heart of WAPM fidelity in practice. In this reporting period alone, the increase in response rate across all eight prescribed metrics resulted in a significant increase in data submission in 87% of participating SSIP programs. SSIP SLs continue to provide professional development and technical assistance opportunities around data-based decision-making by offering six optional data office hours to all participating programs during the statewide deployment of the Pyramid Model Implementation Database (PIDS) system. WAPM employs ongoing practice-based coaching and fidelity of implementation by execution, implementation, and continuous monitoring as featured in the Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT) and Behavior Incident Report System (BIRS). These instruments directly assess fidelity and impact provider practices, parents/caregiver outcomes, and child outcomes. Furthermore, they guide the training and coaching network to assess, examine and provide ongoing practice-based coaching support to participating programs based on direct observation data collected during PWLT convenings and direct classroom observations. Ongoing analysis and data collection processes (as featured in the bi-annual EC-BoQ self-assessment) are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies directly related to staff buy-in (1.2/2), leadership team development (1.4/2), family and community engagement (0.9/2), and integration of data-based decision-making

(0.9/2). Data indicate that WAPM implementation continues to impact teacher/provider practices specifically related to trauma-informed practices, race and equity, and inclusion as recorded through knowledge gain survey data and direct observation data collected via the Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT). The SSIP SDT hypothesizes that ongoing family/caregiver outcomes, feedback, and concern will continue to be recorded and addressed during monthly leadership team meetings and collected via parent/family survey data. The SSIP SDT have worked to begin identifying areas for statewide improvement (e.g., family/community partnership, alignment of professional development opportunities across a mixed delivery system) and engage in bimonthly action planning to address low-score indicators as collected via the State level Benchmark of Quality instrument for increase.

The SSIP SLs have identified and developed the WAPM Training and Coaching Network, designating the existing SSIP RLs to support WAPM and ECSE practices across their respective regions. Each SSIP RL has completed an intensive training and coaching sequence to support local districts in their efforts to assess current system infrastructure to deploy a rigorous action plan aiding in implementation of the frameworks of WAPM to ensure equitable access to children with disabilities across their districts continuum of placement options. SSIP RLs have begun to collaborate and partner with Regional MTSS Implementation Coordinator (RIC) expert in efforts to expand MTSS scale out from K–12 to P–12 across systems convening on two separate occasions during this reporting cycle alone.

To note, the essential components of MTSS are interrelated, and as the intensity of student need increases, each of the components also increases with intensity. Washington state MTSS implementation includes seven critical components: Team Driven Shared Leadership, Data-Based Decision-Making, Family, Student, and Community Engagement, Continuum of Supports, Evidence-Based Practices, Cascading District and School Systems, and Implementation Stages. MTSS implementation and alignment are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies through analysis using tools such as the District Capacity Assessment (DCA) and Schoolwide PBIS Tiered Fidelity Inventory. MTSS continues to emphasize student voice in decisions about their education and provide opportunities for choice and designing supports that fit individual strengths and needs. Implementation of MTSS requires engaging community partners in leadership team development, decision-making, and analysis. The SSIP SLs understand that partnerships with families and community members are essential to successful employment of these EBPs.

The SSIP SLs continue to hypothesize that, by building continued statewide capacity to scale up, sustaining implementation practices through the application of implementation science will significantly impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and practices. ECTA affirms that the adoption of practices can work to support the state's great capacity for change. With an intentional focus on specific steps and associated activities per each stage, the SSIP SLs understand that each program requires individualized support to meet fidelity of implementation to impact the SiMR. Integrating WAPM, MTSS, and Implementation Science provide the SSIP SDT opportunities to assess and revisit program progress based on data to inform decision-making and make individualized program recommendations aligned with relevant data.

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

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

Indicator B7A (1) targets an increase in positive social emotional skills as measured by individual rate of growth—with a proposed future target of 89.2% across a six-year period—Indicator B7A (2), targeting an increase in positive social emotional skills, as measured within age expectations yielded 40.69% in 2021–22 with a proposed future target of 43.9% in 2025–26.

In 2021, 9,565 children ages 3 to 5 were reported to have an IEP in the state of Washington. Of those identified, 25.7% of these children had access to a regular early childhood program (RECP)(B6a) while 49.4% of these children were reported to be enrolled in either a separate class or program (B6b). It was determined that 24.3% of the children reported were either enrolled in a RECP with services provided elsewhere or received specially designed instruction via a service provider location. When compared to the performance indicator B6 data for 2020, there is a positive increase of 4.7% for B6a (from 21%) and decrease of 4.1% (from 53.5%) for B6b. There was also a reported increase of the number of children in a RECP with services provided elsewhere or via service provider location in 2020 from 12.5%.

Analysis of the State Infrastructure Leadership Capacity Assessment indicates stable maintenance across all three domain areas. Acquisition in the leadership area of collaboration yielded a mean score of 3.42. A mean score of 3.42 in motivation and guidance and 3.42 in vision and direction were recorded. A demographic analysis of the SDT indicates that 86% identify as female, 6% identify as male, and 6% as prefer not to report. Additionally, 86% identify as not Hispanic or Latino of any race, 6% identify as Hispanic or Latino of any race and 6% prefer not to report. 6% of SDT members indicated Yes to Dual Language Speaker Status (DLL), 73% indicated No, 13% indicated Other and 6% preferred not to report.

Preliminary discussion regarding the SLT BoQ was initiated in January of 2023. Preliminary findings related to the first critical element “Leadership Team” were discussed and the SSIP SDT requested the SSIP SLs develop a modified scoring procedure to meet the needs of the community spanning across a six-month time sample. The SSIP SDT anticipate reporting on this metric in future reports.

