

Exhibit G - DRAFT Performance Report

**Executive Summary:**

During FFY 2016, Washington State went through a leadership transition at the cabinet level at the State Educational Agency (SEA), with the election of a new superintendent of public instruction. The data included in this report, as well as other available data, have been analyzed at the state level, and analyses with school district staff are being planned as part of comprehensive improvement efforts, including those under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Washington continues to see progress in the graduation rates of students with disabilities, increasing rates of time spent with general education peers for students ages 6-21 (as appropriate), and substantial rates of compliance.

Additionally, during this APR cycle, Washington State decreased drop out rates for students with disabilities from 6.74% to 6.43%, and substantially improved the participation rates of students with disabilities taking the state assessment in grades 6-8 and high school for reading, and in all grades for math. Progress was made on increasing proficiency rates for math and reading in grades 3-5 and 6-8, and new baselines were set for high school in both areas, following a grade change for administration from 11th grade to 10th.

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

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

Stakeholders are ready and supportive of the system-wide changes needed and have suggested more rigorous targets for Indicators 4 and 5A. Washington State's approved ESSA Plan specifically addresses the performance of students with disabilities and will result in the majority of identified schools due to the instruction provided to, and outcomes resulting from, students with disabilities. As a result, and for the first time ever, coordinated efforts across OSPI divisions are actively analyzing the root cause of the current data as well as resulting impacts on other student groups, and creating a comprehensive plan that is specifically targeting improvement efforts regarding the outcomes of students with disabilities.

Washington State is committing more resources to address areas in which there was slippage or targets were not met, including least restrictive environment for all ages (Indicators B5 and B6), early childhood outcomes (Indicator B7), and rates of students with disabilities enrolled in higher education (Indicator B14).

The June 28, 2018 Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Determination Letter states that Washington State needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), for more than two years, and directs Washington State to report with this FFY 2017 SPP/APR submission on two elements - Technical Assistance (TA) sources accessed, and actions taken as a result. Washington continues to work with multiple national TA Centers, including the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) (to support the Indicator B17 State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) efforts), the Center for the Integration of IDEA Data (CIID), the IDEA Data Center (IDC) (to support data integration, analysis, and accuracy efforts across the agency), and the Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR) (to ensure IDEA funds are used efficiently, appropriately, and in collaboration with other improvement efforts, when appropriate). Additionally, our OSEP-assigned TA, Daniel Schreier has provided frequent technical assistance, resulting in practice and policy shifts.

As a result of the TA received, Washington State was able to complete an in-depth analysis of data specific to students with disabilities and begin efforts to identify root causes of the current outcomes, as well as implement the SSIP, which is resulting in a reduction of the early literacy gap between kindergartners with disabilities and typically-developing peers. Washington was also selected to receive intensive TA from NCI, which is an agency-wide effort. These efforts are continuing and ramping up with additional resources during FFY 2018.

**Attachments**

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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

282

**General Supervision System:**

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

Washington State has intentionally integrated each of its systems designed to drive improved developmental, functional, and academic outcomes for students with disabilities while simultaneously ensuring that the requirements of IDEA Part B are met. The State's comprehensive General Supervisory System includes several key components implemented across three primary work groups. The Operations (i.e., Data and Fiscal Management) Work Group has responsibilities for data collection and analysis, Safety Net, and all aspects of fiscal oversight including allocation and regulation of federal funding (see attached federal fund application). The Integrated Program Improvement Work Group is responsible for implementation of the Washington Integrated System of Monitoring (WISM), an

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

**DRAFT**

outcome-based, data-driven monitoring framework which has significantly increased the potential for improving student outcomes with emphasis on consistency between a sufficient evaluation, an appropriate Individualized Education Program (IEP), and the delivery of specially designed instruction (SDI) for each eligible student. The Dispute Resolution Work Group has responsibility for dispute resolution, including activities such as IEP facilitation, citizen complaint investigations, resolution sessions, mediations, and oversight of due process hearings. Planning and provision of universal professional development, technical assistance, and early childhood oversight are integrated across all aspects of the General Supervisory System. There has been a renewed focus on engaging stakeholders involved in, or affected by, special education services and outcomes for students with disabilities to review, analyze, and plan for system improvements and celebrate successes.

Attachments			
File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	
No APR attachments found.			

**Technical Assistance System:**

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

The State has several mechanisms in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support as part of its formal Technical Assistance System. Facilitation for direct district access to technical assistance and professional development resources designed to improve educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities has been continued to be enhanced during FFY 2017. As noted in last year's submission, an online Resource Library was developed and added to the OSPI special education website that includes research-based and evidence-based practices related to increasing and sustaining educational results for all students (<http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/ResourceLibrary/default.aspx>). The State continues to add to the Resource Library website as new resources are identified that delineate the role of school leaders (principals, vice-principals, administrators, etc.) for ensuring the provision of the free, appropriate public education (FAPE) for students with disabilities. The online Resource Library is an example of the State's facilitation of special education improvement efforts to expand dissemination of evidence-based and promising practices for the development of academic, health, and post-school outcomes for students eligible under IDEA Part B. In addition to the online Resource Library, the State Needs Project *eLearning for Educators* (<http://www.evergreen.edu/elearningforeducators>) continues to expand the online course catalog with technical assistance and professional development opportunities for all educators from paraprofessionals through master educators.

Technical assistance resources continue to be allocated through Coordinated Service Agreements (CSAs) with the nine regional Education Service Districts (ESDs) and through five State Needs Projects. The ESDs provide extensive technical assistance directly aligned with each of the indicators in the State Performance Plan based on regional performance profiles routinely updated in accordance with the APR cycles. The State Needs Projects collectively assist with statewide capacity for enhancing student outcomes through professional development opportunities, targeted and intensive technical assistance, and consultation and training for parents, families, and educators. Areas of expertise include, but are not limited to, sensory disabilities, secondary transition, assistive technology, and specially designed instruction provided within a continuum of placement options.

Attachments			
File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	
No APR attachments found.			

**Professional Development System:**

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

Professional Development Systems are in place to ensure service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities. Professional development systems include regional and Local Education Agency (LEA) initial exploration of recommendations from the published Executive Summary of the Transforming Professional Learning in Washington State evaluation report. Funding for the three-year Transforming Professional Learning in Washington State project was secured by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and is being facilitated through key partnerships including the Learning Forward Professional Learning Association for Washington State, Association of Educational Service Districts, and Seattle Pacific University. The project was extended through October 2017. To date, more than 31 school districts, 91 schools, 1,692 educators, and 131,249 students across nine regions in the State have engaged in grant activities designed to support professional learning that will engage leaders in the work of developing effective 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 in the Washington State Performance Plan's Indicator B17 Phase I report include:

- Use of evidence-based approaches to making decisions about the design of professional learning opportunities;
- System-wide use of the Standards for Professional Learning as a means to communicate priorities and distributive leadership;
- Increase data literacy at all levels;
- Seek to understand and recognize the pressures associated with standardized assessment and leverage test results as a useful tool for examining data on student learning and progress;
- Link professional learning activities directly to teachers' content knowledge and support teachers as they teach that content to students; and
- Scale-up support systems state wide in order to build high quality professional learning.

**DRAFT**

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

A current enhancement to the Professional Development System Rules exploring strategies to address the specific elements identified by ESSA in its definition of professional development which emphasizes the importance of "...sustainability (not stand-alone, 1-day, and short-term workshops), intensity, collaboration, job-embedded, data-driven, and classroom focused..." characteristics.

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

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

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
<a href="#">form package 442.pdf</a>	Sandy Grummick	1/28/2019 5:21 PM	
<a href="#">wa_part_b_verif_non_compliance.pdf</a>	Sandy Grummick	1/28/2019 5:22 PM	

**Stakeholder Involvement:**  apply this to all Part B results indicators

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

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

Washington State engaged in several comprehensive planning and development activities which continued throughout FFY 2017 to review trend data for both compliance and results indicators and to study the impact of improvement activities implemented as a result of the previous State Performance Plan cycle. Both internal and external stakeholders representing parents, local districts, regional educational agencies, vocational and rehabilitation providers, early childhood professionals, and community partners were actively involved in these ongoing planning and development activities. Input and feedback mechanisms included video conferencing, Zoom webinars, Regional LEA Director Meetings, community/agency visits, and individualized conference calls.

As a direct result of the stakeholder recommendations solicited during the planning and development activities, targets were set for the results indicators, data trends were reviewed for compliance indicators, and final results of the broad infrastructure and data analyses were reviewed for Indicator B17. Targets were adjusted during this APR for Indicators B4 and B5.

