



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

*Washington State
Performance Plan
(SPP)/Annual Performance
Report (APR) Part B: For
Reporting on FFY 2022*

2024

WASHINGTON STATE APR PART B

For Reporting on Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022

2024

Dr. Tania May
Assistant Superintendent of Special Education

Prepared by:

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

Submission:

U. S. Department of Education
Office of Special Education Programs
February 1, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	7
Indicator 1: Graduation	25
1—Indicator Data.....	26
1—Prior FFY Required Actions.....	27
1—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response	27
1—Required Actions.....	28
Indicator 2: Drop Out.....	29
2—Indicator Data.....	30
2—Prior FFY Required Actions.....	31
2—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response	31
2—Required Actions.....	31
Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs.....	32
3A—Indicator Data.....	33
3A—Prior FFY Required Actions.....	35
3A—OSEP Response.....	35
3A—Required Actions.....	35
Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)	36
3B—Indicator Data	37
3B—Prior FFY Required Actions	40
3B—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response.....	40
3B—Required Actions	40
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)	41
3C—Indicator Data	42
3C—Prior FFY Required Actions	46
3C—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response	46
3C—Required Actions	46
Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)	47
3D—Indicator Data.....	48
3D—Prior FFY Required Actions.....	50
3D—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response.....	50
3D—Required Actions.....	50

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion.....	51
4A—Indicator Data.....	53
4A—Prior FFY Required Actions.....	55
4A—OSEP Response.....	55
4A—Required Actions.....	55
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion.....	56
4B—Indicator Data.....	58
4B—Prior FFY Required Actions.....	60
4B—OSEP Response.....	60
4B—Required Actions.....	60
Indicator 5: Education Environments (Children Five (Kindergarten)–21).....	61
5—Indicator Data.....	62
5—Prior Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) Required Actions.....	64
5—OSEP Response.....	64
5—Required Actions.....	64
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments.....	65
6—Indicator Data.....	66
6—Prior FFY Required Actions.....	68
6—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response.....	68
6—Required Actions.....	68
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes.....	69
7—Indicator Data.....	71
7—Prior FFY Required Actions.....	76
7—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response.....	76
7—Required Actions.....	76
Indicator 8: Parent involvement.....	77
8—Indicator Data.....	78
8—Prior FFY Required Actions.....	84
8—OSEP Response.....	84
8—Required Actions.....	85
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation.....	86
9—Indicator Data.....	87
9—Prior FFY Required Actions.....	89
9—OSEP Response.....	89
9—Required Actions.....	90

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories.....	91
10—Indicator Data	92
10—Prior FFY Required Actions	95
10—OSEP Response.....	95
10—Required Actions	95
Indicator 11: Child Find.....	96
11—Indicator Data	97
11—Prior FFY Required Actions	101
11—OSEP Response.....	102
11—Required Actions	102
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition	103
12—Indicator Data	104
12—Prior FFY Required Actions	108
12—OSEP Response.....	109
12—Required Actions	109
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition.....	111
13—Indicator Data	112
13—Prior FFY Required Actions	115
13—OSEP Response.....	116
13—Required Actions	116
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes.....	118
14—Indicator Data	121
14—Prior FFY Required Actions	125
14—OSEP Response.....	125
14—Required Actions	125
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions	126
15—Indicator Data	126
15—Prior FFY Required Actions	128
15—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response.....	128
15—Required Actions	128
Indicator 16: Mediation.....	129
16—Indicator Data	129
16—Prior FFY Required Actions	130
16—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response.....	131
16—Required Actions	131

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan.....	132
17—Indicator Data	135
17—Prior FFY Required Actions	165
17—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response.....	165
17—Required Actions	165
Certification	166
Instructions	166
DETERMINATION ENCLOSURES.....	167
RDA Matrix	167
Data Rubric.....	169
APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data	171
How the Department Made Determinations.....	172
Legal Notice	173

INTRODUCTION

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

In Washington State, the commitment to inclusive education and improved outcomes for students with disabilities is not just a goal but a collaborative, ongoing journey. Through a co-design approach with invested partners, including students and families, the state continues to strategically focus on key priority areas to foster positive changes and address systemic challenges. These commitments include:

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

The commitment to systemic improvement in Washington is supported and elevated by invested partners that build on what's already working, provide constructive feedback, and bring forward questions in efforts to improve existing processes. In an ongoing collaborative process with the Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), partners have focused their collective efforts on enhancing inclusionary practices over the past four years and are now focused on codesigning systems that focus on key areas as indicated by data and that align with strategic priorities. The outcomes have been tangible, with visible improvements reflected in statewide data, and areas of improvement identified through the disaggregation of that data. This is evident in the evolution of the Inclusionary Practices Project (IPP), which has transformed into the Inclusionary Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN). Although the state was experiencing substantial growth in our placement data, when we disaggregated our data, we were not seeing the same

growth for Black students with disabilities and student with disabilities less than 40% in general education settings, which shifted the aim of our work to follow the path of who is most marginalized in our system to remove barriers for all our Washington State students.

Coordinated efforts are occurring at OSPI. By taking a cross-divisional approach to ongoing analysis of root causes behind current data, efforts extend beyond the immediate impact on students with disabilities to comprehensively address resulting impacts on other student groups. Our state agency has developed a broad plan specifically tailored to target improvement efforts concerning the outcomes of students with disabilities, supported by a robust statewide technical assistance network in coordination with federal technical assistance partners. This includes various workgroups facilitated by a lead from the special education division that elevates priorities to leadership partners in divisions across the agency, which is then elevated to cabinet to influence and ensure that students with disabilities are represented and prioritized in opportunities across the State Education Agency.

On an annual basis, Washington not only recognizes areas where there might have been slippage or where targets were not met but actively commits additional state and federal resources proactively when getting feedback from partners. This feedback is collected ongoing and in a variety of ways, with the goal of making it accessible to a wide range of partners across the state and making sure diverse experiences, perspectives and goals are shared. This includes contributions to develop updated guidance on regulations, expectations, best practices, and systems development done in partnership with internal teams and outside organizations, and with TA partners.

Improvement activities are designed to not be reactive but proactive, addressing areas where partners are identifying the greatest needs for support and are elevating priorities that impact the educational outcomes for students receiving special education services. The iterative nature of this process reflects a commitment to continuous improvement and a dynamic responsiveness to the evolving needs of the educational landscape.

In essence, Washington State is striving for transformative change through instructional leadership. Collaborative efforts underscore the state's dedication to fostering inclusive educational environments where every student, including those with disabilities, can thrive. The allocation of additional resources demonstrates a commitment to the long-term vision of equity and a focus on educational benefit for all students.

The June 23, 2023, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Determination Letter, which is publicly available, states that Washington state meets requirements in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2021 state performance plan (SPP) / annual performance report (APR) submission. Given Washington's commitment to ongoing improvement and the state's unwavering pursuit to engage in proactive, ongoing growth and improvement, the state continues to work with multiple national TA centers, including the:

- National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI);
- National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII);
- National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations (NCPMI);

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

The collaboration with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) remains robust and dynamic. OSEP-assigned Technical Assistance (TA) continues to play a pivotal role in building the capacity of State Education Agency (SEA) special education leadership. This collaborative effort extends beyond capacity building, leading to tangible shifts in both practice and policy.

The TA efforts are strategically targeted at priority areas and aspects of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) where there's been slippage, failure to meet targets, or identified areas needing improvement. The focus areas include, but are not limited to, participation in alternate assessments, ongoing efforts to improve proficiency in state assessments with a focus on students engaging in core content, preschool Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) and outcomes and post-school outcomes. We are continuing to address disproportionality and promoting equity and addressing priorities through the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Theory of Action and its evaluation plan, including a closer alignment of statewide improvement initiatives with the Part C counterpart. To address families reported concerns with mediation, we have been partnering with family-focused community-based organizations to explore family navigator supports embedded within LEAs and ESDs.

The impact of the TA received is evident in the deepened analysis specific to outcome data for students with disabilities and a deepened focus on instructional leadership. This goes hand-in-hand with an extensive review of additional research and policy. Collaborative discussions on promising practices and the ongoing identification of barriers contribute to a comprehensive understanding of Washington State's educational landscape and are reflected in our Special Education division's strategic priorities.

By deliberately and consistently addressing the root causes associated with the outcomes being observed, the state demonstrates a commitment to driving meaningful and sustainable change. In a continuous collaboration with OSEP, Washington State follows a cycle of analysis, refinement, and implementation. This ensures that improvement efforts are not only targeted but also responsive to the evolving needs of the educational system.

The partnership with OSEP continues to serve as a catalyst for informed decision-making, evidence-based practices instructional leadership, and a shared commitment to advancing the educational outcomes for students with disabilities. The TA efforts not only build capacity but foster a culture of continuous improvement, emphasizing a holistic approach that considers both systemic challenges and promising solutions.

In the 2021-22 school year, Washington State convened a Parent Engagement Focus Group as part of the broader State Design Team (SDT). This group specifically engaged in work related to Indicator B-8, focusing on parent engagement in the special education process. In the 2022-23 school year we have continued to meet with this team and provide information and updates about Indicator B-8 during our annual state design team meetings.

Anticipating the full implementation during the 2024-25 school year, OSPI is working towards finalizing the new parent survey tool and process. This comprehensive effort is one part of the state's larger commitment to inclusivity, partner engagement, and the continuous improvement of processes related to special education and parent engagement.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

286

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

Amidst the ever-evolving landscape of education, Washington remains steadfast in its commitment to fostering inclusive and effective learning environments for students with disabilities. The state's proactive approach involves a responsive and intentional integration of systems across the educational spectrum, a concerted effort to elevate developmental, functional, and academic outcomes, with an adherence to uphold the standards of IDEA Part B.

At the heart of Washington's educational strategy is the General Supervisory System, a comprehensive framework orchestrated by three dynamic agency/division work groups, each with policies, procedures, and practices to ensure effective implementation of their work. We continually enhance cross-divisional policies and procedures within our integrated systems for effective implementation. For instance, in the 2022-23 period, responding to community complaints and credible sources, we adjusted our special education monitoring to gather comprehensive data on shortened school days and restraint/isolation incidents statewide. Our general supervisory team has developed a systematic approach to document and analyze responses to calls, emails, and concerns, ensuring a proactive and data-driven process.

Program Improvement Team:

This team is instrumental in designing and implementing the Washington Integrated System of Monitoring (WISM). WISM, focused on data-driven monitoring and innovation, is designed with

intention to support positive change and improving student outcomes. Embracing collaboration, the Program Improvement Team extends its influence across the educational system, co-designing oversight and improvement activities both internally and externally with regional partners. The team works closely with LEA and regional Educational Service District (ESD) partners to ensure all issues of identified non-compliance are corrected, including the examination of subsequent data to ensure the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements (more specific information is included under the compliance indicators of this report). The team has made a strategic expansion to accommodate a Special Projects lead focusing on students with disabilities in nontraditional settings. This lead serves as a liaison across diverse SEA program offices, fostering connections with Native Education, Multilingual Education, Highly Capable, and Learning Options.

Operations Team (Data and Fiscal Management):

Taking a lead role in the activities of data and fiscal management, this team is the keystone in the seamless functioning of several educational priorities that are funded through our department and supports schools and districts in their data and fiscal responsibilities. The responsibilities of this team include data collection, Safety Net activities, and comprehensive fiscal oversight. As part of the state's focus on leading with intention, the Operations Team collaborates with CIFR to improve fiscal policies and protocols, going beyond just managing finances. This team engages in collaborative efforts across teams in the division and across the agency to provide joint fiscal presentations, guidance, and technical assistance.