The Local District Preschool Inclusion Self-Assessment (LDPISA) yielded a 65% instrument response rate, indicating an average of 40% of indicators “in place” with an average 40% of indicators “in process but not in place,” 16% of indicators planned but not implemented, and 6% “not in place.” Statewide analysis indicates developing formal collaborations with community partners (2.82/4) and enhancing professional development (2.94/4) as areas for future growth. Reviewing and modifying resource allocation (3.23/4) and adhering to legal provisions of support and services in inclusive settings with Individualized Education Programs (3.55/4) have been identified as statewide implementation strengths.

The Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT) yielded a 35% response rate, in which 44 cumulative TPOT observations were completed. An analysis of the data indicates 76% of key practices were observed including indicators related to teacher engagement in supportive

conversations with children, collaborative teaming, teaching behavior expectations and connecting with families. A cumulative 51 red flags (RFs) were recorded with the primary red flag attributed to classroom transitions. Analysis indicates a decreasing trend in red flags recorded. An increasing trend in supporting interventions for children with persistent challenging behavior and stable implementation in supporting family use of the Pyramid Model Practices was reported.

The Early Childhood Program Wide Positive Behavior Support Benchmark of Quality (EC BoQ) yielded a 74% instrument response rate. 38% of indicators were reported to be "in place," 40% were "emerging and/or needed improvement," and 22% were "not in place." A statewide analysis of the data aggregated across the implementation cycle indicates monitoring implementation and outcomes (16% in place) and staff buy-in (36% in place) as areas for future growth. Analysis indicates that procedures for responding to challenging behavior (92% in place/ partial) and establishing leadership team (84% in place/ partial) critical elements have been implemented with the highest percentage of fidelity.

The Behavior Incident Report System (BIRS) (26% response rate) indicates a variable decreasing trend. Respondents report 2% in-school suspensions. Of those in-school suspensions (ISS) reported, 21 reported ISS instances in which 13 instances were identified for children enrolled as General Education and 3 instances for children enrolled as having an IEP. When analyzing the frequency of ISS for both children both with and without an IEP by race, the risk ratio for children who identify as Black is 3.04. Children who identify as Asian have a 1.93 risk ratio, and children who identify as White have a 1.14 risk ratio (all other risk ratios yielded a score of 0). 0.002% out-of-school suspensions were reported in which all students were classified as White. In this reporting cycle there were 0% documented dismissals. 38.5% of children with BIRS were classified as children with IEPs and 61.5% of BIRs were classified as children without an IEP. The percentage of BIRS attributed to dual language learners (DLL) is 15.7% and 84.3% for non-DLL children. Data indicates the following percentages of children with BIRs who belong to a student group: Asian (0%), American Indian (1.6%), Alaskan Native (0%), Black or African American (3.6%), Latino or Hispanic (15.3%), Native Hawaiian, (0%), Two or more races (2.2%), Pacific Islander (0%), White (86%), Other (0%), and Prefer not to report (0%). Data indicates that 14.3% of BIRS were attributed to children who identify as Hispanic or Latino of any race, 85.7% to children identified as Not Hispanic or Latino of any race, and 0% of children who identify as Other. Data indicate 14.6% of children with a BIR identify as female, 0% identify as Gender Nonconforming/Transgender, 85.4% identify as male, 0% identify as non-binary, and 0% identify as Other. Note that the data report includes 732 children in total with a total 121 BIRS reported.

Analysis of program and practitioner coach activity logs indicates a cumulative 19,069 minutes (increase of 10,450 minutes) of coaching to support the development of leadership teams, practitioner coaches, behavior specialists, and establish relationships with family and community partners. Program coach data indicates 16% of coaching activities are targeted at assisting with meeting processes, 16% spent reviewing fidelity tools, 16% allocated to leadership team development and 16% focused on developing practitioner coach activities. 61% of coaching activities were reported to occur in face-to-face meetings and 39% via virtual modalities. Data indicates 166 coaching cycles have been completed, yielding an average of 115 minutes per cycle. Within those recorded cycles, coaches report 10% were allocated to developing and setting goals/action plans, whereas reflective conversations and problem-solving discussions both during

the observation period and post-observational meetings accounted for 38%.

The Parent Survey Instrument: School Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale results indicate that 41.7% of the parent respondents believe that schools have facilitated their involvement in their child's education. This report yielded a 10.2% response rate (12 responses/118 total). The total sample of parents surveyed included parents of students identified as Hispanic (33%), American Indian/Alaska Native (0%), Asian (20%), Black (0%), Pacific Islander (0%), Two or More Races (17%), and White (12%).

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

To further enhance the work established within the current SSIP cycle, additional progress monitoring data collection continues to better assess current gains related to short-term outcomes, capturing knowledge gain related to inclusionary practice, race and equity practices, trauma-informed practices, system change and leadership practices, and fidelity criteria and systems infrastructure. The SSIP SDT are in the early stages of SEL implementation and note that practitioner changes in knowledge are expected to accelerate programs towards fidelity in implementation (note 13% of participating programs have met fidelity in implementation in scoring 80% or higher across two or more TPOT administrations and LDPIISA) and ultimately to achieving the SIMR. The SSIP SDT will continue to analyze the Parent Survey Instrument: School Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale in subsequent reporting cycles to assess gains in family engagement as evidenced by participant response and PWLT demographic data.

This process has been supported by the SSIP SDT, which represents a variety of partners across agencies representing children and families between the ages of 0–5 years. Collected through WAPM training and coaching participant survey to assess knowledge gain in five critical areas: Inclusionary Practice, Race and Equity, Trauma Informed Practice, Systems Infrastructure and Fidelity Criteria, and Systems Change and Leadership Practice. Participants reported knowledge gain using a scaling criterion (none, limited, moderate, extensive). Knowledge gain related to inclusionary practices yielded 50% in the moderate category and 50% in the limited category. Knowledge increase related to race and equity practices, yielding 100% in the limited category. Similarly, knowledge increase in the trauma informed practice criteria yielded 100% in the limited category. Notably, knowledge gain in systems infrastructure and fidelity criteria increased over this reporting period with 50% reporting limited increase and 50% reporting moderate increases in this domain. Systems change and leadership practice reported a 50% moderate knowledge increase and 50% extensive knowledge increase. Continued efforts to sustain moderate to extensive knowledge increase across all five domains are in place and are expected to stabilize with increased partner engagement at the local level, regional WAPM certification of SSIP leads, and with the expansion of regional training opportunities across the early learning landscape.