OSPI is strategically positioned to leverage resources, reduce duplication of efforts, and maximize efforts to increase educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities as we continue to solicit input and implement respective recommendations from key stakeholders, including stakeholder input currently embedded in Washington State's ESSA Plan.

### Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2016 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 2016 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2016 APR in 2018, is available.

The State continued to publicly post and report on both SEA and LEA performance on the FFY 2016 SPP targets. The FFY 2016 data were posted (<http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/Data/default.aspx>) in February 2018. Complete copies of the Washington SPP and APR are located at: <http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/Data/default.aspx>.

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

Data showing the performance of each LEA in the state on the SPP and APR indicators are posted on the data profiles at <http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/Data/default.aspx> (Indicators 1 through 14, and 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

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

**DRAFT**

(attached in the General Supervision System section above)  
Accommodations Data for State and District: <http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/Data/Childcount-Placement.aspx>, then scroll down the page to "Part B Assessments".

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

Statewide Alternate Assessment:

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

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

District Alternate Assessment Example:

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

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

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

**Attachments**

**File Name**

**Uploaded By**

**Uploaded Date**

No APR attachments found.

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 1: Graduation**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			67.00%	68.00%	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%		57.70%	85.00%	100%
Data		73.00%	69.00%	69.10%	71.40%	71.40%	80.10%	64.30%	57.60%	54.55%	55.84%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	100%	100%
Data	57.97%	58.74%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	54.90% <del>100%</del>	58.10% <del>100%</del>

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Explanation of Changes**

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

For the FFY 2017 submission: Targets for this indicator are set in Washington's Consolidated Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Plan, most recent version dated January 2018, located at: <http://www.k12.wa.us/ESEA/ESSA/pubdocs/ESSAConsolidatedPlan-Final.pdf>.

The State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) approved these recommendations at the October 2018 meeting. Information regarding the stakeholders included and minutes of the meeting are posted at <http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/SEAC/default.aspx>.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma</a>	6,125	
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate</a>	10,309	null
SY 2016-17 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/28/2018	<a href="#">2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table</a>	59.41%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
6,125	10,309	58.74%	54.90%	59.41%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Graduation Conditions**

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

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

**Washington State Requirements for the Class of 2017:**

- Total credits required: 20
- Non-Credit Requirements: High School & Beyond Plan, Washington State History
- Statewide Assessments: Achieve a score of Level 3 or 4 (See [OSPI testing webpage](#). For more information on state-approved alternative assessments see [OSPI graduation alternatives webpage](#).)
  - High school English language arts Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC)\* (or state-approved alternative)
  - School Proficiency Exam (HSPE) or high school English language arts Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC) (or state-approved alternative)
  - One math End-of-Course Exam (EOC) in Algebra 1/Integrated Math 1 or Geometry/Integrated Math 2 or high school math Smarter Balanced (SBAC) (or state-approved alternative)
  - Students will take a high school science exam, the WCAS (Washington Comprehensive Assessment of Science) aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards, in 11th grade. It is not a graduation requirement and students will not need to pass the test to graduate.
- \* Students need to meet a [graduation score](#), set by the State Board of Education in August 2015, to meet graduation requirements. The graduation score is different from the [college- and career-ready score](#) (Level 3 on the Smarter Balanced assessments).

Districts may have local requirements. The requirements for the Class of 2017 are described in [WAC 180-51-067](#).

**Credit Requirements**

Subject	Number of Credits	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	2	At least one lab

Social Studies	3	Contemporary World History, Geography, and Problems  .5 credits of Civics (civics content may be embedded in another social studies course)  .5 credits of Social Studies Elective
Arts	1	Performing or visual arts
Health & Fitness	2	.5 credits of Health 1.5 credits of Fitness Students must earn credit for physical education unless excused per RCW 28A.230.050
Occupational Education	1	A CTE course, or a course that meets the definition of an exploratory course as described in the CTE program standards.
Electives	4	

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

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 2: Drop Out**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:  
 Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			6.25%	6.00%		6.00%	5.75%	5.75%	5.75%	5.70%	5.65%
Data		6.70%	7.00%	6.80%	6.80%	6.30%	4.80%	5.00%	5.00%	8.18%	4.93%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	5.60%	5.55%
Data	6.34%	6.74%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	5.50%	5.45%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

From original SPP submission: In conjunction with stakeholder input (i.e., SEAC), the above targets were determined to be rigorous, yet achievable based on historical data trends and current performance under this indicator. See introduction for more information regarding stakeholder participation and input.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:  
 Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2 when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? No

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)</a>	5,692	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)</a>	300	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)</a>	12	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)</a>	2,782	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	<a href="#">Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)</a>	24	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of youth ages 14-21 with IEPs who were served in special education	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
2,782	43,243	6.74%	5.50%	6.43%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Use a different calculation methodology**

- Change numerator description in data table
- Change denominator description in data table

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

The State of Washington continues to report using Option 2 of this indicator's Measurement Table.

*Explanation of the Calculations*

Districts provide student information to OSPI through the Comprehensive Education Data and Reporting System (CEDARS). Any student identified as receiving special education services anytime during the 2016-17 school year is included in the numerator this report. Students validated and certified on the federal child count are included in the denominator of this report. Districts had the opportunity to review and update the student-level data that was used in generating this report. OSPI Bulletin 083-17 and the Cohort Graduation and User Guide provided instructions about how to review the data, and included a detailed overview of the methodologies and procedures used to calculate rates for schools and districts. An unduplicated summary for each student served, by building, was then created. Included in the student-level data is information regarding which students completed via graduation, transferred out of a school, or dropped out, as well as the reasons why the student(s) dropped out. Dropouts include those students who provide a reason for dropping out, those who leave school to attempt/obtain a GED, and those students who have an unconfirmed transfer or who were enrolled but stopped attending and no further information could be found for these students. The last two sets of students identified and summarized for the calculations and reporting are: 1) 'continuing seniors', those students identified as being in grade 12 with a current expected year of graduation who are still enrolled and not eligible to graduate; and, 2) completers or graduates, who fall into two sub-categories: those students identified as graduating in the year in which they were expected to graduate (on-time graduates), and those who are graduating past their expected year of graduation (extended graduates). There is no differentiation of the definition of dropout between general education students and students with disabilities.

Annual dropout rates are calculated and reported for students identified as being enrolled and served in grades 7 and 8 during the reporting year. Those students reported as being enrolled and served in grades 9 through 12 are included in the annual high school graduation and dropout calculations. A number of adjustments are made when calculating these rates. Totals for institutions, correctional facilities, unaffiliated or autonomous buildings, and schools where a majority of students come from another district are included in the state and county totals, but not in district totals. Students in juvenile detention centers are excluded from the calculations because the duration of their stay is very short (often just a few days) and they are served elsewhere after their release.[1] Students attending vocational schools or skill centers are counted in their home school, and students enrolled in a high school but who are coded as being in a grade other than 9-12 are excluded from the calculations. In addition, students who exited prior to August 15, 2016 or were age 21 prior to September 1, 2016 are not included in the 2016-17 calculations because they exited prior to the 2016-17 school year. Students who are coded as being "promoted" to the next grade by August 15 are counted as continuing students. *The specific formula used to calculate dropout rates is as follows:*

$$\frac{\# \text{ of students with a dropout, unknown, GED completer code}}{\text{total \# of students served (less transfer outs, juvenile detention, deceased)}} = \%$$

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Data for this indicator are the same data as used for reporting to the U.S. Department of Education under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

**DRAFT**

[1] This policy is used because students located in short-term correctional facilities often enter and exit the same day and have an "unknown" location after exiting. In addition, some of these individuals enter and exit multiple correctional facilities, so they would end up counting as dropouts multiple times as they enter and exit these facilities, even though they may have dropped out of their "home" school in a previous year and are no longer enrolled in school.

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

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

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

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

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs?** No

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

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:  
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Historical Data**

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2017 Data pages.