Dispute Resolution Team:

Operating at the intersection of conflict resolution and policy oversight, the dispute resolution team works to provide an equitable landscape for dispute resolution activities. In response to partner (stakeholder) input, the team has undergone strategic restructuring, augmenting its capacity with additional complaint investigator contractors, expanded leadership roles, and enhanced oversight of non-public agencies. Equity remains paramount, with regular engagements with the state's Office of Administrative Hearings, the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), and mediation and IEP facilitation vendors. Technical assistance has been expanded, with continued and ongoing collaboration across the division to ensure that it is meaningful, relevant and will result in systemic change.

Across the entire General Supervisory System is a sustained commitment to universal and targeted professional development, technical assistance, and early childhood oversight and improvement. Involvement from partners is not a checkbox but a cornerstone, with diverse families and community members actively participating in the collaborative process to ensure the needs of each student with an IEP are not just acknowledged but make urgent the need to improve systems, services, and instruction to improve educational outcomes for students.

Technical Assistance System:

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

Washington's multifaceted approach, combining data analysis, collaborative partnerships, and a commitment to innovation, reflects a dedicated pursuit of improved educational outcomes for

students with disabilities. The state continues to strive to be a dynamic hub of ingenuity and comprehensive strategies for educational improvement for students with disabilities that includes building the capacity of our family and community partners to engage in these efforts. Occurring numerous times over the course of the year are collaborations with school district staff, the SEAC, as well as other education partners that forms the bedrock of the state's commitment to improvement across the education system, one that's inclusive of special education programs and services.

Facilitation for school district access to technical assistance and professional development resources designed to improve educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities is a top priority and it has shifted and changed based on what we learn about what districts need to effectively access and implement technical assistance recommendations and resources that address needs informed by data.

Under the umbrella of the WISM, technical assistance and supports are woven into various activities, offering a multifaceted approach:

- (a) LEA self-assessments undergo thorough review and feedback.
- (b) On-site monitoring reviews and remote desk reviews involve a variety of components like focus groups, individual interviews, and management work sessions.
- (c) Monitoring reports that provides not just observations but actionable recommendations and resources.
- (d) Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS) districts benefit from quarterly meetings.
- (e) OSPI's Special Education Monthly Update disseminates guidance briefs and tips.

The state's commitment to knowledge dissemination extends to a vast audience, with monthly updates reaching over 6,000 subscribers, video summaries have also been incorporated to enhance accessibility and understanding among diverse partner groups. Special education liaisons assigned to the nine Educational Service Districts (ESDs) provide another communication channel, engaging in monthly meetings with district special education directors to discuss key updates and relevant information.

Direct access to SEA leadership is facilitated through semimonthly office hours, where school and district leadership can seek guidance on special education programming, fiscal matters, and data-related queries. These sessions, often enriched by cross-content experts, serve as forums for addressing specific concerns, from preschool funding to implementing positive behavior supports in schools. These office hours are in addition to office hours hosted by other divisions, such as fiscal/data, WISM, and early childhood special education to make sure partners have ongoing access to resources and guidance from leadership on teams across the Special Education division.

Technical assistance resources also move through Coordinated Service Agreements (CSAs) with the nine regional ESDs and the statewide IPTN. The ESDs, with knowledge of their region's needs, align their technical assistance support with indicators in the State Performance Plan and the needs arising across their regions in partnership with the SEA. Responding to the growing demand for mental health and behavioral support, state-level activity funds have been provided for

partnerships with ESDs to bolster therapeutic programs, providing alternatives to Non-Public Agencies (NPAs) and focusing on intensive behavioral and mental health support for students. Over the past year, the ESDs have collaborated with one another and pooled resources to provide more comprehensive services in this area in an effort to keep students in their neighborhood schools.

The IPTN is the expansion from the former Inclusionary Practices Project (IPP) and in addition to the professional development organizations that were part of the IPP, the network now includes organizations from the State Needs Project and ESD partners. This network operates collaboratively, contributing significantly to statewide capacity-building. Endeavoring to pinpoint the kinds of data that center around family and student experiences and outcomes, the IPTN collaborates to align priorities and efforts to dive deeper and show how meaningful inclusion is being realized beyond the reporting of LRE. As the IPP has transitioned to the IPTN we have been harnessing the strengths of the IPP to expand the network to address persistent inequities and to eliminate barriers that continue to exclude students, shifting the focus from evidence of implementing inclusionary practices to fostering inclusionary outcomes.

The IPTN collaboration is developing statewide capacity for sustainable, high-fidelity implementation of effective education practices to maximize academic and social outcomes for all P-12 students. IPTN is making significant efforts to address disproportionality and explicitly address the systems and practices that continue to exclude groups of students from choice and opportunity. The IPTN is engaging in this work using the science of implementation and improvement strategies for organizational change to maximize and support effective practices that produce positive outcomes for students.

Professional Development System:

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

Washington's approach to Professional Development (PD) reflects a comprehensive and intentional strategy that is responsive to data, feedback, and is proactive in design. By leveraging data, partner input, expertise, and involvement, and by focusing on collaboration and cohesiveness, the state strives to create a dynamic learning environment that addresses the learning needs of educators, students, and families.

The State's commitment to improving access and outcomes for students with disabilities is evident through its PD Systems, employing multi-tiered support systems tailored to data-driven needs. These systems, facilitated by regional ESDs, LEAs, and a statewide technical assistance network, ensure service providers' skill development, promote collaboration, and extend improvements across the education system. Strategic alignment addresses both state and local needs, prioritizing family involvement in educational design and content.

Key features of the PD Systems include:

Data-Driven Approach:

The design and implementation of PD structures are informed by thorough data analyses. This data-driven approach helps identify areas of improvement and tailor PD activities to address specific needs.

Partner (Stakeholder) Input:

The inclusion of education partners' input is a critical aspect of the design process. This ensures that the PD activities align with the expectations and requirements of those directly involved in the educational process.

Alignment with Priorities:

The structures are aligned with state and local priorities. This ensures that PD efforts are in harmony with broader educational goals and initiatives.

Support for Professional Learning:

Activities within the PD Systems are designed to support ongoing professional learning. The focus is not only on enhancing individual skills but also on engaging leaders in the development of effective system processes and support structures.

Culture of Collaboration:

A key goal of the Professional Development Systems is to create a culture of collaboration. This collaborative culture is intended to positively impact educator knowledge and skills, fostering an environment conducive to improved student learning. The culture of collaboration is not just within professional development activities, but also making sense of how these activities connect and elevate the work.

Engagement of Leaders:

Instructional leadership plays a crucial role in the success of these systems. PD activities are structured to engage leaders in developing effective and inclusive processes and support structures.

Positive Impact on Student Learning:

The goal is to positively impact student learning. By enhancing the knowledge and skills of service providers, the PD Systems aim to improve the overall educational experience and outcomes for students with disabilities.

Since 2021, we've partnered with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) to advance Inclusive Principal Leadership (AIPL). This collaborative effort, involving OSPI leadership, families, communities, districts, universities, and professional organizations, aims to enhance principals' ability to implement inclusive education. Over the past year, the AIPL design evolved, with Washington's team engaging in bi-monthly meetings with other states, fostering cross-state communities of practice through a consultancy protocol.

The Keeping Exceptional Special Educators (KESE) grant fuels Washington's special education recruitment and retention efforts by providing PD and data. It supports goals like expanding the hiring pool, improving certification pathways, enhancing induction for novices, and addressing working conditions. The KESE task force is comprised of District Leaders and Teachers, Community and Family Support Organizations, Educator Preparation Programs, State Agencies (PESB, Governor's Office), Associations (WACTE, WASP, AESD, WASA, WEA), OSPI Departments (Native Education, BEST, School Improvement, Certification, Bilingual, ELL and Dual Language), and

Partners in Related Initiatives.

Washington collaborates with the CEEDAR Center to enhance both pre-service and in-service learning. The Washington CEEDAR, organized into committees like Inclusive Leadership, Policy and Personnel Preparation, and Data Knowledge and Mobilization, develops resources and plans for changes in educator education. For instance, the team is crafting a syllabi protocol for inclusive practices in educator preparation programs.

In partnership with the Washington Association of School Administrators (WASA), OSPI developed the Special Education Director Academy (SPEDA). This academy supports directors with administrative responsibilities, offering relevant sessions on topics like Supporting Students with Challenging Behavior and Implementing MTSS.

In Washington, educator professional development is enhanced through collaborative efforts facilitated by the Inclusionary Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN). IPTN focuses on diverse needs, covering key topics like MTSS, UDL, literacy, math, early childhood, social-emotional and behavioral supports, multilingual and migrant education, and culturally-affirming curriculum and instruction. The network aligns priorities across all levels to build collaborative structures addressing the diverse needs of students and families.

The IPTN coordinates various technical assistance partners across the state, leveraging the strengths of former State Needs Project partners, leadership from Educational Service Districts (ESDs) and organizations involved in statewide Inclusionary Practices Professional Development Project (IPP). It is facilitated by cross-divisional leadership at OSPI, and partners from the national technical assistance provider, WestEd.

The network comprises over 15 PD providers, that include the Family Engagement Collaborative, Special Education Technology Center, Washington Education Association, and Washington Association of School Administrators, among others. These organizations collaborate to showcase diverse engagement efforts and promote intentional collaboration and learning. To align their efforts, the network analyzed statewide data and established the following aim: The IPTN will offer high-quality guidance, technical assistance, and professional development resources to districts, aiming to disrupt segregated systems of disproportionality and reduce exclusionary practices in WA schools.

Over the course of the last year the IPP engaged 2,268 district level administrators, 1,605 building level administrators, 1,109 education staff associates (those in roles such as counselors, speech language pathologists, social workers, and nurses), 14,980 general education teachers, 2,711 special education teachers, 2,231 paraeducators, and 1004 family and community partners, from over 238 districts statewide. These numbers don't include the 13,182 educators whose roles were not documented and the additional 134 educators who were IPP partners, higher education partners, preservice teachers and administrators, board members and students.

By developing a more comprehensive network, our PD partners have become increasingly adept at creating resources and presentations that are available statewide and at no cost. Though the numbers captured above do not illustrate the full impact does provide an idea of how this effort towards greater inclusion has become a collective movement spanning a wide range of education

partners, that is necessary for transformational change.

As Washington collaborates and explores new ways to measure impact and use data effectively within a MTSS framework, inclusive leadership at all system levels is crucial. The effectiveness of the IPP, engagement with State Need Projects, and intentional organization of professional development are elevating the work.

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The SDT has been instrumental in setting goals, providing feedback and codesigning activities through comprehensive input from various partners (stakeholders) in the improvement of special education indicators. Here's an overview of the key components of the SDT and activities:

Composition of the SDT:

The SDT comprises a diverse group, including OSPI cross-divisional staff, ESD representatives from all nine regions, partners from other state agencies, close to 300 educational partners from across the state, and technical assistance partners.

Among the 356 SDT members that took part in setting targets for the current SPP, there were 12 students, 30 individuals with disabilities, and 142 parents or family members of individuals with disabilities. As we continue to engage the SDT we have high levels of engagement with over 300 registrants for our last SDT Meeting and almost 200 educators, family members, students and members from professional organizations attending our annual update meeting. SDT meetings provide information about current data, collect feedback, and engage on an ongoing basis with smaller work teams, like the Equity team, to analyze the data to codesign and evaluate the effectiveness of our activities. To encourage diverse engagement, SDT Meetings offer closed captioning, ASL and Spanish language interpretation. We also ask that when registering, that partners identify if they need additional accommodations.