The SSIP SLs continue to expand efforts to support educational practitioners with updated technical assistance, professional learning, and coaching that will improve data quality in the long term. In utilizing the Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool, SLs identified a statewide average score of 6.36 (significant increase) in the Communicating with Families (COM1-8) and a statewide average score of 0.525 in Supporting Family Use of the Pyramid Model Practices (INF1-7) as documented across 44 separate direct observations during this reporting cycle.

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

Utilizing the SSIP Logic Model as a guide, the SSIP SLs have implemented the strategies, outputs and desired outcomes identified within this plan to move the needle on SSIP.

With the use of EBPs throughout the implementation process, the SSIP SLs with the support of RLs, community partners and families, have successfully met the identified short term goals: increased numbers of children in general early childhood placements, increased family and community provider engagement within local early learning (EL) programs, increased knowledge of inclusionary practices for Tier 1 and Tier 2 of WAPM, race and equity practices, and trauma informed practices, increased knowledge of fidelity criteria and systems infrastructure, and increased knowledge of systems change and leadership practices. Through efforts made to promote data literacy across all levels of engagement (state, regional, local), the SSIP SLs have identified key next steps to further enhance the SSIP implementation process.

Based upon Community Partner (CP) feedback, the SSIP SLs reviewed, revised the current ECSE PreK Inclusion Champion grant application and associated activities to ensure that they were aligned with the outcomes identified within the SSIP theory of action and logic model. With the prioritization of intensive technical assistance, coordinated professional learning, instructional and systems-level coaching, as well as intentional engagement of both families and community partners, the updated grant and activities will ensure that the SSIP RLs work directly with local districts to prioritize the intersection of social emotional development, embedded inclusionary practices, and MTSS frameworks in early childhood programs by engaging in the activities associated with the Stages of Implementation; Exploration and Planning, Installation, Implementation; initial to full, and scale up. With these efforts, local districts will expand their continuum of alternative placement options, creating greater access to high-quality early-learning and elementary programs. Examples of activities include but are not limited to:

Stage 1–2 (Exploration and Planning, Installation)

- Within six weeks of the current school year's initiation, establish a program-wide leadership team (PWLT) that includes a family representative and at least one community-based early care and education provider.
- With the PWLT, collect baseline and ongoing progress monitoring data using evidence-based practices and standardized metrics including the Local District PreK Inclusion Self-Assessment (LDPISA), and Early Childhood Benchmark of Quality (ECBoQ). Review with district team no less than twice per year to assess progress for up to three years.
- Analyze and create a baseline state of inclusion within each district program utilizing indicator B6 and B7 data.
- With the PWLT, create action plans prioritizing engagement to families and Community Partners within local district's ECSE initiatives, and to further support the efforts of the SSIP RL and local districts as they move closer to decreasing the achievement gap between children with and without disabilities in the social emotional domain and increasing access to inclusive early learning environments, the SSIP SLs have taken steps to collaborate with cross sector partners at DCYF ECEAP to increase integrated programming opportunities for local districts contracting or subcontracting with DCYF for ECEAP slots and associated funding.

ECEAP provides child-centered, individualized preschool education and health coordination services on a foundation of strengths-based family support. Under WAC 110-425-0080, A child is eligible for enrollment in ECEAP if the child is at least three years old by August 31st of the school year, is not age-eligible for kindergarten, and is either: (1) From a family with income at or below one hundred ten percent of the federal poverty level (FPL); (2) Qualified by a school district for special education services under RCW 28A.155.020. All children on a school district individualized education program (IEP) meet this requirement; or (3) From a family with income that exceeds one hundred ten percent federal poverty level and is impacted by specific risk factors incorporated into the department's prioritization system described in WAC 110-425-0085 (4) which includes preference for enrollment of children from families with the lowest income, children in foster care, or children from families with multiple needs. No more than ten percent of slots statewide are enrolled with children eligible under this provision.

At the close of 2022–23, ECEAP Request for Applications (RFAs) for ECEAP Services, 17 applicants applied for 1,331 ECEAP slots across the state, which was 581 more than was projected within ECEAP Expansion efforts to expand for the current school year. DCYF expects to be able to award most of the slots requested as a result of funding that was recaptured from some returned part day slots and additional investment from the legislature in the 2022 Legislative Session. Within the next calendar year, 3,233 additional slots will be available, with 9,699 slots awarded by the start of the 2026–27 school year. Based upon the 2021–22 ECEAP & HEAD START SATURATION STUDY, districts that have been identified as having a higher B6a LRE percentage and who are operating an integrated ECEAP/DD PreK program will receive prioritization for upcoming ECEAP Expansion slot awards.

To expand WAPM across the complex mixed delivery system found in Washington state, the SSIP SLs have combined efforts with DCYF Professional Development leads to create a complimentary training and coaching tract for practitioners working within state and federal preschool programs, licensed childcare, and with partners at Child Care Aware (CCA) of WA.

Over the next year, the SSIP SLs expect to see ongoing program and facility recruitment with a continued focus on regional onboarding and professional development offerings (to date, 1 Training of Trainer offering has been coordinated in this reporting cycle). DCYF leads continue to engage in site onboarding practices utilizing the EC-BoQ to identify instructional practices and training needs with an anticipated TPOT and Teaching Pyramid Infant-Toddler Observation Scale (TPITOS) launch in March 2023. Future DCYF efforts will continue to focus on program alignment, ongoing coaching visits with an intentional focus on Mental Health Consultation and community leadership development in alignment with the stages of implementation. To further enhance the current WAPM training and coaching Network, the SSIP SLs will be working in collaboration with the University of Denver-PELE Center and SSIP RLs, to establish a LEAP Coaching Network that that will span the state of Washington and ensure sustainability of implementation efforts.