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

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
**Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs** **DRAFT**  
 Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	
Reading	A Grade 3-5	2009	Target ≥					95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	
			Data					96.44%	97.53%	98.12%	97.26%	97.89%	95.53%	93.02%	
	B Grade 6-8	2009	Target ≥					95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	
			Data					95.26%	96.36%	96.92%	95.89%	97.49%	94.05%	91.12%	
	C HS	2009	Target ≥						95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data					83.87%	85.42%	87.09%	78.84%	91.45%	87.72%	45.49%	
Math	A Grade 3-5	2009	Target ≥					95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	
			Data					96.92%	97.42%	98.07%	97.21%	97.96%	95.37%	92.47%	
	B Grade 6-8	2009	Target ≥					95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	
			Data					95.25%	96.33%	96.76%	95.75%	97.44%	93.63%	90.39%	
	C HS	2009	Target ≥						95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data					80.10%	87.19%	77.53%	78.20%	85.00%	78.80%	40.33%	

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Grade 3-5	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	93.10%	93.06%
	B Grade 6-8	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	91.90%	92.46%
	C HS	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	58.65%	53.66%
Math	A Grade 3-5	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	92.81%	92.76%
	B Grade 6-8	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	91.29%	91.89%
	C HS	Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%
		Data	51.70%	50.56%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3-5	95.00%	95.00%
	B ≥ Grade 6-8	95.00%	95.00%
	C ≥ HS	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3-5	95.00%	95.00%
	B ≥ Grade 6-8	95.00%	95.00%
	C ≥ HS	95.00%	95.00%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**DRAFT**

DRAFT

FFY 2014 data is the revised baseline year for this indicator due to a newly implemented statewide assessment.

From original SPP submission: Targets for this indicator are set in Washington's Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, most recent version dated June 2014, located at: <http://www.k12.wa.us/ESEA/pubdocs/StateofWA-AYPWorkbook2014.pdf>. See introduction for information regarding stakeholder participation and input.

DRAFT

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2017 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

**Data Source:** SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/13/2018

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	12957	13391	13056	11848	11286	10805	0	9923	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	9262	9491	9070	8180	7842	7405		6883			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2028	2267	2453	2129	1900	1814		1040			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	894	886	792	780	767	745		733			

**Data Source:** SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/13/2018

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	12958	13393	13064	11846	11288	10805	0	9932	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	9943	8818	8022	6660	6285	5842		6005			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1331	2907	3472	3584	3426	3308		1639			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	883	885	794	777	761	742		736			

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A Grade 3-5	39,404	37,143	93.06%	95.00%	94.26%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B Grade 6-8	33,939	31,562	92.46%	95.00%	93.00%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C HS	9,923	8,656	53.66%	95.00%	87.23%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A Grade 3-5	39,415	37,055	92.76%	95.00%	94.01%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B Grade 6-8	33,939	31,385	91.89%	95.00%	92.47%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C HS	9,932	8,380	50.56%	95.00%	84.37%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Public Reporting Information**

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

Accommodations Data for State and District: <http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/Data/Childcount-Placement.aspx>, then scroll down to "Part B Assessments".

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

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

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

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

School Alternate Assessment Example: <https://washingtonstaterreportcard.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".

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Historical Data**

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2017 Data pages.

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

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
**Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**  
 Historical Data and Targets

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Historical Data**

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Grade 3-5	2015 2009	Target ≥			64.20%	76.10%	76.10%	76.10%	88.10%	38.20%	35.20%	88.10%	100%
			Data			37.29%	34.30%	35.47%	36.30%	34.00%	33.70%	36.01%	38.07%	23.85%
	B Grade 6-8	2015 2009	Target ≥			47.60%	65.10%	65.10%	65.10%	82.50%	28.90%	35.20%	82.50%	100%
			Data			22.24%	18.19%	21.36%	24.40%	23.80%	25.30%	24.71%	29.79%	14.35%
	C HS	2017 2009	Target ≥			61.50%	74.30%	74.30%	74.30%	87.20%	44.40%	35.20%	87.20%	100%
			Data			37.46%	37.31%	38.66%	38.50%	42.30%	39.80%	42.40%	41.72%	13.88%
Math	A Grade 3-5	2015 2009	Target ≥			47.30%	64.90%	64.90%	64.90%	58.00%	34.80%	29.70%	79.00%	100%
			Data			31.14%	28.97%	30.08%	29.10%	29.90%	29.60%	30.83%	34.28%	24.65%
	B Grade 6-8	2015 2009	Target ≥			38.00%	58.70%	58.70%	58.70%	79.30%	24.00%	29.70%	79.30%	100%
			Data			14.20%	10.99%	13.94%	17.70%	18.00%	18.70%	19.62%	23.04%	11.52%
	C HS	2017 2009	Target ≥			43.60%	62.40%	62.40%	62.40%	81.20%	28.20%	29.70%	81.20%	100%
			Data			13.89%	8.84%	10.81%	11.90%	24.00%	27.20%	29.27%	31.44%	7.29%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Grade 3-5	Target ≥	17.50% 100%	24.10% 100%
		Data	25.99%	24.76%
	B Grade 6-8	Target ≥	17.50% 100%	24.10% 100%
		Data	17.14%	17.47%
	C HS	Target ≥	17.50% 100%	24.10% 100%
		Data	52.44%	37.73%
Math	A Grade 3-5	Target ≥	13.80% 100%	20.70% 100%
		Data	26.20%	25.43%
	B Grade 6-8	Target ≥	13.80% 100%	20.70% 100%
		Data	14.02%	14.43%
	C HS	Target ≥	13.80% 100%	20.70% 100%
		Data	21.29%	13.76%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**Explanation of Changes**

As with Indicator 1, these indicators baseline and targets have been established in the ESSA Consolidated Plan dated January 12, 2018. The ESSA Plan uses 2015–16 data as the baseline year, which is 17.5 percent for ELA and 13.8 percent for Math. The annual increments are calculated by dividing the total achievement gap (goal of 90 percent - baseline performance) by 10 years. The results were then used to determine the annual improvement targets for each school year, from 2016–17 through 2026–27. This same approach will be used for all schools and student subgroups within each school. The target for improvement for ELA is 6.6 percent per school year and for Math, 6.9 percent per school year for all student groups.

The high school math and reading assessments was taken at the 10th grade level, rather than the 11th grade level, during the FFY 2017 data collection. As the test content and proficiency levels for math, and proficiency levels for reading, were adjusted for the grade shift, the FFY 2017 data are baseline for 10th grade math.

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
-----	------	------

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**DRAFT**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3-5	30.70% <del>400%</del>	37.30% <del>400%</del>
	B ≥ Grade 6-8	30.70% <del>400%</del>	37.30% <del>400%</del>
	C ≥ Grade HS	30.70% <del>400%</del>	37.30% <del>400%</del>
Math	A ≥ Grade 3-5	27.60% <del>400%</del>	34.50% <del>400%</del>
	B ≥ Grade 6-8	27.60% <del>400%</del>	34.50% <del>400%</del>
	C ≥ Grade HS	27.60% <del>400%</del>	34.50% <del>400%</del>

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Explanation of Changes**

In Washington's revised and approved ESSA Consolidated Plan dated January 12, 2018, the proficiency targets for all students and all student groups for 2015-16 will be used as the baseline year. Stakeholders reviewed and approved these changes.

The annual increments are calculated by dividing the total achievement gap (goal of 90 percent - baseline performance) by 10 years. The result will be used to determine the annual improvement targets for each school year, from 2016–17 through 2026–27. This same approach will be used for all schools and student subgroups within each school.

The annual increment for ELA is 6.6% per year through 2026-27 and for Math, the annual increment for improvement is 6.9%. Please refer to the attached document for the entire 10 years of targets (2016-17 through 2026-27).

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

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

FROM FFY 2014 Submission: FFY 2014 data is designated as the baseline year for this indicator due to the newly implemented test.