Focus Groups and Areas of Analysis:

As part of the indicator target setting and to design and evaluate efforts, the following activities occurred:

Participants were divided into seven focus groups based on their areas of interest and role.

Five focus groups were involved in analyzing indicators and target-setting activities, covering areas such as early childhood, secondary transition, inclusionary practices, parent engagement, and addressing disproportionality and significant discrepancy.

Since target setting, the SDT continued to meet over the course of 2022-23 school year to provide input about IEPs, for indicator data updates, and to provide feedback on priority areas, such as the IPTN, and the OSPI Special Education Division Systemic Equity Review (SER).

Meeting Schedule and Collaboration:

After collaboratively developing recommendations for indicator targets in 2021, a virtual meeting was held in January 2022 for the full SDT to review the work of the focus groups and the recommended targets, provide feedback and recommendations.

The target revisions from the January 2022 meeting were presented to the state SEAC for review and approval on January 20, 2022. Focus groups for IEPs continued to meet in 2022-23 and SDT meetings were held annually to provide updates, gather feedback, and answer questions on indicator data, SPP/APR findings, and to share the work and new innovations occurring in service of meeting those targets.

Communication and Documentation:

All focus group materials, including slide decks, indicator guides, discussion protocols, participant guidelines, meeting recordings/transcripts, and participant input, were maintained in a shared Google Docs folder for accessibility. Additional opportunities for input included a parking lot document, homework assignments, and email.

Updates on the SDT's work were posted publicly on OSPI's Special Education Family Engagement and Guidance webpage. SDT Meetings are regularly advertised in OSPI's Special Education Monthly update that has over 6000 subscribers and through the government delivery listserv. Dispute resolution data for Indicators B15 and B16 in Washington State are shared semi-annually with partners, including SEAC meetings and presentations to administrators, families, advocates, and communities. The data is publicly posted on the OSPI website for transparency. SEAC reviews and proposes targets for these indicators, continuing to prioritize partner engagement. The SDT reconvenes to discuss OSEP's clarification feedback. Summaries of SEAC meetings and decisions are accessible on the OSPI SEAC webpage.

SSIP State Design Team and Community Partner Engagement:

Essential partners collectively form a community that supports the SSIP implementation process. By scaffolding the learning of regional ESDs, LEAs, community partners, and families, this community contributes to the successful navigation of the Stages of Implementation Science, MTSS implementation, and other identified evidence-based practices (EBPs).

Here's an overview of the key partners:

WA State ECSE Coordination Team:

The ECSE Coordination Team is involved in coordinating efforts related to early childhood special education and inclusive practices.

SEAC:

SEAC serves as an advisory body providing insights and recommendations on special education matters. Their involvement underscores the importance of collaboration with diverse partners.

PreK and Transitional Kindergarten (TK) Inclusion Champions Network:

This network focuses on promoting inclusive practices in pre-kindergarten and transitional kindergarten settings.

Association of AESD Special Education Directors:

The AESD Special Education Directors represent a collective voice and collaboration among educational service districts. Their involvement ensures that strategies and services are coordinated across regions.

OSPI's Division of Early Learning:

The Division of Early Learning within the OSPI plays a central role in shaping early childhood education policies and practices.

CISL:

CISL is involved in initiatives that aim to improve student learning outcomes. Their partnership contributes to the identification and implementation of EBPs.

UW IPP PreK Demonstration Sites:

The UW IPP PreK Demonstration Sites serves as a demonstration of effective practices in pre-kindergarten education.

Office of Native Education (ONE):

ONE's involvement ensures that initiatives related to inclusive EL settings and alternative placements are culturally responsive and consider the unique needs of Native communities.

Family and Community Engagement:

In addition to SEAC, SDT, and SSIP activities, the IPTN focuses on racial equity, family engagement, and student voice. During FFY 2022-23, the IPTN engaged over 10,000 participants, including students and families and leveraged the expertise of the Family Engagement Collaborative.

The SEA has attended and presented in collaboration with students and families at national conferences. These conferences included but were not limited to TASH and last year's OSEP conference, providing opportunities to share about how partnerships improve educational outcomes and experiences.

The SER formed a team with parents and adults who have firsthand experience with special education services in the state. The Equity team actively sought out family partners who had not previously been engaged in other parent or community councils to elevate new voices and to inform a memo with recommendations and resources for the Special Education division concerning statewide data and processes.

These collaborative structures highlight Washington's commitment to engaging partners with an emphasis on students and families in the decision-making processes, prioritizing diversity, equity, and inclusion across all improvement efforts.

Apply stakeholder engagement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

152

Parent Members Engagement:

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

The Special Education State Design Team (SDT) engaged 142 parents and family members in seven focus groups, analyzing indicator data and crafting recommendations for targets from October to December 2021. The SDT convened in a virtual meeting on January 11, 2022, to review and endorse the proposed targets before presenting them to the State Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) on January 20, 2022. A subsequent meeting in May 2022 addressed feedback from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) clarification window. The SDT's collaborative materials, updates, and engagement opportunities were accessible through a shared Google Docs folder, and public updates were posted on OSPI's Special Education Family Engagement and Guidance webpage. SEAC summaries and decisions are publicly available on OSPI's SEAC webpage. These processes reflect a commitment to transparency, collaboration, and family engagement in Washington State's special education indicator targets.

In 2022-23 ongoing contributions and reports on the indicators, with opportunities for engagement and feedback are provided to families multiple times a year. This is done through SEAC meetings, SDT meetings, and by looking at indicators and priorities with the equity team engaging with the Special Education Division at OSPI as part of our Systemic Equity Review. Additionally, one of the primary drivers of our Inclusionary Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN) is Innovative Family and Community engagement and family engagement is called out in all our primary drivers to identify change activities to improve educational outcomes for students with disabilities. The 142 parent members of the 2022-23 SDT were 3.5% American Indian/Alaska Native, 4.2% Asian, 0.7% Black, 5.6% Hispanic, 0.7% Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, 6.3% Two or More Races, 66.2% White, and 12.7% not specified. Based on these demographics, the SDT parent representatives were overrepresented for White and underrepresented for Asian, Black, and Hispanic members when compared to the state's student demographics.

In addition, as part of our systemic equity review an equity team was created to dive deeper into our indicator data and parent representation was and continues to be a priority on this team. The IPTN also includes the Family Engagement Collaborative that is active in goal setting and Professional Development concerning our priorities, targets and goals as part of our goal setting activities with the state design team.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

Family and Community Engagement with Statewide Technical Assistance Partners:

Beyond directly supporting a significant number of families from diverse backgrounds, the IPP Cadre Family Engagement Collaborative continues to play a pivotal role in guiding the other 15 organizations that are part of the Inclusionary Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN). Their contributions include providing strategies and fostering capacity for meaningful community dialogues, co-designing activities and plans for improvement with families and community members and involving them in collaborative decision-making processes. To achieve these objectives, the IPTN maintains a continuous reflection on their beliefs aligned with inclusive culture, philosophy, and practices, in addition to how to engage a broad range of partners, both educators and families. IPTN technical assistance ensures that educators are learning alongside families and that technical assistance is reflective of the diversity of schools and community partners. Some of the key inquiries the entire IPTN addresses in partnership with districts across Washington includes exploring the narratives, experiences, and events that define the significance of inclusion for staff, students, and families and how this impacts educational outcomes for students with and without disabilities. The IPTN deliberately creates spaces for discussions on inclusion and equity, honoring diverse cultures and identities in the school community, and critically examining how implicit bias and individual perspectives influence the way students and families are perceived, engaged with, and valued. This technical assistance has and continues to center students and families in our work to improve educational experiences and outcomes.

Special Education State Design Team (SDT):

In a concerted effort to foster diversity within the SDT, extensive measures were taken to ensure a representative participant pool. The original invitation and survey were available in the 13 most spoken languages in Washington state and was employed to collect essential details such as contact information, represented age group(s), county/school district affiliations, optional race/ethnicity, role/position, areas of interest, and any necessary accommodations or language access requirements. Wide-reaching dissemination methods included GovDelivery communications, OSPI's Special Education Monthly Updates, ESD meetings, Spanish and English radio and newspaper advertisements, as well as collaborations with statewide professional organizations, diverse community-based organizations, and PTI Centers. Notably, Spanish advertisements were initiated to address underrepresentation of individuals identifying as Hispanic in the preliminary participant demographics.

Participants were thoughtfully assigned to one of seven focus groups based on their identified interests and roles, each comprising 45–55 members with a balanced mix of race/ethnicity, geographic location, background, and role. The demographics of each focus group were closely monitored by the Special Education Program Improvement Coordinator to ensure optimal representativeness aligned with the pool of applicants and their specified areas of interest.

Several of these focus groups continued to meet through the 2022-23 school year and based on the data/targets from the state design team, other teams have formed to continue carrying these priorities forward.

Family and Community Engagement with Statewide Technical Assistance Partners:

We earlier described the family and community engagement partners deliberately integrated in Inclusionary Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN) and the efforts to prioritize family and community engagement through all the IPTN activities. Furthermore, we have actively involved families in our Special Education Divisions Systemic Equity Review. In this collaborative effort, family partners play a crucial role by reviewing the memo compiled from a national technical assistance partner, as a result of months of engagement with those same families providing feedback. For this, parents and families engaged in professional development and shared their own experiences related to equity and disproportionality, analyzed data, and participated in focus group sessions. Their input and continued partnership will be instrumental in shaping division priorities by ensuring that our priorities are driven by what was identified and recommended as part of this review.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

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

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

Continuing through 2022-23, quarterly meetings with SEAC and annual SDT meetings, in addition to more regularly scheduled focus group meetings, focused on analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Regularly scheduled equity team meetings (8 meetings occurring over 6 months) additionally focused on progress towards our targets and goals as part of the Special Education division's systemic equity review and included data analysis and

feedback from partners across the state.

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

All SDT focus group materials, including slide decks, indicator guides, discussion protocols, participant guidelines, meeting recordings/transcripts, and participant input was maintained in a shared Google Docs folder for all participants to access. Additional opportunities to provide input included a parking lot document, homework assignments, and email. Updates on the work of the SDT and focus groups were posted publicly on OSPI's Special Education Family Engagement and Guidance webpage (<https://ospi.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/family-engagement-and-guidance>). Summaries of SEAC meetings and decisions are posted on OSPI's SEAC webpage (<https://ospi.k12.wa.us/about-ospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meeting-workgroups/special-education-advisory-council-seac>).

Each of the IPP Cadre partners in 2022-23 were featured and hyperlinked on the main webpage for the statewide IPP (<https://ospi.k12.wa.us/policy-funding/special-education-funding-and-finance/inclusionary-practices-professional-development-project>).

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

The state continues to publicly post and report on both SEA and LEA performance on the state performance plan (SPP)/annual performance report (APR) indicators. The FFY 2021 data were posted (<https://ospi.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection>) in March 2023. Complete copies of the Washington SPP and APR are located on the same webpage.

The APR is disseminated throughout the state via OSPI's website (<https://ospi.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection>) and the agency's social media accounts (Twitter, RSS feeds, Facebook) and available to the media and families. This information was also distributed in the February 2023 special education monthly update, through the Partnerships for Action Voices for Empowerment (PAVE) PTI Center, to stakeholder committees who gave substantial input and feedback to the development of this document, and to the SEAC. This information is also presented at regional ESD meetings and various conferences throughout the state.