In partnership with the Center for the Improvement of Student Learning (CISL), the SSIP SLs have secured funds that allow the SSIP RLs to begin the process of initial exploration and planning with the MTSS K–12 Regional Implementation Coordinators (RICs). Over the next implementation cycle, we expect that this community of partners will engage in regional collaboration opportunities (within this reporting cycle 2 have occurred with 3 additional connections forecasted) to support

project alignment and sustainability. Additional efforts are underway to develop a comparative analysis tool (e.g., crosswalk) for programs utilizing the EC-BOQ to support comprehensive leadership team development to better support sustainability and scale up practices. Future progress will be reported in subsequent reporting cycles.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

The testimony of the ECSE Inclusion Champions, which include the SSIP Implementation programs, paired with submitted data, show that the current model of the SSIP is effective in offering districts the opportunity to assess current practices, create viable improvement strategies, and increase access to high-quality learning environments for all children when provided with intensive professional learning and technical assistance related to inclusion, inclusionary practices, and social emotional learning. Local districts that paired this technical assistance with system level and instructional coaching found greater buy-in from program staff, community partners, and families, as well as positive outcomes for children engaged integrated learning environments.

Local districts shared that:

"The project gave staff the ability to best support students across settings and to align their practices as of their PLC efforts... The use of aligned materials increased the amount of success our students experienced as they transitioned from our special education program into our Inclusive classrooms... this supported us in having 100% of our 4-year-old students included with their same aged peers for the majority of their school day."

"It was a building year. There are LOTS of discussions about the direction and planning or the center regarding inclusive practices. Solidifying "where we've been, where are, and where are we going" was key to planning and having common mission."

"Our action plan helped us to being the connection with local daycare and we even visited one, opening the door for communication. This is an area that we need to continue to grow and build. ECEAP went through a big transition with new staff and we now feel like we can start to build relationships with them."

"We are thrilled to say that the opportunities provided by this grant

and (with) the support of the ESD, we are on target to meet that goal~ Our Inclusion Committee and our entire staff should be commended for their willingness to engage in deep conversations, be open to new learning and try new strategies to support students... (we) are on our way to making our vision a reality."

State data trends indicate an increase in response data across all tools prescribed by the SSIP SLs. An increase in the utilization of the Teaching Pyramid Observation Tools (TPOTs) were conducted via direct observation methods, yielded a 35% (a 5% increase from prior reporting period) response rate across 23 participating programs. The Behavior Incident Reporting System (BIRS) yielded a statewide response rate of 26% (a 6% increase from prior reporting period). Accordingly, the SSIP SLs continued to identify ongoing coaching and training opportunities as a critical element to ensure fidelity in assessment and analysis in subsequent reporting cycles. In addition to direct observation methods, programs were directed to complete either the Local District Preschool Inclusion Self-Assessment tool, yielding a 65% instrument response rate (15% increase from prior reporting period), and/or the EC-BoQ, yielding a 74% instrument response rate (24% increase from prior reporting period). Note that 52% (12% increase from prior reporting period) of participating programs conducted both self-assessment instruments. The SSIP SLs hypothesize that the recent deployment of the Pyramid Model Implementation Database (PIDS) system has supported the increase in statewide data submission. As such, the SSIP SLs expect an increase in data analysis and monitoring practices as recorded in the EC-BoQ Monitoring Implementation and Outcomes domain in the subsequent reporting period.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) on pages 10–12 above for a detailed description.

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

Essential partners enlisted to improve the overall quality of early childhood programming in WA state has increased significantly in the past year due to intentional alignment with internal and external cross-sector strategic planning. Representatives identified within each partner group (state, regional, local district, families, and community partners) below were actively engaged throughout the project work with special consideration made to ensure equitable representation and opportunities for co-creation at each level of implementation. As shared earlier in this report, the SDT captures a wide variety of partners, including practitioners and leaders from our State Parent Advocacy groups, State and Federal PreK programs, Part C State Agency representatives, Higher Education, ESDs, local districts, tribes, and Child Care Aware of WA.

Using the SSIP Logic Model as a guide, the SSIP SLs were able to make meaningful progress towards meeting identified outcomes in the 2021 school year. To support the expansion of inclusive EL settings, and to expand access to WAPM training and coaching, DCYF ECEAP and Head Start took remarkable measures to change recruitment methods and communications related to inclusion and least restrictive environment. Annually, DCYF prepares the ECEAP and Head Start Saturation Study to analyze access to Washington's ECEAP and Head Start programs serving 3-and

4-year-olds. This study estimates the number of eligible children living within each school district boundary and calculates the percentage currently served. This Saturation Study is part of the information DCYF uses to determine appropriate locations for ECEAP slots. Current or potential ECEAP contractors may also use this study to inform decisions to apply for ECEAP slots or move existing ECEAP slots to communities with high needs. To encourage the expansion of integrated programs and inclusive settings, the 2021–22 ECEAP & HEAD START SATURATION STUDY, published November 9, 2022, shared with potential ECEAP contractors the definition of least restrictive environment (LRE) and included the B6 PreK Environments data, disaggregated by ELL status, race/ethnicity, and age. Shifting the focus of priority groups to include local districts with the lowest B6a data increases opportunities for districts to access additional funding and integrated programming. This will be the first time many local districts will be placed in the position to access ECEAP funding, and braiding funds that allow districts and community ECEAP programs to work collaboratively to better serve children with disabilities across learning environments.