From original SPP submission: See introduction for information regarding stakeholder participation and input. Targets for this indicator are set in Washington's Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, most recent version dated June 2014, located at: <http://www.k12.wa.us/ESEA/pubdocs/StateofWA-AYPWorkbook2014.pdf>.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2017 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? no

**Data Source:** SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/13/2018

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	12184	12644	12315	11089	10509	9964	0	8656	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2705	2622	2315	1501	1495	1238		1704			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	308	301	339	159	190	152		161			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	509	485	432	419	439	413					

**Data Source:** SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/13/2018

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	12157	12610	12288	11021	10472	9892	0	8380	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3154	2625	1830	1240	1090	779		445			
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	180	183	165	92	108	80		34			
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	481	503	504	450	492	387		467			

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A Grade 3-5	37,143	10,016	24.76%	30.70%	26.97%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B Grade 6-8	31,562	6,006	17.47%	30.70%	19.03%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C HS	8,656	2,100	37.73%	30.70%	24.26%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Reasons for Group C Slippage**

Washington state continued to make progress and increased the reading proficiency for students with disabilities in grades 3-5 and 6-8. There was slippage in the proficiency rates of students with disabilities in high school/grade 10. Following an analysis of the data, and discussions with staff across OSPI in Learning and Teaching, Assessment, and Special Education Services, the slippage was the result of a combination of activities:

- 1) These data should be considered baseline data as the assessment was taken by 10th grade level rather than the 11th grade level as it was in the FFY 2017 data collection. The cut scores were adjusted for the grade shift, but the change still may have had an impact on assessment results. Thus, these are baseline data for 10th grade reading.
- 2) The participation rate of students with disabilities increased substantially, from 53.66% to 87.23%. This represents 3,320 more students who participated than the previous year, when the assessment was administered to 11<sup>th</sup> graders. This substantial increase reflects proficiency scores for previously unassessed students with disabilities, and is a more accurate reflection of the proficiency rates of students with disabilities across the state.
- 3) Not only did more students with disabilities participate in the assessment, upon closer analysis, it appears that the majority of the increase occurred in students with disabilities taking the regular state assessment **without** accommodations, as the number of students in that category doubled from 3,460 to 6,883. The assessment system relies on district personnel to indicate within the online assessment system when students should receive accommodations, per their IEP (see <https://wa.portal.airast.org/core/fileparse.php/2317/urlt/Guidelines-on-Tools-Support-or-Accommodations.pdf>). The state is unable to determine at this point, with the data available, if students were not provided their accommodations, or if IEP teams are determining that accommodations are not needed during the assessment. For the last year, OSPI, Educational Service Districts (ESDs), and school districts have focused on addressing the need for students with disabilities to participate in state assessments, and while those efforts will continue, they will expand to include technical assistance and professional development on accommodations, IEP team decisions, and the importance of identifying any needed accommodations within the online testing system. OSPI is also in the process of developing and implementing monitoring of state assessments, which will provide additional data on the implementation of accommodations during state assessments.
- 4) As part of addressing slippage, through the State ESSA plan, proficiency rates of students with disabilities are reported publicly for each school, and used to determine additional supports needed. The data reflecting the opportunity gap for students with disabilities, and the resulting prioritization of resources across the OSPI and the state, has focused the education community on strengthening special education programs. Please see the attachment for priorities that OSPI and stakeholders are using to make improvements. Content specialists from OSPI Learning and Teaching, have focused on UDL and classroom and assessment accommodations with general educators, and are intentionally scaling up efforts, which allows partnerships and aligned professional development with leaders and educators.

OSPI is not content with the current outcomes for all students with disabilities, and especially 10th grade students with disabilities, and is working with legislators, schools, and parents/families to continue efforts, recognizing that the slippage shown was expected as we shift practices, policies, and procedures.

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A Grade 3-5	37,055	9,625	25.43%	27.60%	25.97%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B Grade 6-8	31,385	4,718	14.43%	27.60%	15.03%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C HS	8,380	946	13.76%	27.60%	11.29%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Reasons for Group C Slippage**

Washington state continued to make progress and increased the math proficiency for students with disabilities in grades 3-5 and 6-8. There was slippage in the proficiency rates of students with disabilities in high school/grade 10. Following an analysis of the data, and discussions with staff across OSPI in Learning and Teaching, Assessment, and Special Education Services, the slippage was the result of a combination of activities:

- 1) These data should be considered baseline data as the assessment was taken by 10th grade level rather than the 11th grade level as it was in the FFY 2017 data collection. The cut scores were adjusted for the grade shift, but the change still may have had an impact on assessment results. Thus, these are baseline data for 10th grade math.
- 2) The participation rate of students with disabilities increased substantially from 50.56% to 84.37%. This represents 3,045 more students who participated than the previous year, when the assessment was administered to 11<sup>th</sup> graders. This substantial increase reflects proficiency scores for previously unassessed students with disabilities, and is a more accurate reflection of the proficiency rates of students with disabilities across the state.
- 3) Not only did more students with disabilities participate in the assessment, upon closer analysis, it appears that the majority of the increase occurred in students with disabilities taking the regular state assessment **without** accommodations, as the number of students in that category went from 2,744 to 6,005. The assessment system relies on district personnel to indicate within the online assessment system when students should receive accommodations, per their IEP (see <https://wa.portal.airast.org/core/fileparse.php/2317/urlt/Guidelines-on-Tools-Support-or-Accommodations.pdf>).

The state is unable to determine at this point, with the data available, if students were not provided their accommodations, or if IEP teams are determining that accommodations are not needed during the assessment. For the last year, OSPI, Educational Service Districts (ESDs), and school districts have focused on addressing the need for students with disabilities to participate in state assessments, and while those efforts will continue, they will expand to include technical assistance and professional development on accommodations, IEP team decisions, and the importance of identifying any needed accommodations within the online testing system. OSPI is also in the process of developing and implementing monitoring of state assessments, which will provide additional data on the implementation of accommodations during state assessments.

## FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

4) As part of addressing slippage, through the State ESSA plan, proficiency rates of students with disabilities are reported publicly for each school, and used to determine additional supports needed. The data reflecting the opportunity gap for students with disabilities, and the resulting prioritization of resources across the OSPI and the state, has focused the education community on strengthening special education programs. Please see the attachment for priorities that OSPI and stakeholders are using to make improvements. Content specialists from OSPI Learning and Teaching, have focused on UDL and classroom and assessment accommodations with general educators, and are intentionally scaling up efforts, which allows partnerships and aligned professional development with leaders and educators.

OSPI is not content with the current outcomes for all students with disabilities, and especially 10th grade students with disabilities, and is working with legislators, schools, and parents/families to continue efforts, recognizing that the slippage shown was expected as we shift practices, policies, and procedures.

### Public Reporting Information

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

Accommodations Data for State and District: <http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/Data/Childcount-Placement.aspx>, then scroll down the page to "Part B Assessments".

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

Statewide Alternate Assessment:

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

District Alternate Assessment Example:

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

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

School Alternate Assessment Example:

<https://washingtonstaterreportcard.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".

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			0%	8.10%	8.10%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	7.50%	7.00%
Data		21.00%	14.00%	8.10%	8.10%	7.10%	3.70%	3.40%	3.40%	3.37%	3.70%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	6.50%	6.25%
Data	3.33%	2.51%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	4.00% <del>6.00%</del>	4.00% <del>6.75%</del>

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Explanation of Changes**

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) approved these recommendations for target revisions at the October 2018 meeting. Information regarding the stakeholders included and minutes of the meeting are posted at <http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/SEAC/default.aspx>.

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 3

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
2	277	2.51%	4.00%	0.72%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

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

Definition of Significant Discrepancy and Methodology

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

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

- Calculate the State-level suspension/expulsion rate for students with IEPs for FFY 2017 (using 2016-17 data). The State suspension/expulsion rate is determined by calculating the statewide total number of students with IEPs identified as having been suspended for greater than 10 days statewide (*EdFacts* File Spec C 006) divided by the number of students with IEPs enrolled statewide (*EdFacts* File Spec C 002 and C 089). The State's suspension/expulsion rate for FFY 2017 was 0.87%.
- The Single State Bar is defined as the State suspension/expulsion rate plus two percent. Therefore, the Single State Bar for FFY 2017 was 2.87%.
- Calculate each district's rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for students with IEPs (total number of students with IEPs who were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in the district divided by the total number of students with IEPs in the district). This process will result in each district's rate of suspensions/expulsions for students with IEPs.
- The rate of suspensions/expulsions of students with IEPs for each district is compared to the Single State Bar. Districts that are above the Single State Bar are identified as having a significant discrepancy.
- Districts with fewer than 30 total students with IEPs are not included in the analysis. A total of three districts were excluded from the FFY 2017 calculation as a result of not meeting this minimum "n" size requirement. Those districts were not included in the denominator of this calculation, but were included in the calculation of the Single State Bar.
- The percentage of districts in Washington identified by OSPI as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with IEPs for greater than 10 days in a school year is calculated by dividing the total number of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy (2) by the total number of districts in Washington State who met the minimum "n" size requirement (277).

This information is published in the *district data profile* on OSPI's special education data webpage (<http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/Data/default.aspx>).