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

to statewide data at-a-glance. Districts also use these data to complete their LEA federal fund applications.

State assessment data links are below:

Accommodations Data for State and District:

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

Statewide Smarter Balanced Assessment:

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

Statewide Alternate Assessment:

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

District Alternate Assessment Example:

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

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

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

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

INDICATOR 1: GRADUATION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. [20 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1416(a)(3)(A)]

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

1—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2018	68.21%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	54.90%	58.10%	61.30%	71.00%	72.00%
Data	59.41%	69.86%	62.24%	73.91%	76.13%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	6,030
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	15
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,903

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
6,030	7,948	76.13%	73.00%	75.87%	Met target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

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

Washington State Requirements for the class of 2022: Total credits required = 24

Subject, number of credits required and additional information:

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

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

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

Non-Credit Requirements:

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

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

NO

1—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

Response

None

1—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 2: DROP OUT

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) who exited special education due to dropping out. [20 United States Code (U.S.C.) 1416 (a)(3)(A)]

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

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

2—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2018	31.93%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	5.50%	5.45%	5.45%	31.00%	30.50%
Data	6.43%	6.61%	6.81%	25.75%	2021

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	6,030
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	15
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	1,903

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14–21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14–21)	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
1,903	7,948	23.63%	29.00%	23.94%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

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

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

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

NO

2—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

Response

None

2—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 3A: PARTICIPATION FOR CHILDREN WITH IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

3A—Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source:

SY 2022–23 Assessment Data Groups—Reading (ED*Facts* file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	13,670	11,841	11,222
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	9,260	7,813	7,226
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2,816	1,964	1,310
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	783	680	728

Data Source: SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (ED*Facts* file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	13,671	11,841	11,217
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	7,453	4,802	5,129
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	4,587	4,880	3,180
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	786	680	734

- (1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.
- (2) The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row (a) for all the prefilled data in this indicator.
- (3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs participating	Number of children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	12,859	13,670	92.03%	95.00%	94.07%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	10,457	11,841	87.44%	95.00%	88.31%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	9,264	11,222	79.58%	95.00%	82.55%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs participating	Number of children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	12,826	13,671	91.70%	95.00%	93.82%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	10,362	11,841	87.01%	95.00%	87.51%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs participating	Number of children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	9,043	11,217	77.66%	95.00%	80.62%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

None

3A—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A—OSEP Response

None

3A—Required Actions

None

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

See [Indicator 3A Results Indicator](#) above on page 29.

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B—Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

School Year (SY) 2022–23 Assessment Data Groups—Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	12,076	9,777	8,536
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,491	1,314	1,673
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	368	144	207

Data Source: SY 2022–23 Assessment Data Groups—Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date: 01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	12,040	9,682	8,309
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,465	701	425
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	400	106	57

(1) The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,859	12,076	22.80%	63.70%	23.68%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,458	9,777	13.77%	63.70%	14.91%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,880	8,536	24.43%	63.70%	22.02%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Washington state had an overall 1.3% decrease in high school proficient rate for all students from 2021-2022 (62.2%) to 2022-2023 (60.9%). It is the hypothesis that this is due in part to the disrupted instruction as a result of the COVID-19 school closures and impacts. It is not surprising

that students with disabilities, who have higher learning needs, continued to experience an outsized impact (2.41% decrease) as a result of disrupted instruction. OSPI will continue to examine the assessment data for potential causal factors and implement actions to improve proficiency on state assessments for students with disabilities through inclusionary practices and instructional leadership.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	2,865	12,040	21.53%	62.10%	23.80%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	807	9,682	7.08%	62.10%	8.34%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	482	8,309	5.30%	62.10%	5.80%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

3B—Prior FFY Required Actions

3B—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response

3B—Required Actions

None

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

See [Indicator 3A Results Indicator](#) above on page 29.

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C—Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source: School Year (SY) 2022–23 Assessment Data Groups—Reading (ED*Facts* file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date: 01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	783	680	728
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	264	252	304

Data Source: School Year (SY) 2022–23 Assessment Data Groups —Math (ED*Facts* file spec FS185; Data Group: 583)

Date: 01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	786	680	734

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	295	233	418

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards	Number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	264	783	39.23%	63.70%	33.72%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	252	680	40.64%	63.70%	37.06%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	304	728	37.77%	63.70%	41.76%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

There are several potential, general reasons for the slippage which include:

1. Across the areas of Grade 4 Reading and Math, and Grade 8 Reading and Math, our data in each area indicate an increased use of the Less Complex Access Point, which will produce a lower overall score due to weighting. Based on teacher predicted achievement levels, our data shows strong correlation between teacher predicted achievement and actual achievement. This suggests that students are being administered the correct access point and this is likely an accurate reflection of the student's skills during this test administration.
2. Additionally, Washington state data indicates an increase in students who "Do Not Alert to Others" (0.3% increase from the previous year) and "Alerts to Others" (0.7% increase from the previous year), while data is not available by grade level, this increase may have contributed to a decrease in overall achievement levels.
3. Additionally, data indicates there was an .08% increase in students who communicate primarily through cries, facial expressions, change in muscle tone- but no clear use of objects/textures, gestures, signs, etc. to communicate. While this data is not broken down by grade level, this increase may have contributed to a decrease in overall achievement levels.
4. Data also indicates that in SY 22-23 there was an increase in students who have uncertain

response to stimuli (0.8% increase from the previous year) or who are at an alert level (0.3% increase from the previous year).

Additionally, specific to the slippage of group A, a review of the raw scores data from grade 4 ELA indicates an increase in 0 items correct across the intermediate and more access points of all strands. This may point to teachers not choosing the appropriate access points, a lack of access to academic instruction related to those standards, or this could be an accurate reflection of the student's skills during this test administration.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

See information provided in Group A.

Additionally, specific to the slippage of group B, a review of the raw scores data from grade 8 ELA indicates an increase in 0 items correct across most access points of all strands. This may point to teachers not choosing the appropriate access points, a lack of access to academic instruction related to those standards, or this could be an accurate reflection of the student's skills during this test administration.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards	Number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	295	786	42.20%	62.10%	37.53%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	233	680	35.88%	62.10%	34.26%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	418	734	51.96%	62.10%	56.95%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

There are several potential, general reasons for the slippage which include:

1. Across the areas of Grade 4 Reading and Math, and Grade 8 Reading and Math, our data in each area indicate an increased use of the Less Complex Access Point, which will produce a

lower overall score due to weighting. Based on teacher predicted achievement levels, our data shows strong correlation between teacher predicted achievement and actual achievement. This suggests that students are being administered the correct access point and this is likely an accurate reflection of the student's skills during this test administration.

2. Additionally, Washington state data indicates an increase in students who "Do Not Alert to Others" (0.3% increase from the previous year) and "Alerts to Others" (0.7% increase from the previous year), while data is not available by grade level, this increase may have contributed to a decrease in overall achievement levels.
3. Additionally, data indicates there was an .08% increase in students who communicate primarily through cries, facial expressions, change in muscle tone- but no clear use of objects/textures, gestures, signs, etc. to communicate. While this data is not broken down by grade level, this increase may have contributed to a decrease in overall achievement levels.
4. Data also indicates that in SY 22-23 there was an increase in students who have uncertain response to stimuli (0.8% increase from the previous year) or who are at an alert level (0.3% increase from the previous year).

Additionally related to specifically group A, a review of the raw scores data from grade 4 Math indicates an increase in 0 items correct across most access points. This may point to teachers not choosing the appropriate access points, a lack of access to academic instruction related to those standards, or this could be an accurate reflection of the student's skills during this test administration.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

See information provided in Group A.

Additionally, related specifically to group B, a review of the raw scores data from grade 8 Math indicates an increase in 0 items correct across most access points. This may point to teachers not choosing the appropriate access points, a lack of access to academic instruction related to those standards, or this could be an accurate reflection of the student's skills during this test administration.

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

3C—Prior FFY Required Actions

3C—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response

3C—Required Actions

None

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

See [Indicator 3A Results Indicator](#) above on page 29.

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D—Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source: School Year (SY) 2022–23 Assessment Data Groups—Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date: 01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	77,490	77,978	77,500
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	12,076	9,777	8,536
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	38,406	39,827	50,836
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	479	237	266
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,491	1,314	1,673

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	368	144	207

(1) The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

Data Source: SY 2022–23 Assessment Data Groups—Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 583)

Date: 01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	77,520	77,634	76,361
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	12,040	9,682	8,309
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	37,818	26,556	25,353
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	499	160	84
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,465	701	425
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	400	106	57

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	23.68%	50.18%	27.88	20.90	26.51	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	14.91%	51.38%	38.60	32.70	36.47	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Group	Group name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS	22.02%	65.94%	44.97	36.70	43.91	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	23.80%	49.43%	25.75	21.10	25.63	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	8.34%	34.41%	27.31	27.60	26.08	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5.80%	33.31%	29.71	26.70	27.51	Did not meet target	No Slippage

3D—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response

None

3D—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 4A: SUSPENSION/EXPULSION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the

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

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of

noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2019	3.41%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	2.50%	2.50%	2.25%	3.16%	2.91%
Data	0.72%	1.79%	3.19%	0.71%	0.00%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

4

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the state's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
6	283	0.00%	2.66%	2.12%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

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

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

1. Calculate each district's rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for students with IEPs (total number of students with IEPs who were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days

in the district divided by the total number of students with IEPs in the district). This process will result in each district's rate of suspensions/expulsions for students with IEPs.

2. Calculate each district's rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for students without IEPs (total number of students without IEPs who were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in the district divided by the total number of students without IEPs in the district). This process will result in each district's rate of suspensions/expulsions for students without IEPs.
3. Subtract the district rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for all students without IEPs from the district rate of suspension/expulsions for students with IEPs. The result is the rate difference.
4. Districts with a rate difference of 2.0 or greater are identified as having a significant discrepancy.
5. Districts must have a minimum cell size of at least two students with out-of-school disciplinary incidents of more than 10 days, and a minimum "n" size of 10 total students with IEPs is required in order to be considered for significant discrepancy.
6. Four districts were excluded from the FFY 2022 calculation as a result of not meeting these minimum cell and "n" size requirements.

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021–2022 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", six districts had a rate difference over 2.0 and were therefore identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2022 (using school year 2021-22 data).

For all six 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 in FFY 2022, OSPI reviewed and, if appropriate, required the affected district to revise the policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS), and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

All six districts were required to complete a self-review of discipline, and other related policies, procedures, and practices, as part of a disproportionality self-assessment (Disproportionality

Workbook). In the self-assessment, the districts were required to report on their review of policies, procedures, and practices; identify potential root causes for the significant discrepancy; and describe their plan for addressing the discrepancy in the upcoming school year. If revisions were made to the district's policies, procedures, or practices as a result of this review, the district was required to describe those revisions in the self-review. Revisions to formal, written special education policies and procedures were also required to be submitted for OSPI review.

Data collections conducted through the general supervisory system were analyzed to verify district-reported results. The state also selected a sampling of student records from the discrepant cells as part of WISM systems analysis reviews in designated districts. The state did not identify any noncompliance with IDEA Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 C.F.R. §300.170(b).