Other essential partners that have supported statewide efforts to increase access to inclusive EL settings and the expansion of local districts' continuum of alternative placement options includes the Washington state ECSE Coordination Team, the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), The PreK and Transitional Kindergarten (TK) Inclusion Champions Network, the Association of Educational Service Districts (AESD) Special Education Directors, and OSPI's Division of Early Learning, Center for the Improvement of Student Learning (CISL), UW IPP PreK Demo Sites, and Office of Native Education (ONE). Each community represents an essential partner of the SSIP implementation process that has been developed to scaffold the learning of regional ESDs, local districts, community partners, and families, as they navigate the Stages of Implementation Science, MTSS implementation, and other identified EBPs.

To increase family and CP engagement at the local level, OSPI has leveraged Federal Special Education 619 activity funds to incentive local districts to hold permanent positions for families and CPs on their Program Wide Leadership Teams (PWLTs) and to include them in all relevant training and technical assistance opportunities related to the implementation of WAPM, inclusionary practices, race/equity, and/or the impacts of trauma. Project outcomes cited by district partners engaged in the Washington state PreK Inclusion Champions (PICs) Initiatives, a grant intended to support local districts as they work to increase the continuum of alternative placement options and to increase student access to high-quality early learning with strategic utilization of EBPs, included:

"... Public School and our community partners continued our partnership to improve our program and capacity to serve preschool students with disabilities in inclusive preschool settings. (the) ECSE Coordinator and ECSE teaching staff worked collaboratively with community preschool staff and administrators during monthly collaboration and coaching sessions to implement the practices identified in the research to action plan."

"(the) early childhood program has been able to expand the number of placement options in general education settings within the district"

for preschool children with disabilities being served on an IEP from 26% to 43% for the 2021–22 school year."

The Washington state ECSE Coordination Team continues to be an essential partner group, with intentional efforts made to assess current technical assistance and professional learning and modify as necessary. With the support of national technical assistance partners from ECTA, IDC, and DaSy, the Washington state ECSE Coordination Team has been responsive to the needs of the practitioners in the field of early learning and ECSE by developing technical assistance materials supporting federal indicators: B6, B7, B11, and B12. Partners within this group have also met criteria to be identified as WAPM Implementation Specialists and SSIP Regional Leads and, in turn, have become the master trainers and coaches within their regions, ensuring that all training and technical assistance is aligned across regions, regardless of geographic location and local district size. This shift in engagement has empowered the ECSE Coordination Team to become the leaders of MTSS and WAPM implementation within their agencies, which, in turn, has ensured the successful integration of each framework within agency cross-sector and cross-divisional project work.

Sustainability and scale-up efforts continue to be a priority for the SSIP SLs as they partner with SSIP RLs and local districts to build skills in the utilization of implementation science and work to align initiatives across agencies. As the work to expand WAPM, MTSS, and the implementation of inclusionary practices continues, it is paramount that districts take explicit efforts to understand the implications of personal biases of staff and the lived experiences of the children and families they serve. To truly engage in practices that create systems of support and infrastructure improvement, local districts must first examine their current practices to build understanding of the implications of disproportionate representation within their educational systems by race and equity and/or specific disability category (performance indicator B9 and B10). Referral for special education is a result of well-intended adult responses to student needs. Disproportionality is a measure of the impact of those adult decisions on the lived experiences of students, particularly students of color. It is critical that partners across education understand that these decisions can cause harm when actions do not address the root causes of student need and are not culturally affirming.

Equally essential is the need for local district staff to have a strong understanding of the communities they serve, the potential trauma experienced over the course of the pandemic on both children and families, and the impacts of intergenerational trauma on Black, Indigenous, and other persons of color. To better serve the SSIP Implementation districts, the SSIP SLs have continued efforts to collaborate with experts in the field who are successfully making positive changes for children and families farthest from opportunity.

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

Describe how the state addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

With the engagement of CPs, local districts, SSIP RLs, and families, the SSIP SLs continue to take significant steps to move the implementation of inclusion, inclusionary practices, and MTSS in early childhood programs across the complex mixed delivery systems for children, 0–5 years. Each

advisory group has been actively engaged in collective influence, identifying issues, solving problems, and taking action to ensure all students have access to high-quality early learning environments across Washington state. Opportunities to engage have varied to be responsive to the needs of CPs at the state, regional, and local levels, offering monthly network meetings, bi-weekly OSPI ECSE updates on hot topics, editing and writing sessions for upcoming guidance, access to statewide advisories, including the Coordinated Recruitment and Enrollment (CRE), and Integrated Early Childhood Programming in partnership with DCYF.

Accordingly, an analysis of identified CP concerns include the following:

- Equitable considerations for Tribal children, including children with disabilities, children impacted by intergenerational trauma, including Black children, and practitioners living within these communities.
- Leveraging existing data sources to avoid the weaponization of data, especially when considering the most marginalized community members.

Within this reporting cycle, the SSIP SDT and SLs have worked to address these critical concerns with the following actions:

- The SSIP SDT and SLs executed a contract in November 2021 with Swan Innovations to review existing technical assistance training materials and plan dialogue with tribal early learning programs to adapt materials for use in tribal early learning programs, State Compact Schools, and Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) Schools in Washington state. Swan Innovations offers unique and transformational experiences for Indigenous communities, and those who serve them, by providing innovative training and creative health and wellness content aligned with Indigenous values and worldview. Following the content review and analysis conducted by Swan Innovations consultants Dr. Martina Whelshula, PhD., and Cree Whelshula, a written summary of collected feedback and recommended revisions was developed. This written summary and feedback included adaptations from tribal consultation related to WAPM Coaching and Training materials. This planned review included cross-cultural training recommendations and a close-in examination of WAPM practices through an Indigenous epistemological lens to determine what elements can be adapted to Native American tribal early childhood programs. One key recommendation from this examination is that adaptations of the professional development materials will vary depending on whether the training is for Native American educators or non-Native educators. Recommendations related to trauma-informed care, culturally responsive relationships, supportive environments, social-emotional learning, rules and expectations, reflective practice, and training and coaching have been embedded within the WAPM professional development framework within the Module 1 and Module 2 offering and will continue with subsequent offerings. Current efforts are underway to develop an additional professional development opportunity for participating programs that supports a deeper understanding of cultural bias and how individuals who come from western European cultures (which includes mainstream American culture) may mistake their own cultural values, beliefs, and paradigms as universal behavior and values. The SSIP SLs intend to report on progress related to this CP concern in the subsequent reporting cycle.
- To promote alignment in practice and technical assistance across a mixed delivery system, the SSIP SDT and SLs developed a content review process to provide community partners with opportunities to provide feedback related to content development and materials.