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Based on the methodology described in the section titled "Definition of Significant Discrepancy and Methodology", two districts were identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

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

Both of the identified districts were required to complete a self-review of child find, evaluation, eligibility, discipline, and other related policies, procedures, and practices. If revisions were made as a result of this review, districts were required to describe those revisions in the self-review. Revisions to formal, written special education policies and procedures were also required to be submitted to OSPI. The identified districts used the self-review process embedded in the LEA federal fund application. In addition, data collections conducted through the general supervisory system were analyzed to verify district-reported results. The State also completed a comprehensive student record review from the discrepant cells in designated districts.

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

- Provided staff development for teachers, administrators, and paraeducators related to PBIS and other similar systems; Whole Child; equity; access to general education curriculum; proactive behavior supports; engagement strategies; and working effectively with students exhibiting severe behaviors.
- Implemented PBIS; both tiered and universal methods, including evidence-based practices.
- Implemented the Whole Child Initiative.

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

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
**Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**  
 Historical Data and Targets

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	1.50%	1.10%	1.87%	0.37%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0.37%	1.66%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement?  Yes  No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 24

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
29	0	256	1.66%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

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

Definition of Significant Discrepancy and Methodology

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

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

- Calculate the State-level suspension/expulsion rate for students with IEPs for FFY 2017 (using 2016-17 data). The State suspension/expulsion rate is determined by calculating the statewide total number of students with IEPs identified as having been suspended for greater than 10 days statewide (*EdFacts* File Spec C 006) divided by the number of students with IEPs enrolled statewide (*EdFacts* File Spec C 002 and C 089). The State's suspension/expulsion rate for FFY 2017 was 0.87%.
- The Single State Bar is defined as the State suspension/expulsion rate plus two percent. Therefore, the Single State Bar for FFY 2017 was 2.87%.
- Calculate each district's rates of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for each race/ethnicity group (total number of children with IEPs who were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days for each race/ethnicity divided by the total number of children with IEPs for that race/ethnicity in the district). This process will result in each district's rates of suspensions/expulsions for each race and ethnicity group.
- The rates of suspensions/expulsions by race and ethnicity for each district are compared to the Single State Bar. Districts that are above the Single State Bar for any race or ethnicity group are identified as having a significant discrepancy.
- Districts with fewer than 30 children with IEPs in the identified race/ethnicity group are not included in the analysis. A total of 24 districts were excluded from the FFY 2017 calculation as a result of not meeting this minimum "n" size requirement. These districts were not included in the denominator of this calculation, but were included in the calculation of the Single State Bar.
- The percentage of districts in Washington identified by OSPI as having a significant discrepancy, by race/ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs for greater than 10 days in a school year is calculated by dividing the total number of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy (29) by the total number of districts in Washington State who met the minimum "n" size requirement (256).

This information is published in the *district data profile* on OSPI's special education data webpage ( <http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/Data/default.aspx> ).

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 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", 29 districts were identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

For each of the 29 districts that the State identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, OSPI reviewed and, if appropriate, required the affected district to revise the policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

Each of the 29 identified districts was required to complete a self-review of child find, evaluation, eligibility, discipline, and other related policies, procedures, and practices. If revisions were made as a result of this review, districts were required to describe those revisions in the self-review. Revisions to formal, written special education policies and procedures were also required to be submitted to OSPI.

The identified districts used the self-review process embedded in the LEA federal fund application. In addition, data collections conducted through the general supervisory system were analyzed to verify district-reported results. The State also completed a comprehensive student record review from the discrepant cells in designated districts.

The State did not identify any noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review.

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

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**  
**Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance**

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

**FFY 2016 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 1.66% noncompliance in FFY 2016. Four districts were determined to have policies, procedures, or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and did not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), and procedural safeguards (34 CFR 300.170(b) and 300.646(b)). These four districts were notified in writing of the identified noncompliance in the spring of 2016 and were required to correct this noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.

The State verified that the four districts with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2016 APR: (a) corrected all individual cases of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09–02, dated October 17, 2008; and (b) were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR 300.170(b) and 300.646(b) based on a review of updated data.

In order to verify that each district was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, a review of updated data, conducted by regional ESD representatives and validated by OSPI, was completed. Verification activities included on-site visits, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. This review verified 100% compliance; the four districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements of 34 CFR 300.170(b) and 300.646(b).

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

The four districts corrected and accounted for all individual instances of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district. The districts identified root causes of noncompliance and reviewed policies, procedures, and/or practices that contributed to the noncompliance. The correction of identified noncompliance was summarized and reported to OSPI through the IDEA Compliance Package (see the iGrants Form Package 442 attachment).

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

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2016 for Indicator 4B were corrected within one year of identification.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

**DRAFT**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)** **DRAFT**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			49.35%	49.99%	50.45%	51.00%	51.55%	51.55%	51.55%	51.65%	51.85%
		Data		49.05%	50.11%	50.65%	50.20%	50.06%	50.81%	52.30%	52.40%	52.57%	53.49%
B	2005	Target ≤			14.56%	14.31%	14.06%	13.81%	13.56%	13.56%	13.56%	13.46%	13.36%
		Data		14.11%	13.46%	14.05%	13.93%	13.57%	13.47%	13.20%	13.20%	13.22%	13.27%
C	2005	Target ≤			14.56%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
		Data		1.09%	13.46%	1.67%	1.15%	1.00%	0.09%	0.90%	0.83%	0.81%	0.84%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	52.05%	52.25%
	Data	54.35%	55.21%
B	Target ≤	13.26%	13.16%
	Data	13.24%	13.13%
C	Target ≤	1.00%	1.00%
	Data	0.83%	0.86%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	52.35%	55.00% <del>52.45%</del>
Target B ≤	13.06%	12.96%
Target C ≤	1.00%	1.00%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Explanation of Changes**

The SEAC identified indicator 5A targets needed to continue to be increased; however, at a faster rate than was previously included. The SEAC identified an ultimate target of 60.0 percent. As this plan only includes one additional year, the target was increased at a higher rate than previously and moved from 52.45 percent to 55.0 percent. As additional options are provided in the future, additional targets will continue to increase as suggested by SEAC.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

From original SPP submission for Indicators 5B and 5C: See introduction for information regarding stakeholder participation and input.

For the Indicator 5A changes: The State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) approved their recommendation at the October 2018 meeting. Information regarding the stakeholders included and minutes of the meeting are posted at <http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/SEAC/default.aspx>.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)** **DRAFT**  
**FFY 2017 Data**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21</a>	127,073	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</a>	71,170	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</a>	16,683	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools</a>	797	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities</a>	166	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements</a>	126	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	71,170	127,073	55.21%	52.35%	56.01%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16,683	127,073	13.13%	13.06%	13.13%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,089	127,073	0.86%	1.00%	0.86%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									28.30%	28.45%	28.60%
		Data								27.80%	27.80%	26.99%	26.35%
B	2011	Target ≤									39.00%	38.80%	38.60%
		Data								39.40%	40.60%	40.85%	40.05%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	28.75%	28.90%
	Data	24.88%	24.81%
B	Target ≤	38.40%	38.20%
	Data	40.51%	40.96%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	29.05%	29.20%
Target B ≤	38.00%	37.80%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

From original SPP submission: While stakeholders agreed that targets for this indicator should be rigorous, yet achievable, the need for caution was also stressed. The students they are seeing are being identified at an earlier age and have more involved disabilities and needs. Given the needs of this population, serving these students in regular early childhood settings could become more challenging. See introduction for more information regarding stakeholder participation and input.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**  
**FFY 2017 Data**

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5</a>	16,425	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">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</a>	3,909	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">b1. Number of children attending separate special education class</a>	6,553	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">b2. Number of children attending separate school</a>	315	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	<a href="#">b3. Number of children attending residential facility</a>	6	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	3,909	16,425	24.81%	29.05%	23.80%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	6,874	16,425	40.96%	38.00%	41.85%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology

**Reasons for A Slippage**

In reviewing data trends by geographical regions, the Washington State Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Coordination Team identified two potential causal factors related to slippage in B6A. This key stakeholder group comprised of ECSE leadership within each of the nine Educational Service Districts, identified an increase in the severity of disability and intensity of needed instructional supports as a dominate factor, compounded by a shortage of qualified preschool teachers available to co-teach in inclusive and integrated settings. For example, more preschoolers with IEPs are being served in a regular early childhood setting but receiving the majority of special education and related services in a different setting. Districts are finding it increasingly difficult to recruit and train itinerant special educators who can be released from district-sponsored classrooms to provide direct services and coach general educators in community-based settings. Qualitative information from educators in the community-based settings indicate a lack of knowledge and confidence to serve preschoolers with IEPs who need accommodations and supports that extend beyond speech and/or communication needs.