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

4A—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A—OSEP Response

None

4A—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 4B: SUSPENSION/EXPULSION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Compliance Indicator

Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include state's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B—Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2019	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

8

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the state's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	
32	0	279	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

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

1. Calculate each district’s rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for students with IEPs for each race/ethnicity group (total number of students with IEPs from that race/ethnicity group who were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in the district divided by the total number of students with IEPs from that race/ethnicity group in the district). This process will result in each district’s rate of suspensions/expulsions for students with IEPs for each race/ethnicity group.
2. Calculate each district’s rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for students without IEPs (total number of students without IEPs who were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days in the district divided by the total number of students without IEPs in the district). This process will result in each district’s rate of suspensions/expulsions for students without IEPs.
3. Subtract the district rate of suspension/expulsion for greater than 10 days for all students without IEPs from the district rate of suspension/expulsions for students with IEPs for each race/ethnicity group. The result is the rate difference.
4. Districts with a rate difference of 2.0 or greater for any race/ethnicity group are identified as having a significant discrepancy.
5. Districts must have a minimum cell size of at least two students with out-of-school disciplinary incidents of more than 10 days, and a minimum "n" size of 10 total students with IEPs is required in order to be considered for significant discrepancy.
6. Eight districts were excluded from the FFY 2022 calculation as a result of not meeting these minimum cell and "n" size requirements.

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

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

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021–2022 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", 32 districts had a rate difference over 2.0 and were therefore identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2022 (using school year 2021-22 data).

All 32 districts were required to complete a self-review of discipline, and other related policies, procedures, and practices, as part of a disproportionality self-assessment (Disproportionality Workbook). In the self-assessment, the districts were required to report on their review of policies procedures, and practices; identify potential root causes for the significant discrepancy; and describe their plan for addressing the discrepancy in the upcoming school year. If revisions were made to the district's policies, procedures, or practices as a result of this review, the district was required to describe those revisions in the self-review. Revisions to formal, written special education policies and procedures were also required to be submitted for OSPI review.

Data collections conducted through the general supervisory system were analyzed to verify district-reported results. The state also selected a sampling of student records from the discrepant cells as part of WISM systems analysis reviews in designated districts. The state did not identify any noncompliance with IDEA Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 C.F.R. §300.170(b).

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

4B—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B—OSEP Response

None

4B—Required Actions

None

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

5—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	52.35%	55.00%	57.00%	60.00%	61.70%
A	59.99%	Data	56.01%	56.63%	57.73%	59.99%	59.99%
B	2020	Target <=	13.06%	12.96%	12.75%	12.20%	12.13%
B	12.15%	Data	13.13%	12.83%	12.43%	12.15%	12.15%
C	2020	Target <=	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
C	0.98%	Data	0.86%	0.89%	0.95%	0.98%	0.98%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	141,130
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	89,493
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16,034
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	975
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	185
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	166

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

NO

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2020 data	FFY 2021 target	FFY 2021 data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	89,493	141,130	62.37%	63.40%	63.41%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16,034	141,130	11.65%	12.06%	11.36%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.	1,326	141,130	0.96%	0.99%	0.94%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

5—Prior Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) Required Actions

5—OSEP Response

5—Required Actions

INDICATOR 6: PRESCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

6—Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data—6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	29.05%	29.20%	29.20%	21.04%	23.24%
A	Data	23.80%	25.29%	26.39%	21.04%	25.71%
B	Target <=	38.00%	37.80%	37.80%	53.50%	51.40%
B	Data	41.85%	40.71%	39.03%	53.50%	49.41%
C	Target <=				1.00%	0.90%
C	Data				0.53%	0.59%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

Part	Baseline year (FFY)	Baseline data
A	2020	21.04%

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

Inclusive Targets—6A, 6B

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

Inclusive Targets—6C

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

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5—Total
Total number of children with IEPs	4,068	5,581	1,170	10,819
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	1,083	1,891	390	3,364
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,872	2,069	413	4,354
b2. Number of children attending separate school	139	158	26	323
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	2	3	0	5
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	22	22	5	49

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

NO

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data—Aged Three through Five

Preschool environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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	3,364	10,819	25.71%	25.44%	31.09%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	4,682	10,819	49.41%	49.30%	43.28%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	49	10,819	0.59%	0.80%	0.45%	Met target	No Slippage

6—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response

None

6—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 7: PRESCHOOL OUTCOMES

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

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

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

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

Data Source

State-selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

7—Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2020	Target >=	83.50%	83.60%	83.70%	87.00%	87.40%
A1	87.01%	Data	90.79%	91.00%	89.59%	87.01%	87.29%
A2	2020	Target >=	51.00%	51.20%	51.20%	38.10%	39.30%
A2	38.14%	Data	47.12%	47.89%	44.43%	38.14%	40.69%
B1	2020	Target >=	82.50%	82.60%	82.70%	86.00%	86.50%
B1	86.01%	Data	88.46%	88.97%	88.77%	86.01%	86.71%
B2	2020	Target >=	52.00%	52.20%	52.20%	37.56%	38.80%
B2	37.56%	Data	48.26%	48.74%	44.77%	37.56%	38.39%
C1	2020	Target >=	81.50%	81.60%	81.70%	86.65%	87.10%
C1	86.65%	Data	89.61%	89.50%	88.91%	86.65%	86.81%
C2	2020	Target >=	66.00%	66.20%	66.20%	48.06%	49.30%
C2	48.06%	Data	61.72%	60.43%	54.74%	48.06%	48.92%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2022 State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR) Data

Number of preschool children aged three through five with IEPs assessed

5,157

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

Outcome A progress category	Number of children	Percentage of children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	110	2.13%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	646	12.53%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,449	47.49%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,438	27.88%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	514	9.97%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$</i>	3,887	4,643	87.29%	87.90%	83.72%	Did not meet target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$</i>	1,952	5,157	40.69%	40.40%	37.85%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome B progress category	Number of children	Percentage of children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	106	2.06%

Outcome B progress category	Number of children	Percentage of children
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	668	12.95%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,408	46.69%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,538	29.82%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	437	8.47%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	3,946	4,720	86.71%	87.00%	83.60%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,975	5,157	38.39%	40.10%	38.30%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C progress category	Number of children	Percentage of children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	111	2.15%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	660	12.80%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,018	39.13%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,650	32.00%

Outcome C progress category	Number of children	Percentage of children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	718	13.92%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$</i>	3,668	4,439	86.81%	87.50%	82.63%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$</i>	2,368	5,157	48.92%	50.40%	45.92%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	<p>Given the significant slippage in all three areas of the Child Outcome Summary (COS) report relating to the number of children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited program, a comprehensive review of data and stakeholder feedback has attributed the findings to the following key factors.</p> <p>a. Stakeholders continue to investigate the potential correlation between lack of access to an inclusive environment (as reported in Indicator 6B) and delivery method of specially designed instruction (pull out vs. push in) to provide individualized instruction intended to support and improve functioning at the level comparable to same-aged peers.</p> <p>b. The expansion of Transition to Kindergarten (TK) may also be a factor, as children are offered exit ratings upon exit from a PreK program, and in most cases for before their 6th birthday. For the 2022 school year, it was reported that 10,822 children placed in PreK programs were found eligible for IDEA, Part B. This is an increase of 1,257 children enrolled in preschool placements from the previous school year. Additionally, 179 children with disabilities, ages 4 and 5 years were placed in a Transition to Kindergarten (TK), a general education placement option.</p> <p>c. District staff continue to report significant social emotional incidents (physical aggression, running away, unsafe behaviors) of children enrolled in PreK programs, which correlated to young</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	children and family's inability to assess structured learning environments during the COVID pandemic. Families' inability to access structured high-quality learning environments and data slippage were further compounded by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff attrition within early childhood settings (state and federal preschool programs, child care, developmental PreK programs, TK, and traditional kindergarten settings), impacting districts ability to open and sustain inclusive classrooms, and • Failure to recruit new staff resulted in late hires, missed the training windows, and potential incomplete assessment of all children entering and exiting PreK programs.
A2	See explanation for slippage in text box for A1.
B1	See explanation for slippage in text box for A1.
C1	See explanation for slippage in text box for A1.
C2	See explanation for slippage in text box for A1.

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

YES

Sampling question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

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

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

Beginning with the 2020–21 school year Washington added all the elements of the COS to the statewide student information system. Any student with an IEP in grade level preschool (PreK) was

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

7—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

Response

None

7—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 8: PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

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

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

Data Source

State-selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

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

8—Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2011	21.10%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	22.10%	22.30%	22.50%	33.10%	33.80%
Data	28.03%	30.27%	32.34%	41.99%	30.16%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
688	2,443	30.16%	34.60%	28.16%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

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

First, there was a difference in the racial/ethnic composition of the families surveyed in FFY 2022 compared to FFY 2021. Specifically, parents of Hispanic students made up 18.63% of the total surveyed population in FFY 2021 but represented 33.81% of the surveyed population in FFY 2022. Washington currently offers an online survey tool, but it is only available in English. While the paper/pencil survey is available in the 12 most commonly spoken languages in Washington, the absence of similar options in the online survey likely affected the representativeness of the survey results for Hispanic families (as explained later in this indicator), which, in turn, may have influenced the survey results.

Additionally, an analysis of data from FFY 2019 through FFY 2022 regarding the state's performance on Indicator B-8 indicates a consistent trend. This trend aligns with anecdotal information shared among educational partners and reflects a shift that has occurred since 2019-20 and 2020-21 regarding family expectations. As communities adapted to the ongoing impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and its transition to endemic conditions, expectations from families and community members regarding the provision of services, including compensatory education (or recovery services), have increased. In other words, public perception has shifted from a sense of collective responsibility to a belief that additional delays and shortages are disproportionately affecting students with disabilities. This shift may have influenced the results of the parent surveys for both FFY 2021 and 2022.

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

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

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

17,236

Percentage of respondent parents

14.17%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response rate	12.75%	14.17%

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

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

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The data for all cohort districts were reviewed and disaggregated by geographical location (regional review by ESD) and district size. Other factors considered during the analysis included a review of the response rates, the degree of representativeness of the survey respondents (by race/ethnicity, grade level, least restrictive environment (LRE) placement, disability category, and survey type), and the potential of non-response bias.

The analyses for the FFY 2022 survey data suggest that the results of the survey are statistically underrepresented for one race/ethnicity group (parents of students with IEPs identified as Hispanic/Latinx, -9.62%), one disability category (students eligible under the category of Specific Learning Disability, -10.18%), and one least restrictive environment (LRE) category (students spending 40-79% of the day in the general education setting -3.33%). The results were determined to be over-representative of parents of students identified as White/Caucasian (+7.09%), students eligible under the disability category of Autism (+6.05%), and students spending less than 40% of the day in the general education setting (+3.27%). The results were found to be representative across all of the other disability categories, race/ethnicity groups, and LRE codes, as well as across all grade levels.

The demographics of the children for whom parents are responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

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

During the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years, OSPI collaborated with stakeholders, including the State Design Team's (SDT) Parent Engagement Focus Group, to analyze data and strategize methods to improve overall response rates and the representativeness of respondents. Implemented strategies include offering the survey in the 12 most commonly spoken languages in Washington, piloting an online version of the survey tool in English (in addition to the paper version), sending additional follow-up reminders to parents, coordinating with local school districts to notify parents in advance about the survey, and gathering feedback from parents who have completed the survey.

During the 2021-22 school year, Washington convened a Parent Engagement Focus Group, part of the State Design Team (SDT), which worked on developing a new parent survey tool. This group included diverse participants and aimed to increase response rates, especially among underrepresented groups.