Through content review meetings, SSIP SDT noted the imminent need to center on family/community voice, trauma-informed practice, inclusionary practice, and race and equity in all aspects of the implementation framework, cascading logic model, and theory of action. Accordingly, the state has employed an ongoing content review process to review all technical assistance content to further advance/promote family and community voice, trauma-informed practice, race and equity, and inclusionary practice for future training and coaching opportunities focused on data analysis and literacy. The SSIP SDT regularly participates in technical assistance offerings and provides ongoing feedback as part of the content review and bi-monthly convening process. Within this reporting cycle, OSPI has partnered with the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), a federally funded technical assistance center, to co-design a systemic equity review. The systemic equity review's priorities include centering students with disabilities, partner voice, racial equity, and inclusionary practices. It has been hypothesized that data yielded from the systemic equity review will better inform current beliefs, processes, and practices as it relates to the SiMR. Additionally, the SSIP SLs expect that this analysis of the state's current systems through multiple data sources is essential to better inform future changes across Washington state related to data impact and systems development that avoids the weaponization of data. Future efforts are underway to create SSIP SDT professional development opportunities that explore the three pillars of culturally responsive data literacy (culturally responsive pedagogy, data-decision making, and equitable instruction) in subsequent SSIP SDT workgroups and/or bi-monthly convenings facilitated by Dr. Alexandria Harvey, NCSI Senior Program Associate. The SSIP SLs intend to report on progress in the subsequent reporting cycle.

Additional Implementation Activities

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

A legislative mandate was made in the 2021 legislative session based upon the Governor's request for a technical report of agency actions and legislative recommendations for programs regulated by the state or government-to-government responsibilities that must be met for children aged 3–5. As changes in PreK services affect enrollment in birth–3 and school-age care, impacts on these other programs are vital to alignment work.

Decades of rigorous research show that high-quality early learning inclusive of children with disabilities in a least restrictive environment contributes to a child's lifelong ability to learn and relate to others. Washington state has a diverse mixed delivery system of public and private early learning and preschool programs to build upon. However, there are wide variations in resources and quality. Information about available places to enroll is spread out, so families have a difficult time finding and accessing services. There are dramatic shortages in some communities and competitive pressures in others. That is why the Governor and Legislature have asked the DCYF and OSPI to align services for children ages 3 to 5, so families get what they need – when and where they need it. DCYF and OSPI formed a core team to drive coordination and planning of coordinated recruitment and enrollment practices across the state's mixed delivery system. A statewide cross-agency workgroup was created to advise these efforts, with workgroup members representing school district and community-based early learning programs, advocacy groups, community

colleges, and other regional and state organizations, all of whom will support and maintain their advisory role under this initiative, and a supplemental statewide advisory, the Coordinated Recruitment and Enrollment (CRE) Committee. DCYF and OSPI are recommending funding be provided within the 2022 legislative session to go towards state, local, and regional coordinated recruitment and enrollment (CRE) pilots that improve family navigation and access to the best choice for their child by addressing projected gaps in services. It is also suggested that funding be secured to develop a CRE communication toolbox that can be adapted to individual community needs. Both agencies plan to further expand opportunities to engage, gather, and implement community-based feedback and human-centered design principles moving forward. This will include, but is not limited to, the expanding ECEAP pathways work, future OSPI inclusion work, and the integrated programs pilot work that is anticipated to start in the fall of 2022.

DCYF and OSPI are committed to building an aligned inclusive early learning system. This can offer families better choices of services when and where they are needed. This can also improve child development and learning up to high school and beyond to higher education and employment. As described in the report, DCYF and OSPI have listened carefully and learned from tribes, families, and providers about what it will take to improve services and reduce the barriers and disincentives necessary to realizing our goal of a highly integrated and inclusive PreK system. As state agencies, DCYF and OSPI have examined their policies and procedures and worked together to identify key actions that they are taking within their existing authorities and those that will require legislative action. Addressing some of the biggest challenges will require legislative action and funding. These range from enacting ways to support timely renovation of small provider/family home child care provider facilities to support small providers in making renovations needed to accommodate children with disabilities, to increasing access to high-quality preschool by increasing ECEAP slot rates. Taken together, these actions will help our state advance our goals of equitably serving PreK-aged children and their families. To further align the practices of the SSIP Implementation project across local district and community-based settings, the SSIP SLs, in partnership with DCYF ECEAP and Head Start, have developed an additional level of engagement, convening the state leaders overseeing policy and procedure of the local districts engaged in the project work. A core advisory committee has been developed to support ongoing planning and policy and practice alignment necessary to support identified SiMR outcomes, including cross-agency policy and procedures necessary to expand access to students with disabilities across EL programs. As was anticipated and shared earlier in this report, data sourcing and alignment were reflected in the DCYF saturation study, Request for Application (RFA), and it is expected over the course of the SSIP implementation cycle to later be reflected in both the Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) and Early Learning Management System (ELMS).