In response to this preliminary information, the State convened a state-wide team of more than 90 inclusion champions representing multiple and mixed service delivery settings in early December 2018. This Pre-K Inclusion Collaboration Team will be assisting with the initial development of a state inclusion policy and companion toolkit.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
**Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**  
 Historical Data and Targets

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						82.70%	83.00%	83.00%	83.00%	83.10%	83.20%
		Data					82.70%	84.70%	89.00%	87.60%	89.40%	89.85%	91.29%
A2	2008	Target ≥						49.40%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.20%	50.40%
		Data					49.40%	50.80%	53.80%	52.30%	51.60%	51.17%	49.19%
B1	2008	Target ≥						81.10%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.10%	82.20%
		Data					81.10%	84.80%	87.90%	86.40%	88.20%	88.30%	89.11%
B2	2008	Target ≥						50.20%	51.00%	51.00%	51.00%	51.20%	51.40%
		Data					50.20%	51.80%	55.20%	53.80%	53.10%	53.73%	50.40%
C1	2008	Target ≥						80.80%	81.00%	81.00%	81.00%	81.10%	81.20%
		Data					80.80%	84.90%	87.90%	88.30%	89.50%	89.43%	89.58%
C2	2008	Target ≥						64.30%	65.00%	65.00%	65.00%	65.20%	65.40%
		Data					64.30%	65.70%	68.00%	68.40%	67.00%	66.61%	64.61%

	FFY	2015	2016
A1	Target ≥	83.30%	83.40%
	Data	90.17%	91.19%
A2	Target ≥	50.60%	50.80%
	Data	47.60%	48.91%
B1	Target ≥	82.30%	82.40%
	Data	88.78%	89.93%
B2	Target ≥	51.60%	51.80%
	Data	50.51%	49.67%
C1	Target ≥	81.30%	81.40%
	Data	89.56%	91.20%
C2	Target ≥	65.60%	65.80%
	Data	62.79%	62.81%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	83.50%	83.60%
Target A2 ≥	51.00%	51.20%
Target B1 ≥	82.50%	82.60%
Target B2 ≥	52.00%	52.20%
Target C1 ≥	81.50%	81.60%
Target C2 ≥	66.00%	66.20%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

From original SPP submission: While stakeholders agreed that targets for this indicator should be rigorous, yet achievable, the need for caution was also stressed. The preschool students are being identified at an earlier age and have more involved disabilities and needs.

**DRAFT**

Given the needs of this population, serving these students in regular early childhood settings could become more challenging. See introduction for more information regarding stakeholder participation and input.

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	5452.00
--	---------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	53.00	0.97%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	400.00	7.34%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2430.00	44.57%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2034.00	37.31%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	535.00	9.81%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	4464.00	4917.00	91.19%	83.50%	90.79%	Met Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2569.00	5452.00	48.91%	51.00%	47.12%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	66.00	1.21%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	489.00	8.97%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2266.00	41.56%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1988.00	36.46%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	643.00	11.79%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	4254.00	4809.00	89.93%	82.50%	88.46%	Met Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	2631.00	5452.00	49.67%	52.00%	48.26%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	62.00	1.14%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	394.00	7.23%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1631.00	29.92%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2302.00	42.22%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1063.00	19.50%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
1/30/2019							

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

		<b>DRAFT</b>	Data	Target	Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	3933.00	4389.00	91.20%	81.50%	89.61%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	3365.00	5452.00	62.81%	66.00%	61.72%

Met Target      No Slippage  
 Did Not Meet Target      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

**Was sampling used?**    No

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process?**    Yes

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

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

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

The Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process is a team process for summarizing information on a child's functioning in each of the three child outcome areas using a  [7-point scale](#). 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](#).

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

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

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

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			24.00%	25.00%	25.00%	28.00%	28.00%	28.00%	30.00%	20.40%	21.50%
Data		24.00%	24.00%	26.00%	19.50%	19.90%	19.90%	21.10%	20.20%	25.77%	19.37%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	21.70%	21.90%
Data	27.32%	28.68%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	22.10%	22.30%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

From original SPP submission: Based on stakeholder analysis of historical trends and current performance data, as well as increased familiarity with the instrument, stakeholders strongly advised that targets be reset from the previous cycle. Targets were set using the FFY 2012 performance data. See introduction for additional information regarding stakeholder participation and input.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
787.00	2808.00	28.68%	22.10%	28.03%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	9.10%	30855.00
---	-------	----------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

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.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. No

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.

**Representativeness**

The State conducted an analysis to determine possible strategies for statewide technical assistance and guidance to help ensure progress and movement towards the targets in this indicator. The data for all cohort districts were reviewed and disaggregated by geographical location (regional review by ESD) and district size. Other factors considered during the analysis included a review of the response rates, the degree of representativeness of the survey respondents, and the potential of non-response bias. The potential for non-response bias was minimized through an in-depth comparison of respondent and target population characteristics including race/ethnicity and student disability. The analyses suggest that the results of the survey are statistically representative of the target population with small variance noted within two of the race/ethnicity groups, and across two of the disability groups. Parents of students identified as Hispanic/Latino are slightly under-represented, while parents of students identified as White are somewhat over-represented. Parents of students identified as Hispanic/Latino are 21% of the sample but 14% of the respondents; parents of students identified as White are 53% of the sample but 62% of the respondents. The variance represented in these two race/ethnicity groups has increased slightly in comparison to prior year analyses. Similar to prior year 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 under-represented. Parents of students eligible under the category of Autism are 11% of the sample but 18.6% of the respondents; conversely parents of students eligible under the category of Specific Learning Disability are 31.5% of the sample but 20% of the respondents.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0.34%	0%	0%	0.40%	0%	0%	0.37%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement?  Yes  No

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 totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 17

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
17	0	265	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

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

The State has a process in place for reviewing all districts and educational service agencies in the state each year with regard to disproportionate representation. The first step of this process includes a data analysis of all districts conducted by OSPI. The State utilizes Weighted Risk Ratios (WRR) for the purpose of determining whether the district has met the state-defined threshold for disproportionate representation:

- Over-representation:  $WRR \geq 2.0$  for 3 consecutive years in the same race/ethnicity group, with a minimum "n" size of 10 in that race/ethnicity group and a minimum "n" size of 10 in the comparison group (all other race/ethnicity groups combined)

The source data used to calculate the WRRs for FFY 2017 were the Total Enrollment Report submitted by every district in the state in October 2017, and the November 2017 Federal Special Education Child Count and LRE Report submitted by every district in the state.

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

Using the criteria established above, the State determined that 17 districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation under Indicator 9. A total of 17 districts were excluded from the calculation due to not meeting the minimum "n" size requirement.

The State analyzed the 17 districts identified through the FFY 2017 data review as having disproportionate representation to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. The identified districts were required to complete a self-review as part of the LEA federal fund application. The State provided feedback and technical assistance to districts and asked for further clarification as needed in this review. As part of the review, the State required the districts to review their policies, procedures, and practices related to child find/referral, evaluation/eligibility, placement, and discipline.

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

As a result of this process, the State found that all of the 17 identified districts were in compliance with child find, eligibility, and evaluation requirements. In these 17 districts, the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education was not the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**  
**Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance**

**DRAFT**

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation*

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

**Specific Disability Categories**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0.34%	0%	0%	0.40%	1.50%	0.37%	1.49%	0.37%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
**Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories**  
 FFY 2017 Data

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement?  Yes  No

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 totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 100

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
10	0	182	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?  Yes  No

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

The State has a process in place for reviewing all districts and educational service agencies in the state each year with regard to disproportionate representation. The first step of this process includes a data analysis of all districts conducted by OSPI. The State utilizes Weighted Risk Ratios (WRR) for the purpose of determining whether the district has met the state-defined threshold for disproportionate representation:

- Over-representation:  $WRR \geq 2.0$  for 3 consecutive years in the same race/ethnicity-disability category cell, with a minimum "n" size of 10 in that cell and a minimum "n" size of 10 in the comparison group (all other race/ethnicity groups for that disability category combined)

The source data used to calculate the WRRs for FFY 2017 were the Total Enrollment Report submitted by every district in the state in October 2017 and the November 2017 Federal Special Education Child Count and LRE Report submitted by every district in the state.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate 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 10 districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation under Indicator 10. A total of 100 districts were excluded from the calculation due to not meeting the minimum "n" size requirement.