Considerations for the new tool included discussions on methods for increasing response rate, such as reducing survey questions, ensuring clarity, offering it in more languages, using incentives, and improving accessibility.

The Parent Engagement Group's work led to a condensed set of survey questions, discussed with the state's Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) in May 2022, and finalized by the end of the 2021-22 school year.

In the 2022-23 school year, OSPI collaborated with the TAESE center to plan the implementation process based on the group's recommendations. This involved reviewing other state's processes and issuing a request for proposals to partner with a vendor. The full implementation of the new parent survey tool and process is expected in the 2024-25 school year. The state believes that this comprehensive process, including expanding languages and methods for accessing the survey, will increase the representativeness of the parent survey results moving forward.

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

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

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

underrepresented groups.

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

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

During the 2022-23 school year, OSPI worked with the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) center to discuss and determine the process for implementing the new parent survey, using the recommendations provided by the Parent Engagement Focus Group. This work involved the review of other state's processes, including strategies for increasing response rate and representativeness. This work resulted in a request for proposals that has been issued by the state to partner with a vendor to develop the process for implementing the new tool and the recommendations from the SDT and TAESE. OSPI anticipates the new parent survey tool and process, the culmination of this work, will be fully implemented during the 2024-25 school year.

The state believes that this comprehensive process, including expanding languages and methods for accessing and submitting the survey, will increase the parent survey response rate moving forward, including for parents of students identified as Hispanic, students eligible as having a specific learning disability, and students placed in general education settings 40-79% of the school day.

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

The data for all cohort districts were reviewed and disaggregated by geographical location (regional review by ESD) and district size. Other factors considered during the analysis included a review of the response rates, the degree of representativeness of the survey respondents (by race/ethnicity, grade level, least restrictive environment (LRE) placement, disability category, and survey type), and the potential of non-response bias. The review considered the results to be statistically representative of the target population if the response rate was +/- 3.0% of the target population for each characteristic.

With regard to race/ethnicity, the analyses for the FFY 2022 survey data suggest that the results of the survey are statistically underrepresented for parents of students with IEPs identified as Hispanic/Latinx (-9.62%), and overrepresented for parents of students identified as White/Caucasian (+7.09%). When examining the survey results for these two groups, it was noted that 32.0% of the surveys from Hispanic parents reported the school made efforts to partner with them, which is higher than the aggregate survey results for the state (28.2%). Conversely, 26.1% of surveys from White parents met the survey standard, which is lower than the state's overall results (28.2%). Therefore, it can be hypothesized that if the demographics of the survey respondents had been representative for parents of students identified as Hispanic (i.e., if parents of Hispanic

students were not under-represented), the overall state results for this indicator would have been higher.

With regard to disability categories, the analyses for the FFY 2022 survey data suggest that the results of the survey are statistically underrepresented for parents of students with IEPs identified under the category of SLD (-10.2%), and overrepresented for parents of students identified under the category of Autism (+6.0%). When examining the survey results for these two groups, it was noted that 27.3% of the surveys from parents of students with SLD reported the school made efforts to partner with them, which is slightly lower than the aggregate survey results for the state (28.2%). For parents of students with Autism, 28.0% of surveys met the survey standard, which is comparable to the state's overall results (28.2%). Based on these analyses, it appears that if the demographics of the survey respondents had been representative for parents of students identified with SLD and Autism, the overall state results for this indicator would not have been significantly impacted.

With regard to placement categories, the analyses for the FFY 2022 survey data suggest that the results of the survey are slightly underrepresented for parents of students with IEPs placed in general education 40-79% of the school day (LRE 2, -3.3%), and slightly overrepresented for parents of students with IEPs placed in general education less than 40% of the school day (LRE 3, +3.3%). When examining the survey results for these two groups, it was noted that 25.9% of the surveys from parents of students placed in LRE 2 reported the school made efforts to partner with them, which is lower than the aggregate survey results for the state (28.2%). For parents of students placed in LRE 3, 29.9% of surveys met the survey standard, which is higher than the state's overall results (28.2%). Based on these analyses, it appears that if the demographics of the survey respondents had been representative for parents of students placed in LRE 2 and 3, the overall state results for this indicator would have been slightly lower.

The state continues to conduct analyses to determine strategies for statewide technical assistance and guidance to help ensure progress and movement toward the targets for this indicator, as well as to reduce identified non-response biases and increase responses from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities. As described previously under this indicator, the racial/ethnic demographics of the families surveyed in FFY 2022 differed from those surveyed in FFY 2021. Specifically, parents of students identified as Hispanic represented 18.63% of the total population surveyed in FFY 2021, but represented 33.81% of those surveyed in FFY 2022. Washington currently offers an online version of the survey tool, but it is only available in English. While the paper/pencil survey is available in the 12 most commonly spoken languages in Washington, the lack of similar options in the online survey likely had an impact on the under-representation of the survey results for families of students identified as Hispanic. The new survey process to be implemented in 2024-25 will include online versions of the tool in multiple languages, as well as other strategies for increasing response rates and representativeness of the responders.

As previously described, Washington worked with the Parent Engagement Focus Group in 2021-22, and the TAESE center in 2022-23, to improve both the parent survey tool and the process for implementing the parent surveys. This work continues to include the analyzing of survey data and identifying methods for increasing response rates, particularly for underrepresented groups.

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

Sampling question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

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

8—Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

8—OSEP Response

As described previously in this indicator, the aggregate data were reviewed and analyzed, including a review of the response rates, the degree of representativeness of the survey respondents (by race/ethnicity, grade level, placement, disability category, and survey type), and the potential of non-response bias.

The analyses for the FFY 2022 survey data suggest that the results of the survey are statistically underrepresented for one race/ethnicity group (parents of students with IEPs identified as Hispanic/Latinx, -9.62%), one disability category (students eligible under the category of Specific Learning Disability, -10.18%), and one least restrictive environment (LRE) category (students spending 40-79% of the day in the general education setting -3.33%). The results were determined to be over-representative of parents of students identified as White/Caucasian (+7.09%), students eligible under the disability category of Autism (+6.05%), and students spending less than 40% of the day in the general education setting (+3.27%). The results were found to be representative across all of the other disability categories, race/ethnicity groups, and LRE codes, as well as across all grade levels.

Current strategies for increasing representativeness of the survey respondents include: providing the survey in the 12 most commonly spoken languages in Washington, piloting of an online version of the English survey tool (in addition to the paper copy), additional follow-up reminders to

parents to complete the survey, working with the local school district to provide advance notice to parents that the survey is coming, and collection of feedback from parents who have completed the survey.

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

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

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

During the 2022-23 school year, OSPI worked with the TAESE center to discuss and determine the process for implementing the new parent survey, using the recommendations provided by the Parent Engagement Focus Group. This work involved the review of other state's processes, including strategies for increasing response rate and representativeness. This work resulted in a request for proposals that has been issued by the state to partner with a vendor to develop the process for implementing the new tool and the recommendations from the SDT and TAESE. OSPI anticipates the new parent survey tool and process, the culmination of this work, will be fully implemented during the 2024-25 school year.

The state believes that this comprehensive process, including expanding languages and methods for accessing and submitting the survey, will increase the response rate, as well as the representativeness, of the parent survey results moving forward.

None

8—Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

INDICATOR 9: DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Disproportionality.

Compliance Indicator

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9—Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

13

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the state's minimum “n” and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
8	0	273	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

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

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

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

Using the criteria established above, the state determined that eight districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation under Indicator B-9. The state analyzed the eight districts identified through the FFY 2022 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-assessment (Disproportionality Workbook). As part of the self-assessment, districts were required to conduct a self-review their policies, procedures, and practices related to child find, referral, evaluation, and eligibility. The self-assessment also required an analysis of potential causal factors for the identified disproportionality and a description of the district's plan to address the disproportionality in the upcoming school year.

The state examined the results of each district's self-assessment, including the results of the district's self-review of child find, referral, evaluation, and eligibility policies, procedures, and practices, and also reviewed each district's written special education policies and procedures. The state provided feedback and technical assistance to districts and asked for further clarification as needed in this review. Data collections conducted through the state's general supervisory system were also analyzed to verify district-reported results. The state also completed a comprehensive student record review within the disproportionate cells across designated districts.

Following this process, the state determined that all eight identified districts were in compliance with child find, eligibility, and evaluation requirements, and that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education within these districts was not the result of inappropriate identification.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

9—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9—OSEP Response

None

9—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 10: DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION IN SPECIFIC DISABILITY CATEGORIES

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Disproportionality.

Compliance Indicator

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10—Indicator Data

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

26

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the state’s minimum “n” and/or cell size	FFY 2021 data	FFY 2022 target	FFY 2022 data	Status	Slippage
57	0	260	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

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

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

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

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

Using the criteria established above, the state determined that 57 districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation under Indicator B-10. The state analyzed the eight districts identified through the FFY 2022 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-assessment (Disproportionality Workbook). As part of the self-assessment, districts were required to conduct a self-review their policies, procedures, and practices related to child find, referral, evaluation, and eligibility. The self-assessment also required an analysis of potential causal factors for the identified disproportionality and a description of the district's plan to address it in the upcoming school year.

The state examined the results of each district's self-assessment, including the results of the district's self-review of child find, referral, evaluation, and eligibility policies, procedures, and practices, and also reviewed each district's written special education policies and procedures. The state provided feedback and technical assistance to districts and asked for further clarification as needed in this review. Data collections conducted through the state's general supervisory system were also analyzed to verify district-reported results. The state also completed a comprehensive student record review within the disproportionate cells across designated districts.

Following this process, the state determined that all of the 57 identified districts were in compliance with child find, eligibility, and evaluation requirements, and that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education within these districts was not the result of inappropriate identification.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

10—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10—OSEP Response

None

10—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 11: CHILD FIND

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find.

Compliance Indicator

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2005	98.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.30%	99.36%	99.37%	99.72%	98.94%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
32,675	32,323	98.94%	100%	98.92%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

352

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

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

For those 352 children whose evaluations were not completed on time or under federal exception:

- 58.52% (206) were late due to district scheduling and/or staffing issues with no agreement to extend;
- 20.7% (73) agreement to extend did not meet requirements;
- 9.94% (35) were due to data/tracking errors;
- 5.97% (21) were late due to other issues not specified by the district;
- 3.98% (14) parent or child unavailable; and
- 0.85% (3) Delays due to additional testing or evaluation.

Regarding the range of days for the 352 students reported above, a total of 64.8% (228) were delayed 15 school days or less and 35.2% (124) were delayed more than 15 school days.

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

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

When the student is to be evaluated to determine eligibility for special education services and the educational needs of the student, the school district shall provide prior written notice to the parent, obtain consent, fully evaluate the student, and arrive at a decision regarding eligibility within:

- (a) Thirty-five school days after the date written consent for an evaluation has been provided to the school district by the parent; or
- (b) Thirty-five school days after the date the consent of the parent is obtained by agreement through mediation, or the refusal to provide consent is overridden by an administrative law judge following a due process hearing; or
- (c) Such other time period as may be agreed to by the parent and documented by the school district, including specifying the reasons for extending the timeline.
- (d) Exception. The thirty-five-school-day time frame for evaluation does not apply if:
 - (i) The parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or
 - (ii) A student enrolls in another school district after the consent is obtained and the evaluation has begun but not yet been completed by the other school district, including a determination of eligibility.
- (e) The exception in (d)(ii) of this subsection applies only if the subsequent school district is making sufficient progress to ensure a prompt completion of the evaluation, and the parent

and subsequent school district agree to a specific time when the evaluation will be completed.