Similarly, recognizing the integration and alignment of inclusionary practices and MTSS infrastructures into our PreK–3 systems is critical to student outcomes. OSPI’s ECSE and Early Learning divisions have joined forces to prioritize the integration of WAPM, race/equity, inclusionary practices, and trauma-informed practices within Transitional Kindergarten (TK) programs. Intentional alignment between TK and WAPM has strengthened the quality of instructional practices. Ongoing, deliberate, and intentional coordinated collaboration meetings (bi-weekly meetings with state leads, monthly with TK Leads) support the partnerships necessary to provide increased access to regular early childhood programs (RECPs), with the development of Regional Implementation Teams (RITs), bringing together EL Coordinators, ECSE Coordinators,

DCYF ECEAP and Head Start CPs, and families, to elevate an innovative and collaborative partnership. An added benefit to this collaboration has been the expansion of the PreK Inclusion Network. For the 2021–22 school year, TK program leads were invited into this network to engage in conversations that bridge PreK to TK and Kindergarten (K), allowing for peers to inspire peers. With the expansion of this network, and the extensive efforts made by the SSIP RLS to recruit and sustain partners within this work, monthly engagement has expanded from 30 district leaders engaged to over 90 district leaders engaged (33.3% increase). Washington continues to embrace the opportunity to reimagine a stronger, more aligned early learning and education system that prioritizes quality, inclusion, and family choice. High-quality early learning programs promote children’s development, learning, health, and safety.

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

The SSIP Evaluation Plan lays out the long term, intermediate, and short-term outcomes to meet the SiMR over the course of the five-year implementation cycle. This Plan also identifies the associated targets and performance indicators, who is responsible for each action step, the frequency of actions taken, and data collection tools used. Opportunities to engage CPs have varied in an effort to be responsive to the needs at the state, regional, and local levels, offering monthly network meetings (PIC Network), bi-weekly OSPI ECSE updates (ECSE Coordination Team meetings), editing and writing sessions for upcoming guidance (ESIT and EHDDI), access to statewide advisories, including the ECSE Focus Group, Coordinated Recruitment and Enrollment (CRE), and Integrated Early Childhood Programming in partnership with DCYF, as well as the Office Hours for LEA Special Education Directors.

To meet the long-term outcomes, SSIP SL participated in the development of a technical report that was written with OSPI and DCYF early learning leadership regarding ways to improve access to high-quality PreK experiences for children ages 3-5 years. The report includes recommendations DCYF and OSPI suggest for legislative action in the 2023 session, as well as actions DCYF and OSPI are taking individually and jointly to programs they administer. It also includes actions and recommendations developed through government-to-government partnerships with sovereign tribal nations. While the mixed-delivery system includes many components such as private programs and what happens in PreK-aged programs may impact 0-3 serving programs, this report is focused on attending to the elements outlined in the proviso as directed by the Legislature.

Both the value and challenge of our complex system of early care and education are evident in the legislative charges noted in the provisos that DCYF and OSPI identify and take actions and make further recommendations that can align and integrate:

- Capital needs;
- Data collection and data sharing;
- Fiscal modeling and funding; and
- Statutory and rule changes and the funding needed to achieve administrative efficiencies.

Work is underway. The agencies are beginning work on a DCYF and OSPI MOU that codifies the ongoing joint and individual work that OSPI and DCYF will undertake to align and integrate services for preschool-aged children. The state agencies are working together to create a shared definition of quality so that we have a clear and unified understanding about the programmatic

experiences that will best promote children's learning and development. DCYF is making careful plans for ECEAP expansion and bolstering the child care market. OSPI is engaging in rulemaking to clarify the requirements for school districts implementing TK, building on the Five Pillars of TK.

To meet the intermediate outcomes and to further strengthen existing infrastructures that increase and sustain SEL and academic skills as measured in the SiMR, the SSIP SL, in partnership with the OSPI Early Learning Division, within the strategic goals outlined within Washington state's PreK Development Grant (PDG), launched the WAPM 0–5 Transition and Beyond project work in December 2021 OSPI's Special Education and Early Learning, with external partners, partners have drafted a manual on transition practices for children exiting ESIT Birth to 3 (Part C) and entering a Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) (Part B). This manual is set for joint agency publication in the winter of 2023. The manual highlights the vision that all children and families benefit from a family-centered, statewide framework that supports coordinated, effective, equitable, culturally, and linguistically responsive transitions from early intervention to preschool special education services and/or the Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP), Head Start, and other high-quality early childhood settings. The development of this manual has integrated rigorous content review sessions from Washington's Department of Health, the Department for Children, Youth, and Families, Washington State School for the Blind, Partnership for Action, Voices for Empowerment, PDG family listening session partners, Open Doors for Multi-Cultural Families, The Early Hearing-Loss Detection, Diagnosis, and Intervention Program, Washington Sensory Disabilities Services and Washington State Hands and Voices.

A steady increase in participation of regional and local partners with the ECSE Inclusion Initiatives is evident as the SSIP SLs continue to examine and engage in comparative analysis between the SSIP data pool (23 participating programs) and the larger body of ECSE initiative work (127 participating programs). Approximately 80% of participating PIC and ITK champions engaged in baseline assessment practices. In this reporting cycle, 62 new programs have participated in the PIC or ITK project work, further highlighting expansion efforts across Washington's mixed delivery system to center on inclusionary practices. These efforts directly correspond to the SSIP Theory of Action which works to strengthen infrastructures for effective implementation of education innovations, increase knowledge of fidelity criteria and systems infrastructure, and increase family and community provider knowledge of regional and local EL systems directly impacting the SiMR.

To meet the short-term outcomes outlined in the SSIP Evaluation Plan, and with the support of OSPI's Early Learning Division, a contract was executed with Swan Innovations in November 2021. To date, this contract has included dialogue with tribal early learning programs to adapt WAPM materials and associated training materials for use in tribal early learning programs, State Compact Schools, and Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) Schools in Washington state. Swan Innovations submitted a final review of WAPMs that has been embedded in the WAPM Coaching and Training content (November 2022). Future efforts are underway to develop an additional professional development opportunity that supports a deeper understanding of cultural bias as it relates to WAPM implementation with an anticipated launch date of June 2023. Proposed data collection measures to identify the effectiveness of this project work include the knowledge gain survey assessment metric related to the short-term and intermediate outcomes as featured in the SSIP Evaluation Plan (knowledge gain related to inclusionary practices, race/equity practices and trauma-informed practices).