The State analyzed the 10 districts identified through the FFY 2017 data review as having disproportionate representation to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. The identified districts were required to complete a self-review as part of the LEA federal fund application. The State provided feedback and technical assistance to the districts and asked for further clarification as needed in this review. As part of the review, the State required the districts to review their policies, procedures, and practices related to child find/referral, evaluation/eligibility, placement, and discipline.

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

As a result of this process, the State found that all of the 10 identified districts were in compliance with child find, eligibility, and evaluation requirements. In these 10 districts, the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was not the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**DRAFT**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in**  
**Specific Disability Categories**  
**Required Actions from FFY 2016**

**DRAFT**

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation*

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in**

**DRAFT**

**Specific Disability Categories**

**Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance**

*Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation*

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 11: Child Find**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		98.00%	87.40%	95.00%	97.80%	98.90%	99.00%	98.60%	98.80%	99.05%	99.26%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	99.27%	99.27%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
30,172	29,960	99.27%	100%	99.30%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	212
---	-----

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

Of the 48 LEAs not meeting the target, a review of both the range of days beyond the timeline the evaluation was completed and the reason(s) for the delay(s) was conducted.

Of the 212 initial evaluations not completed on time or under state or federal exception, 57.1% (121) were late due to district scheduling or staffing issues; 13.2% (28) were due to the agreement not meeting minimum acceptable requirements; 6.6% (14) were due to scheduling issues between staff, parents and outside agencies; 6.1% (13) were due to data or tracking issues; 5.7% (12) were due to delays in testing; and 1.9% (4) were due to staff shortages/vacancies. In 9.4% (20), the evaluations were late due to other issues not specified by the district.

A total of 70.6% (150) were delayed 15 school days or less and 29.4% (62) 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 used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

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

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

This indicator was calculated using raw data submitted by local districts through a report form that was included in the State’s required data reports as outlined in Bulletin No. 089-17 Federal Special Education Data Reporting Requirements.



Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
42	42	0	0

**FFY 2016 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 99.3% compliance in FFY 2016. Forty-two districts were determined to be noncompliant with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). The districts were notified in writing of the identified noncompliance and were required to correct this noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.

The State verified that the districts with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2016 APR: (a) corrected all individual cases of noncompliance, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008; and (b) was correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) based on a review of updated data.

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

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

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

Special education representatives from the regional ESDs and OSPI verified that the 42 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made.

Verification activities included on-site visits, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. Regional ESD representatives reviewed data to verify that the noncompliance was corrected. All 42 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 2016 for Indicator 11 was corrected within one year of identification.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016**

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None		

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		83.00%	71.00%	92.40%	95.90%	98.70%	98.10%	97.20%	97.20%	98.89%	98.07%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	97.65%	98.65%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,850
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	689
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	3,031
d. Number of children for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	63
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	15
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	3,031	3,083	98.65%	100%	98.31%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	52
--	----

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

Of the 24 LEAs not meeting the target, a review of both the range of days beyond the timeline that the evaluation was determined and the IEP developed (if found eligible), and the reason for the delay was completed.

Of the 52 children whose evaluations were not completed on time or under federal exception, 42.3% (22) were late due to district scheduling and/or staffing issues; 15.4% (8) were because the student was referred late to Part B and/or the transition meeting did not occur at least 90 days prior to the student's third birthday; 11.5% (6) were due to family attendance/scheduling issues; 11.5% (6) were due to the family and district agreeing to extend the timeline; 7.7% (4) were due to data or tracking issues; and 1.9% (1) were due to delays in receiving medical records. In 9.6% (5), the transitions were late due to other issues not specified by the district.

With regard to the range of days for the 52 reported above 51.9% (27) were delayed 15 calendar days or less, 21.2% (11) were delayed 16 to 29 calendar days beyond the child's third birthday, and 26.9% (14) 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. During the process of disaggregating data for the range of days by district size, it was noted that close to 43% (6 out of 14) of the students who had an evaluation completed 30 or more calendar days beyond the student's third birthday was located within one larger-sized district. 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.

**Attached PDF table (optional)**

[Wa Part B Ind 12 charts with range of days and reasons for delay](#)

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

This indicator was calculated using raw data submitted by local districts through a report form that was included in the State's required data reports as outlined in Bulletin No. 089-17 Federal Special Education Data Reporting Requirements.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**  
**Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance**

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
26	26	0	0

**FFY 2016 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 98.65% compliance in FFY 2016. Twenty-six districts were determined to be noncompliant with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.124(b). The districts were notified in writing of the identified noncompliance and were required to correct this noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.

The State verified that the districts with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2016 APR: (a) corrected all individual cases of noncompliance, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09–02, dated October 17, 2008; and (b) were correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) based on a review of updated data.

In order to verify that the districts were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, a review of updated data, conducted by regional ESD representatives and validated by OSPI, was completed. Verification activities included on-site visits, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. This review verified 100% compliance; the 26 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 CFR §300.124(b).

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

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

Special education representatives from the regional ESDs and OSPI verified that the 26 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations. Regional ESD representatives reviewed data to verify that the noncompliance was corrected. All 26 districts were found to have developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any student for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district.

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2016 for Indicator 12 was corrected within one year of identification.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
	None		

**DRAFT**

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						83.70%	96.60%	98.00%	97.10%	92.11%	95.79%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	93.94%	95.22%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
1,143	1,193	95.22%	100%	95.81%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

- State monitoring
- 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.

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

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

- 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.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

- Yes
- No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**  
**Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance**

**DRAFT**

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

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
23	23	0	0

**FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The State reported 95.22% compliance in FFY 2016. Twenty-three districts were determined to be noncompliant with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.320(b) and 300.321(b). The districts were notified in writing of the identified noncompliance and were required to correct this noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from identification.

The State verified that the 23 districts with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2016 APR: (a) corrected all individual cases of noncompliance, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008; and (b) were correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.320(b) and 300.321(b) based on a review of updated data.

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

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

The 23 identified districts corrected and accounted for all individual instances of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. The districts identified root causes of noncompliance and reviewed policies, procedures, and/or practices that contributed to the noncompliance. The correction of identified noncompliance was summarized and reported to OSPI through the IDEA Compliance Package (see the iGrants Form Package 442 attachment).

Special education representatives from the regional ESDs and OSPI verified that the 23 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, observations, etc. All 23 districts were found to have corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the district.

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2016 for Indicator 13 was corrected within one year of identification.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016**

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

**DRAFT**

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
**Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**  
 Historical Data and Targets

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had 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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Historical Data**

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							25.50%	26.00%	25.50%	25.60%	25.70%
		Data						25.14%	25.50%	23.59%	25.00%	23.74%	22.30%
B	2009	Target ≥							49.00%	50.00%	46.30%	48.95%	49.15%
		Data						48.75%	46.30%	49.20%	47.60%	52.11%	53.21%
C	2009	Target ≥							68.00%	69.00%	66.20%	67.03%	67.13%
		Data						66.93%	66.20%	63.90%	65.70%	65.13%	67.38%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	25.80%	25.90%
	Data	22.13%	21.79%
B	Target ≥	49.35%	49.55%
	Data	55.56%	57.13%
C	Target ≥	67.23%	67.33%
	Data	70.46%	72.21%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	26.00%	26.10%
Target B ≥	49.75%	49.95%
Target C ≥	67.43%	67.53%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

From original SPP submission February 2015: The targets for this indicator were developed using state-level stakeholder input and collaboration across educational agencies, advocacy agencies, vocational rehabilitation, and advisory committees to OSPI and the Center for Change in Transition Services (CCTS). Stakeholders reviewed and analyzed trend data using the National Post Secondary Outcomes (NPSO) trend analysis tool and other technical assistance resources available on the NPSO website. Results of this indicator are shared annually with stakeholders in an effort to monitor and support State progress towards these targets. See introduction for additional information regarding stakeholder participation and input.

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

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had 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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	6475.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1380.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2251.00
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)	198.00
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).	845.00

	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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1380.00	6475.00	21.79%	26.00%	21.31%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	3631.00	6475.00	57.13%	49.75%	56.08%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	4674.00	6475.00	72.21%	67.43%	72.19%	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.
- Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

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.

**Representativeness**

After the census was conducted, the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) Response Calculator was used to measure the representativeness of the respondent group. Calculations were made on the characteristics of disability type, race/ethnicity, gender, and exit status in order to determine whether the leavers who responded to the interviews were similar, or different from, the total population of young adults with an IEP who exited school in 2016-17 (see table below).