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of noncompliance identified	Findings of noncompliance verified as corrected within one year	Findings of noncompliance subsequently corrected	Findings not yet verified as corrected
76	76	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OSPI issued a written notification of non-compliance in September 2022 to 76 districts that were determined to not meet the IDEA implementation requirements for Indicator B-11 (i.e., all districts that were not at 100% for this indicator) for the 2021-22 school year per the Indicator B-11 report submitted by districts on July 15, 2022.

Districts identified with non-compliance under Indicator B-11 conducted a root cause analysis to identify the cause(s) for the non-compliance, which included a review of policies, procedures, and/or practices that contributed to the noncompliance. Actions were taken by each district to address the specific, identified root cause(s) and were reported to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) through the IDEA Compliance Package (an iGrants application, due from districts as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2023). Actions taken by districts were specific to the identified root cause(s) and included activities such as:

- a. providing professional development to district staff, including individuals responsible for data reporting, related to the timelines for initial evaluations and allowable exceptions;
- b. providing written guidance to staff related to the timelines and allowable exceptions;
- c. updating the district’s procedures manual/standard operating procedures;
- d. implementing a new district practice or form to timely document an agreement to extend the evaluation timeline;
- e. e. implementing additional internal controls (i.e., supervision and oversight) to ensure the accuracy of data reporting for Indicator B-11 prior to submission of the data to OSPI; etc.

In order to verify that the districts corrected the identified non-compliance with the specific

regulatory requirement(s) (systemic compliance) related to C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1), verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the district's regional Educational Service District (ESD), in partnership with OSPI. Verification activities included, but were not limited to, on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and observations. The verification also included a review of documentation, including updated data reports for the 2022-23 school year showing evidence of timely initial evaluations; student records; information from the district's student information system; guidance documents provided to staff; professional development materials and attendee rosters; updated/ revised policies, procedures, and practices manuals; staff meeting agendas; and more.

A detailed description of the identified root cause(s), the specific actions taken to correct the systemic non-compliance, and the documentation and activities completed to verify the systemic correction, were submitted by district's and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 1, 2023). OSPI staff reviewed the IDEA Compliance Package and worked with the ESD representative if any additional documentation, information, or evidence was needed to validate the correction of the identified non-compliance. The results of these validations showed 100% compliance; all 76 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1).

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

The identified districts corrected and accounted for each individual, child-specific instance of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. Special education representatives from the district's regional ESD, in partnership with OSPI, verified that the 76 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations.

The verification also included a review of documentation, including student records, information from the district's student information system, guidance documents provided to staff, professional development materials and attendee rosters, updated procedures manuals, staff meeting agendas, and more.

A detailed description of the identified root cause(s) for each individual, child-specific case of non-compliance, the specific actions taken to correct the child-specific non-compliance, and the documentation and activities completed to verify the corrections, were submitted by districts and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package. OSPI staff reviewed the IDEA Compliance Package and worked with the ESD representative to obtain any supplementary documentation, information, or evidence necessary to validate the correction of identified child-specific non-compliance instances.

The outcomes of these verifications demonstrated that all 76 districts successfully completed the initial evaluation, albeit late with delays, for every student for whom the initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child was no longer under the district's jurisdiction. OSPI also confirmed that there were no existing, outstanding corrective actions under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child through review of due process actions submitted as part of the IDEA Compliance Package and consultation with the OSPI special education complaint investigators.

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2021 for Indicator B-11 was corrected within one year of identification.

11—Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

As described previously in this indicator, OSPI issued a written notification of non-compliance in September 2022 to 76 districts that were determined to not meet the IDEA implementation requirements for Indicator B-11 (i.e., all districts that were not at 100% for this indicator) for the 2021-22 school year per the Indicator B-11 report submitted by districts on July 15, 2022.

In order to verify that the districts corrected the identified non-compliance with the specific regulatory requirement(s) (systemic compliance) related to C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1), verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the district's regional Educational Service District (ESD), in partnership with OSPI. Verification activities included, but were not limited to, on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and observations. The verification also included a review of documentation, including updated data reports for the 2022-23 school year showing evidence of timely initial evaluations; student records; information from the district's student information system; guidance documents provided to staff; professional development materials and attendee rosters; updated/ revised policies, procedures, and practices manuals; staff meeting agendas; and more.

A detailed description of the identified root cause(s), the specific actions taken to correct the systemic non-compliance, and the documentation and activities completed to verify the systemic correction, were submitted by district's and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 1, 2023). OSPI staff reviewed the IDEA Compliance Package and worked with the ESD representative if any additional documentation, information, or evidence was needed to validate the correction of the identified non-compliance. The results of these validations showed 100% compliance; all 76 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1).

The identified districts corrected and accounted for each individual; child-specific instance of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. Special education representatives from the district's regional ESD, in partnership with OSPI, verified that the 76 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations.

The verification also included a review of documentation, including student records, information from the district's student information system, guidance documents provided to staff, professional development materials and attendee rosters, updated procedures manuals, staff meeting agendas, and more.

A detailed description of the identified root cause(s) for each individual, child-specific case of non-compliance, the specific actions taken to correct the child-specific non-compliance, and the documentation and activities completed to verify the corrections, were submitted by districts and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package. OSPI staff reviewed the IDEA Compliance Package and worked with the ESD representative to obtain any supplementary documentation, information, or evidence necessary to validate the correction of identified child-specific non-compliance instances.

The outcomes of these verifications demonstrated that all 76 districts successfully completed the initial evaluation, albeit late with delays, for every student for whom the initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child was no longer under the district's jurisdiction. OSPI also confirmed that there were no existing, outstanding corrective actions under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child through review of due process actions submitted as part of the IDEA Compliance Package and consultation with the OSPI special education complaint investigators.

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2021 for Indicator B-11 was corrected within one year of identification.

11—OSEP Response

None

11—Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

INDICATOR 12: EARLY CHILDHOOD TRANSITION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition.

Compliance Indicator

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12—Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2005	83.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.31%	97.53%	97.93%	98.43%	92.41%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in IDEA Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,749
b. Number of those referred determined to be not eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	492

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,828
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 C.F.R. §300.301(d) applied.	106
e. Number of children who were referred to IDEA Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	58
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a state's policy under 34 C.F.R. §303.211 or a similar state option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by IDEA Part C prior to age three who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,828	3,093	92.41%	100%	91.43%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

265

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

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

For those 265 children whose evaluations were not completed on time or under federal exception:

- 61.5% (163) were due to district scheduling or staffing issues;
- 18.1% (48) were because the student was referred late to IDEA Part B;
- 7.9% (21) were due to the family and district agreeing to extend the timeline;
- 7.6% (20) were due to the transition meeting not occurring at least 90 days prior to the student's third birthday; and
- 2.6% (7) were due to data entry or tracking errors; and
- 2.3% (6) were due to issues for which districts did not provide explanations;

Regarding the range of days for the 265 students reported above:

- 26.0% (69) were completed 1–15 calendar days beyond the child's third birthday;
- 18.5% (49) were completed 16–29 calendar days beyond the child's third birthday; and
- 55.5% (147) were completed 30 or more calendar days beyond the child's third birthday.

Further data analysis addressing the reasons for delay and an examination of the range of days by geographic region and district size groupings within each of the nine regions, was completed and

discussed with stakeholders. There were no emerging patterns or trends identified with one exception. In addition to the universal supports provided for the correction of noncompliance to all LEAs not at 100% compliance, targeted and/or intensive technical assistance will be provided to this LEA through the designated regional professional development system.

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

A statewide data collection process was implemented in FFY 2020. All districts continue to report evaluation and eligibility data on all children referred to IDEA Part B for initial eligibility determination but at the student level using the statewide student database. District staff review and verify each student record submitted for the reporting time period. This indicator is then calculated using the student level data verified by district staff to determine the statewide percentage of on-time initial evaluations.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of noncompliance identified	Findings of noncompliance verified as corrected within one year	Findings of noncompliance subsequently corrected	Findings not yet verified as corrected
44	44	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OSPI issued a written notification of non-compliance in September 2022 to 44 districts that were determined to not meet the IDEA implementation requirements for Indicator B-12 (i.e., all districts that were not at 100% for this indicator) for the 2021-22 school year per the Indicator B-12 report submitted by districts on July 15, 2022.

Districts identified with non-compliance under Indicator B-12 conducted a root cause analysis to identify the cause(s) for the non-compliance, which included a review of policies, procedures, and/or practices that contributed to the noncompliance. Actions were taken by each district to address the specific, identified root cause(s) and were reported to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) through the IDEA Compliance Package (an iGrants application, due from districts as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2023). Actions taken by districts were specific to the identified root cause(s) and included activities such as:

- a. partnering with Part C lead agency staff to develop and implement new timelines, procedures, and/or practices for timely notification and transition planning for identified children;
- b. providing professional development to district staff, including individuals responsible for data reporting, related to the timelines for Part C to Part B transition and allowable exceptions;
- c. providing written guidance to staff related to the Part C to Part B transition and allowable exceptions;
- d. updating the district’s procedures manual/standard operating procedures;
- e. implementing a new district practice or form for documenting late Part C to Part B transitions

- and the reason for the late transition;
- f. implementing additional internal controls (i.e., supervision and oversight) to ensure the accuracy of data reporting for Indicator B-12 prior to submission of the data to OSPI; etc.

In order to verify that the districts corrected the identified non-compliance with the specific regulatory requirement(s) (systemic compliance) related to C.F.R. §300.124(b), verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the district's regional Educational Service District (ESD), in partnership with OSPI. Verification activities included, but were not limited to, on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and observations. The verification also included a review of documentation, including updated data reports for the 2022-23 school year showing evidence of timely Part C to Part B transitions; student records including transition planning meetings; information from the district's student information system; guidance documents provided to staff; professional development materials and attendee rosters; updated/revised policies, procedures, and practices manuals; staff meeting agendas; and more.

A detailed description of the identified root cause(s), the specific actions taken to correct the systemic non-compliance, and the documentation and activities completed to verify the systemic correction, were submitted by districts and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 1, 2023). OSPI staff reviewed the IDEA Compliance Package and worked with the ESD representative if any additional documentation, information, or evidence was needed to validate the correction of the identified non-compliance. The results of these validations showed 100% compliance; all 44 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.124(b).

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

The identified districts corrected and accounted for each individual, child-specific instance of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. Special education representatives from the district's regional ESD, in partnership with OSPI, verified that the 44 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations.

The verification also included a review of documentation, including student records, information from the district's student information system, guidance documents provided to staff, professional development materials and attendee rosters, updated procedures manuals, staff meeting agendas, evidence of meetings with the Part C lead agency, and more.

A detailed description of the identified root cause(s) for each individual, child-specific case of non-compliance, the specific actions taken to correct the child-specific non-compliance, and the documentation and activities completed to verify the corrections, were submitted by districts and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package. OSPI staff reviewed the IDEA Compliance Package and worked with the ESD representative to obtain any supplementary documentation, information, or evidence necessary to validate the correction of identified child-specific non-compliance instances.

The outcomes of these verifications demonstrated that all 44 districts successfully completed the transition to Part B, albeit with delays, for every student for whom the transition was not executed promptly, unless the child was no longer under the district's jurisdiction. OSPI also confirmed that there were no existing, outstanding corrective actions under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child through review of due process actions submitted as part of the IDEA Compliance Package and consultation with the OSPI special education complaint investigators.