With the expansion of MTSS implementation in Washington state, the SSIP SLs expanded their current partnership with representatives from Washington MTSS to include Regional Implementation Coordinators (RICs), to support the outcomes predicted within the SSIP Logic Model, Evaluation Plan, and Theory of Action. Leveraging the existing efforts of the SSIP RLs and SSIP Implementation project sites, the goal of this collaboration includes supporting the implementation of MTSS, P-12, through intentional alignment of professional development, technical assistance, and coaching (instructional and systems level). A workgroup comprised of SSIP RLs and RICs has identified the following objectives and anticipates completions of the first two objectives no later than April 2023, with long-term objectives set for completion within the subsequent reporting cycle:

- Identify shared professional development opportunities highlighting the similarities and differences in WAPM and MTSS.
- Create a crosswalk of training requirements and instrument for programs to reduce duplication and align cascading systems and implementation sequence.

The SSIP SDT understands that supporting a child with an IEP is not the sole responsibility of special education staff, but rather is the responsibility of the greater mixed-delivery system in Washington state and efforts to align systems to promote greater outcomes for children, families, and communities' benefit everyone.

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

Within these convenings, CPs, SSIP Implementation Sites, and SSIP RLs have identified that the greater barriers for the success of the SSIP implementation and larger systems-level change in the early learning community falls in the space of equitable funding and systems alignment for early childhood programs. These expressed barriers, shared by local district and SSIP RLs, were categorized into the following three bullets and efforts are underway to systemically address each concern:

- Intentional connections and leverage of current K–12 practices and initiatives with early childhood to harness district level support and to ensure sustainability to ensure sustainability and scale up included the continued offering of WAPM trainings for early childhood expansion into K–3rd grade;
- Continued emphasis on Washington state's public school system as an inclusive 3–21 system, not K–12. (Spec ED strategic plan);
- Access to equitable funding to support the alignment for early childhood programs.

Current efforts to address these concerns include the following:

- As cited in Section C of this report, the expansion of MTSS through WAPM welcome partners representing Washington MTSS to support in the development of the SSIP Logic Model, Evaluation Plan, and Theory of Action to further enhance alignment. The goals of this project include leveraging current K–12 practices to harness district level support to ensure sustainability. As a key strategy notated in the SSIP Logic Model, alignment to Washington ECSE initiatives and cross sector partners is essential to sustainability and scale-up practices. The SSIP SLs understand that these efforts are actualized when systems to support improvement (infrastructure) and developed with the use of fidelity metrics and data-based decision making.

- OSPI supports and empowers students, educators, families, and communities through equitable access to high-quality curriculum, instruction, and support. OSPI's shared focus is supporting all of Washington's learners by providing coordinated, data-driven resources and support to school districts and programs. OSPI is committed to providing equitable access to strong foundations. OSPI's strategic goals are deliberately aspirational, and leaders understand that progress will require continued, effective collaboration and advocacy with CPs. OSPI has identified their first strategic goal to focus on increasing student access to and participation in high-quality early learning and elementary by amplifying and building on inclusive, asset-based policies and practices. Initial objectives for this goal include providing universal access to PreK, New K–3 literacy focus, and universal access to dual language learning by elementary. Activities to support this practice include the utilization of implementation science to increase knowledge of systems change and leadership practices as cited in the SSIP Logic Model: Sustainability and Scale-Up.
- Funding that school districts for special education services receive is not well aligned with their expenditures, leaving some districts to rely on local levies to supplement their special education programs. School districts have a legal obligation to serve all students with disabilities in Washington, regardless of the cost of services. OSPI has requested that the legislature remove the 13.5% cap on state special education funding and increase the special education tiered multiplier to fully cover the cost of special education services and sustain the state's investment in inclusionary practices. Providing full funding for special education will provide districts and schools across the state access to the resources they need to reimagine the ways they are providing special education services, including job-embedded professional development around inclusive practices for early childhood programs.

17—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response

None

17—Required Actions

None

ABBREVIATIONS GLOSSARY

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

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

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

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

CERTIFICATION

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Dr. Tania May

Title:

Assistant Superintendent Special Education

Email:

tania.may@k12.wa.us

Phone:

253-245-9541

Submitted on:

01/31/23 2:35:48 PM and 04/26/23 5:00:29 PM

DETERMINATION ENCLOSURES

RDA Matrix

2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination¹

Percentage (%)	Determination
85.42%	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	24	17	70.83%
Compliance	20	20	100.00%

2023 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	86%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	82%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	32%	2
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	89%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	31%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	89%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	85%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	81%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	44%	2
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	87%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	24%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	90%	1

¹ For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2023: Part B."

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	24	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	76	1

*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential **2023 Part B

Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator ²	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	98.94%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	92.41%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	98.04%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	97.62%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2

² The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

Part B Compliance Indicator ²	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020	Score
Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

Data Rubric

FFY 2021 APR³

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data		
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1
	Subtotal	21
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2021 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
	Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

³ In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

		618 Data ⁴		
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 4/6/22	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22	1	0	1	2
Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22	1	1	1	3
			Subtotal	20
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	24.76

Indicator Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	24.76
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	50.76
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator*) =	0.9762
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	97.62

***Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

⁴ In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2023 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all EDFacts files or the entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	1 st Wednesday in April
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Exiting	C009	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	Wednesday in the 3 rd week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date)
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	1 st Wednesday in May

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to EDFacts aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>

LEGAL NOTICE



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

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

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

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

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

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



**ESTD
1889**

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



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

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