According to the NTACT Response Calculator, differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of ±3% are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representativeness of the group and positive differences indicate over-representativeness.

As seen in following table, Washington state was able to gather data from a representative group, meeting the recommendations provided by NTACT for all groups (excluding leavers who dropped out of school). Students who dropped out (didn't receive a diploma) continue to be under-represented in the current response group (-4.10%).

**NTACT Reponse Calculation Table**

Over-all Specific Emotionally/ Intellectual All Other Female Minority Drop-out

**DRAFT**

	Learning Disability	Behaviorally Disabled	Disability	Disabilities				
Target Leaver Totals	8,250	4,048	440	482	3,280	2,952	3,605	1,939
<b>Response Totals</b>	6,475	3,172	307	392	2,604	2,349	2,747	1,256
<b>Target Leaver Representation</b>	49.07%	5.33%	5.84%	39.76%	35.78%	43.70%	23.50%	
<b>Respondent Representation</b>	48.99%	4.74%	6.05%	40.22%	36.28%	42.42%	19.40%	
<b>Difference</b>	-0.08%	-0.59%	0.21%	0.46%	0.50%	-1.28%	-4.10%	

**Selection Bias**

Post-school outcome data collection continues to show representativeness in areas of disability, gender, and ethnicity. The under-representativeness of youth in the dropout category may be attributed to the fact that this group of youth, in general, is a difficult population to reach. Reaching this student population is a continued need. Additionally, user error in the data collection platform (TSF2), where students categorized as dropped out are often deleted from the system, may contribute to this year's difference. In previous years, students in this exit category were deleted at a higher rate than students in other exit categories. CCTS is working to provide districts with ongoing training and technical assistance to increase our respondent representation.

**Response Rate**

As seen in the Response Rate Calculation table above, 8,250 youth left school during the 2016-2017 school year, had not re-enrolled in secondary school, and were alive at the time of data collection. Contact was made with 6,652 leavers or their designated family members and interviews were conducted with 6,475 individuals. The contact rate was 80.6% (6,652 divided by 8,250) and the response rate was 78.5% (6,475 divided by 8,250).

Number of eligible leavers in the state	8,250
Number of youth contacted	6,652
Number of completed surveys	6,475
Response rate: (6,475/8,250)*100	78.5%

The overall response rate indicates that out of 8,250 students who left school last year, post-school outcome information for 21.5% (1,775) of former students was not obtained. Of the 1,775 leavers with no outcome data, 68 of these leavers did not have data because their surveys were never started (e.g., school district personnel did not reach out to the leavers). An additional 131 leavers had incomplete surveys as school district personnel attempted to contact the leavers but did not complete the survey.

This total number of leavers (68 not started/131 incomplete) was not included in the count of 1,576 non-responders. Of the 1,576 non-responders, educators reported a variety of reasons for non-response, including poor or no contact information (25.0%), unable to reach after three attempts (58.8%), declined interview (11.2%), and other reasons (5.0%).

**Results of the Calculations**

1,380 (21.3%) of Washington leavers from FFY 2017 were enrolled in higher education for at least one full term, a decrease of 0.5 percentage points from FFY 2016. The "Some Other Education" category increased by 0.2 percentage points to 3.1%. The competitive employment rate decreased by .5 percentage points from 35.3% in FFY 2016 to 34.8% in FFY 2017, whereas the "Some Other Employment" category increased by 1.0 percentage point. Overall the engagement rate remained the same: 72.2% in both FFY 2016 and FFY 2017.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had 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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥				22.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.25%	25.50%
Data		18.50%	19.30%	42.00%	32.90%	38.60%	22.58%	34.78%	39.13%	27.66%	18.75%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	25.75%	26.00%
Data	33.33%	30.77%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	26.25%	26.50%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

From original SPP submission: Target data from Washington’s State Performance Plan for 2005-2012 and actual data from the Annual Performance Report for reporting year 2012 for this indicator was shared with the stakeholders. The discussion included clarification that OSPI is not a party to the resolution meeting and does not influence the outcome. The discussion also addressed the reasons for success or lack of success in reaching agreements, including the motivation of the parties and the willingness of parties to compromise to reach an agreement through resolution sessions.

Data for resolution agreements for the past 8 years have been highly variable, ranging from a high of 42.00% in FFY 2007 to a low of 22.58% in FFY 2010. Given the variability in the rates of agreement each reporting year, the stakeholders proposed gradual increases in the targets for reaching agreements through resolution sessions.

See introduction for general information regarding stakeholder participation and input.

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	18	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	56	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
18	56	30.77%	26.25%	32.14%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Indicator 16: Mediation**  
**Historical Data and Targets**

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Historical Data**

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			85.00%	86.00%	87.00%	88.00%	89.00%	89.00%	89.00%	75.00%	
Data		87.00%	82.00%	78.50%	89.00%	83.30%	77.78%	83.72%	78.18%	78.00%	84.62%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥		
Data	77.50%	88.89%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets**

FFY	2017			2018		
Target	75.40%	-	85.40%	75.50%	-	85.50%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

From original SPP submission: Target and performance data from Washington’s State Performance Plan for 2005-2012 and from the Annual Performance Report for FFY 2012 was reviewed by stakeholders. Discussion included clarification that OSPI is not a party to the mediation session and does not influence the outcome. Discussion also addressed reasons for success or lack of success in reaching agreements, including the motivation of the parties and the willingness of parties to compromise to reach an agreement through mediation.

Stakeholders compared targets to national data provided by the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE). The national mediation agreement rate has remained relatively stable at 77%, and Washington State's agreement rate fluctuates between 78% and 84%. At that time, the stakeholders determined the targets previously set were too rigorous and recommended current targets be set using FFY 2012 performance data.

See introduction for general information regarding stakeholder participation and input.

**DRAFT**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	6	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	59	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	68	null

**FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
6	59	68	88.89%	75.40% - 85.40%	95.59%

Status

Met Target

Slippage

No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Actions required in FFY 2016 response**

none

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

**Reported Data**

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target ≥					
Data					

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

**FFY 2018 Target**

FFY	2018
Target ≥	

Key: Blue – Data Update

**Description of Measure**

See attached PDF for a complete copy of Washington State's SSIP Part B Phase III, Year 1 Report.

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

See Attachment for a complete copy of Washington State's Part B SSIP.

**Overview**

*Monitoring Priority: General Supervision*

**Results indicator:** The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

### **Data Analysis**

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

See Attachment for a complete copy of Washington State's Part B SSIP.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

### Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

See Attachment for a complete copy of Washington State's Part B SSIP.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

**State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities**

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

See Attachment for a complete copy of Washington State's Part B SSIP.

Description

See Attachment for a complete copy of Washington State's Part B SSIP.

*Monitoring Priority: General Supervision*

**Results indicator:** The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

### **Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies**

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

See Attachment for a complete copy of Washington State's Part B SSIP.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

### Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Submitted Theory of Action:** No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

See Attachment for a complete copy of Washington State's Part B SSIP.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

### Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

See attachment for a complete copy of Washington State's SSIP Part B Phase II Strategic Plan.

### Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

See attachment for a complete copy of Washington State's SSIP Part B Phase II Strategic Plan.

### Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

See attachment for a complete copy of Washington State's SSIP Part B Phase II Strategic Plan.

### Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

See attachment for a complete copy of Washington State's SSIP Part B Phase II Strategic Plan.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

### Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

### A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

See attached PDF for a complete copy of Washington State's SSIP Part B Phase III, Year 2 Report. This PDF also includes the Executive Summary for Indicator B-17. (March 2018)

### B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

See attached PDF for a complete copy of Washington State's SSIP Part B Phase III, Year 2 Report. This PDF also includes the Executive Summary for Indicator B-17. (March 2018)

### C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SiMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

See attached PDF for a complete copy of Washington State's SSIP Part B Phase III, Year 2 Report. This PDF also includes the Executive Summary for Indicator B-17. (March 2018)

### D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

See attached PDF for a complete copy of Washington State's SSIP Part B Phase III, Year 2 Report. This PDF also includes the Executive Summary for Indicator B-17. (March 2018)

### E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to targets

See attached PDF for a complete copy of Washington State's SSIP Part B Phase III, Year 2 Report. This PDF also includes the Executive Summary for Indicator B-17. (March 2018)

### F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

See attached PDF for a complete copy of Washington State's SSIP Part B Phase III, Year 2 Report. This PDF also includes the Executive Summary for Indicator B-17. (March 2018)

