

Annual District Determinations and Updates to Rubric for November 2018

Written notifications of district determination levels for the 2017–18 school year will be mailed on or around November 1, 2018 to each school district and Educational Service Agency (ESA) in the state. These notifications summarize a district's performance on implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) for Part B for the time period beginning July 1, 2017 and ending on June 30, 2018 (school year 2017–18).

The rubric for calculating the 2017-18 determination levels has been expanded to include level four criteria for most areas, as well as the addition of a sixth area related to significant disproportionality. The current rubric to be used for the November 1, 2018 determinations, as well as the rubric that was in place prior to this year, are found on the next two pages.

IDEA details four categories for both the State and district determinations. The level of determination may be:

- Meets the requirements and purposes of IDEA;
- Needs assistance in implementing the requirements of IDEA;
- Needs intervention in implementing the requirements of IDEA; or
- Needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of IDEA.

IDEA identifies specific technical assistance and/or enforcement actions that the State must take under specific circumstances for districts that are not determined to "meet requirements." If you have any questions about the district determination process, contact Jennifer Story at jennifer.story@k12.wa.us or 360-725-6075.

CURRENT Washington State Rubric for November 2018 Determinations

CRITERIA	(1) MEETS REQUIREMENTS	(2) NEEDS ASSISTANCE	(3) NEEDS INTERVENTION	(4) NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL INTERVENTION
1. Did the LEA/ESA resolve all special education audit findings (if any)? <i>[Source - OSPI Audit Resolution]</i>	yes	<i>n/a</i>	no single fiscal year	no multiple fiscal years
2. Were all identified issues of non-compliance corrected by the LEA/ESA, including verification and validation by the ESD and OSPI, as soon as possible but no later than one year from identification? <i>[Source - OSPI general supervision, including program reviews, Safety Net, citizen complaints, etc.]</i>	yes	<i>n/a</i>	no corrected, but not timely	no not timely & uncorrected non-compliance remains
3. Did the LEA/ESA submit timely, complete, and accurate data? <i>[Source - District-submitted data reports, see list on next page] (Note: This includes information from ongoing monitoring activities & other public information related to district compliance with IDEA 2004.)</i>	90% or higher	75.0% to 89.9%	Below 75%	Below 50%
4.1 Did the LEA/ESA demonstrate substantial compliance (on SPP Indicators 11, 12, and 13)? <i>[Source - District-submitted reports (Ind. 11 and 12 - see list on next page), Safety Net &/or OSPI Monitoring and Program Review (Ind. 13)] ("n<reqd" = LEA did not meet the "n" size for that indicator)</i>	90% or higher on <u>all three</u> indicators (&/or "n<reqd")	75.0% to 89.9% on <u>any</u> of the three indicators	Below 75% on <u>any</u> of the three indicators	Below 50% on <u>any</u> of the three indicators
4.2 Is disproportionate representation (if any) the result of <u>inappropriate identification</u> (Indicators 9 and 10)? <i>[Source - OSPI Monitoring and Program Review]</i>	no	yes 2 or more individual instances of inappropriate ident.	yes 5 or more individual instances of inappropriate ident.	yes systemic issues noted across all files reviewed
4.3 Is the LEA's/ESA's suspension/expulsion data above the Single State Bar, AND is the data the result of <u>non-compliant policies, procedures, or practices</u> (Indicator 4B)? <i>[Source - OSPI Monitoring and Program Review]</i>	no	yes 2 or more individual instances of non-compliance	yes 5 or more individual instances of non-compliance	yes systemic issues noted across all files reviewed
5. Did the LEA/ESA demonstrate substantial performance on SPP Indicator 14C (Postsecondary Engagement Rates) that is based on a valid and reliable response rate? <i>[Source - District-submitted report (Ind. 14 - see list on next page)] (For LEAs with fewer than 10 leavers, a 3-year trend was used)</i>	Indicator 14C = 60% or higher and Response Rate = 70% or higher	Indicator 14C = 40.0-59.9% or Response Rate = 50.0-69.9%	Indicator 14C = Below 40% or Response Rate = Below 50%	<i>n/a</i>
6. Did the district receive a designation of Significant Disproportionality? <i>[Source - District-submitted reports (Special Education Students Suspended/Expelled, Federal Special Education Child Count/LRE, and October Total Enrollment report)]</i>	no	yes 1 or 2 years of designations	yes designations 3 consecutive years or more with no progress	yes designations 5 consecutive years or more with no progress

PREVIOUS Washington State Rubric for Determinations

CRITERIA	(1) MEETS REQUIREMENTS	(2) NEEDS ASSISTANCE	(3) NEEDS INTERVENTION	(4) NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL INTERVENTION
1. Did the LEA/ESA resolve all special education audit findings (if any)? <i>[Source - OSPI Audit Resolution]</i>	yes	<i>n/a</i>	no	<i>n/a</i>
2. Were all identified issues of non-compliance corrected by the LEA/ESA, including verification and validation by the ESD and OSPI, as soon as possible but no later than one year from identification? <i>[Source - OSPI general supervision, including program reviews, Safety Net, citizen complaints, etc.]</i>	yes	<i>n/a</i>	no corrected, but not timely	no not timely & uncorrected non-compliance remains
3. Did the LEA/ESA submit timely, complete, and accurate data? <i>[Source - District-submitted data reports, see list on next page]</i> <i>(Note: This includes information from ongoing monitoring activities & other public information related to district compliance with IDEA 2004.)</i>	90% or higher	75.0% to 89.9%	Below 75%	<i>n/a</i>
4.1 Did the LEA/ESA demonstrate substantial compliance (on SPP Indicators 11, 12, and 13)? <i>[Source - District-submitted reports (Ind. 11 and 12 - see list on next page), Safety Net &/or OSPI Monitoring and Program Review (Ind. 13)]</i> <i>("n<reqd" = LEA did not meet the "n" size for that indicator)</i>	90% or higher on all three indicators (&/or "n<reqd")	75.0% to 89.9% on <u>any</u> of the three indicators	Below 75% on <u>any</u> of the three indicators	<i>n/a</i>
4.2 Is disproportionate representation (if any) the result of <u>inappropriate identification</u> (Indicators 9 and 10)? <i>[Source - OSPI Monitoring and Program Review]</i>	no	yes	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
4.3 Is the LEA's/ESA's suspension/expulsion data above the Single State Bar, AND is the data the result of <u>non-compliant policies, procedures, or practices</u> (Indicator 4B)? <i>[Source - OSPI Monitoring and Program Review]</i>	no	yes	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
5. Did the LEA/ESA demonstrate substantial performance on SPP Indicator 14C (Postsecondary Engagement Rates) that is based on a valid and reliable response rate? <i>[Source - District-submitted report (Ind. 14 - see list on next page)] (For LEAs with fewer than 10 leavers, a 3-year trend was used)</i>	Ind. 14C = 60% or higher and Response Rate = 70% or higher	Ind. 14C = 40.0-59.9% or Response Rate = 50.0-69.9%	Ind. 14C = Below 40% or Response Rate = Below 50%	<i>n/a</i>