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2021 for Indicator B-12 was corrected within one year of identification.

12—Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

As previously described under this indicator, OSPI issued a written notification of non-compliance in September 2022 to 44 districts that were determined to not meet the IDEA implementation requirements for Indicator B-12 (i.e., all districts that were not at 100% for this indicator) for the 2021-22 school year per the Indicator B-12 report submitted by districts on July 15, 2022.

In order to verify that the districts corrected the identified non-compliance with the specific regulatory requirement(s) (systemic compliance) related to C.F.R. §300.124(b), verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the district's regional Educational Service District (ESD), in partnership with OSPI. Verification activities included, but were not limited to, on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and observations. The verification also included a review of documentation, including updated data reports for the 2022-23 school year showing evidence of timely Part C to Part B transitions; student records including transition planning meetings; information from the district's student information system; guidance documents provided to staff; professional development materials and attendee rosters; updated/revised policies, procedures, and practices manuals; staff meeting agendas; and more.

A detailed description of the identified root cause(s), the specific actions taken to correct the systemic non-compliance, and the documentation and activities completed to verify the systemic correction, were submitted by districts and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 1, 2023). OSPI staff reviewed

the IDEA Compliance Package and worked with the ESD representative if any additional documentation, information, or evidence was needed to validate the correction of the identified non-compliance. The results of these validations showed 100% compliance; all 44 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.124(b).

The identified districts corrected and accounted for each individual, child-specific instance of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. Special education representatives from the district's regional ESD, in partnership with OSPI, verified that the 44 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations.

The verification also included a review of documentation, including student records, information from the district's student information system, guidance documents provided to staff, professional development materials and attendee rosters, updated procedures manuals, staff meeting agendas, evidence of meetings with the Part C lead agency, and more.

A detailed description of the identified root cause(s) for each individual, child-specific case of non-compliance, the specific actions taken to correct the child-specific non-compliance, and the documentation and activities completed to verify the corrections, were submitted by districts and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package. OSPI staff reviewed the IDEA Compliance Package and worked with the ESD representative to obtain any supplementary documentation, information, or evidence necessary to validate the correction of identified child-specific non-compliance instances.

The outcomes of these verifications demonstrated that all 44 districts successfully completed the transition to Part B, albeit with delays, for every student for whom the transition was not executed promptly, unless the child was no longer under the district's jurisdiction. OSPI also confirmed that there were no existing, outstanding corrective actions under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child through review of due process actions submitted as part of the IDEA Compliance Package and consultation with the OSPI special education complaint investigators.

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2021 for Indicator B-12 was corrected within one year of identification.

12—OSEP Response

None

12—Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR,

the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

INDICATOR 13: SECONDARY TRANSITION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition.

Compliance Indicator

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2009	83.70%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.81%	96.99%	97.47%	99.08%	98.04%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1,397	1,423	98.04%	100%	98.17%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

State monitoring

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

These data are collected from the State’s monitoring activities, which include Systems Analysis on-site visits and off-site desk reviews, and files submitted for Safety Net reimbursement. Regarding selection of districts for Systems Analysis visits and desk reviews, secondary transition risk factors, such as graduation and dropout rates and prior performance on Indicator B-13, as well as the length of time since the last Systems Analysis review assist OSPI in prioritizing districts for review.

During the monitoring review, a comprehensive student file review is conducted which includes IEPs of students turning 16 and above to determine whether the elements described below are appropriately documented in the IEP: Evidence that the measurable post-secondary goal(s) were based on age-appropriate transition assessment(s).

- 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.
- h.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of noncompliance identified	Findings of noncompliance verified as corrected within one year	Findings of noncompliance subsequently corrected	Findings not yet verified as corrected
18	18	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OSPI issued a written notification of non-compliance in September 2022 to 18 districts that were determined to not meet the IDEA implementation requirements for Indicator B-13 (i.e., all districts

that were not at 100% for this indicator) for the 2021-22 school year, as identified through monitoring reviews completed in spring/summer 2022.

Districts identified with non-compliance under Indicator B-13 were required to report on the correction of the non-compliance to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) through the IDEA Compliance Package (an iGrants application, due from districts as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2023).

In order to verify that the districts corrected the identified non-compliance with the specific regulatory requirement(s) (systemic compliance) related to C.F.R. §300.320(b) and 300.321(b), verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the district's regional Educational Service District (ESD), in partnership with OSPI. Verification activities included, but were not limited to, on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, observations, etc. The verification also included a review of updated documentation, including IEPs developed during the 2022-23 school year, showing evidence that the district was correctly implementing the applicable regulatory requirements for secondary transition.

A detailed description of the specific actions taken to correct the non-compliance, and the documentation and activities completed to verify the systemic correction, were submitted by districts and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 1, 2023). OSPI staff reviewed the IDEA Compliance Package and worked with the ESD representative if any additional documentation, information, or evidence was needed to validate the correction of the identified non-compliance. The results of these validations showed 100% compliance; all 18 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.320(b) and 300.321(b).

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

The identified districts corrected and accounted for each individual, child-specific instance of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. Special education representatives from the district's regional ESD, in partnership with OSPI, verified that the 18 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations.

The verification also included a review of documentation, including each student's current IEP and/or IEP amendment, information from the district's student information system, professional development and/or guidance documents provided to staff, etc.

A detailed description of the specific actions taken to correct each individual, child-specific case of non-compliance, and the documentation and activities completed to verify the corrections, were submitted by districts and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package. OSPI staff reviewed the IDEA Compliance Package and worked with the ESD representative to obtain additional documentation, information, or evidence necessary to validate the correction of the identified child-specific non-compliance.

The outcomes of these verifications demonstrated that all 18 districts corrected each individual case of non-compliance, unless the student was no longer under the district's jurisdiction. OSPI also confirmed that there were no existing, outstanding corrective actions under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child through review of due process actions submitted as part of the IDEA Compliance Package and consultation with the OSPI special education complaint investigators.

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2021 for Indicator B-13 was corrected within one year of identification.

13—Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

As previously described under this indicator, OSPI issued a written notification of non-compliance in September 2022 to 18 districts that were determined to not meet the IDEA implementation requirements for Indicator B-13 (i.e., all districts that were not at 100% for this indicator) for the 2021-22 school year, as identified through monitoring reviews completed in spring/summer 2022.

Districts identified with non-compliance under Indicator B-13 were required to report on the correction of the non-compliance to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) through the IDEA Compliance Package (an iGrants application, due from districts as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2023).

In order to verify that the districts corrected the identified non-compliance with the specific regulatory requirement(s) (systemic compliance) related to C.F.R. §300.320(b) and 300.321(b), verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the district's regional Educational Service District (ESD), in partnership with OSPI. Verification activities included, but were not limited to, on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, observations, etc. The verification also included a review of updated documentation, including IEPs developed during the 2022-23 school year, showing evidence that the district was correctly implementing the applicable regulatory requirements for secondary transition.

A detailed description of the specific actions taken to correct the non-compliance, and the documentation and activities completed to verify the systemic correction, were submitted by districts and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 1, 2023). OSPI staff reviewed the IDEA Compliance Package and worked with the ESD representative if any additional documentation, information, or evidence was needed to validate the correction of the identified non-compliance. The results of these validations showed 100% compliance; all 18 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.320(b) and 300.321(b).

The identified districts corrected and accounted for each individual, child-specific instance of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. Special education representatives from the district's regional ESD, in partnership with OSPI, verified that the 18 districts' corrections, as summarized in the IDEA Compliance Package, were made. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, and/or observations.

The verification also included a review of documentation, including each student's current IEP and/or IEP amendment, information from the district's student information system, professional development and/or guidance documents provided to staff, etc.

A detailed description of the specific actions taken to correct each individual, child-specific case of non-compliance, and the documentation and activities completed to verify the corrections, were submitted by districts and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package. OSPI staff reviewed the IDEA Compliance Package and worked with the ESD representative to obtain additional documentation, information, or evidence necessary to validate the correction of the identified child-specific non-compliance.

The outcomes of these verifications demonstrated that all 18 districts corrected each individual case of non-compliance, unless the student was no longer under the district's jurisdiction. OSPI also confirmed that there were no existing, outstanding corrective actions under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child through review of due process actions submitted as part of the IDEA Compliance Package and consultation with the OSPI special education complaint investigators.

All identified noncompliance from FFY 2021 for Indicator B-13 was corrected within one year of identification.

13—OSEP Response

None

13—Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State

data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

INDICATOR 14: POST-SCHOOL OUTCOMES

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition.

Results Indicator

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

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

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

Data Source

State-selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

I. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented. The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

14—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2013	Target >=	26.00%	26.10%	26.20%	19.75%	20.50%
A	23.74%	Data	21.31%	20.45%	19.50%	16.74%	16.87%
B	2013	Target >=	49.75%	49.95%	52.21%	54.00%	55.40%
B	52.11%	Data	56.08%	56.64%	52.95%	43.91%	47.61%
C	2013	Target >=	67.43%	67.53%	70.00%	73.00%	74.00%
C	65.13%	Data	72.19%	74.68%	72.04%	69.93%	74.27%

FFY 2021 Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	8,369
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	6,522
Response rate	77.93%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,135
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2,671
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)	253
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).	693

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2021 data	FFY 2022 target	FFY 2022 data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education.	1,135	6,522	16.87%	21.40%	17.40%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.	3,806	6,522	47.61%	57.40%	58.36%	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.	4,752	6,522	74.27%	75.50%	72.86%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C	<p>The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on K-12 schools, postsecondary education, employment, and the community began in Washington state in March 2020. Schools closed across the state, moving to virtual instruction with various degrees of knowledge and expertise. Businesses, particularly those in the service industry, moved to online services or closed (temporarily or permanently). By the end of the 2020-21 school year, most schools in Washington had returned to in-person instruction, and businesses have been in recovery mode since.</p> <p>Washington's performance under Measurement A of Indicator B14 for FFY 2022 is 17.40%, which is an increase of 0.53 percentage points, or 3.14%, from FFY 2021. Performance under Measurement B of this indicator is 58.36%, an increase of 10.75 percentage points, or 22.58%, from FFY 2021. Under Measurement C, the state performed at 74.27%, which is a decrease of 1.41 percentage points, or 1.90%, from FFY 2021.</p> <p>The state performance of Indicator B14 is based on a 77.93% response rate for FFY 2022, which is a decrease of 0.94 percentage points, or 1.19%, from FFY 2021. Although slippage occurred in the response rate from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022, overall engagement and response rates from the FFY 2022 survey align with data from before the start of the pandemic. It may be that response rates increased during the pandemic because people were spending more time at home and were available to answer the survey calls. As respondents, who are mostly parents, had more fully</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>returned to the workplace by FFY 2022, their availability to respond to the survey calls may have decreased, resulting in slippage.</p> <p>This slippage in response rates could have impacted the slight decrease in engagement rates under Part C of this Indicator. OSPI, in conjunction with Washington's Center for Change in Transition Services, will engage in deeper analyses of the data and potential causal factors if the decrease in engagement rates appears to be a trend based on FFY 2023 data. It may be too soon to speculate on the cause of this small slippage in response rates, but further analysis may provide information for this year's variance. Washington state has met and exceeded the response rate expectations as determined by OSPI over the last nine years. If this continues or looks to be a trend, an analysis by school districts could provide information to design strategies to increase the response rate. Questions to consider would include 1) which school districts have the highest response rate and which have the lowest, 2) what strategies are the districts using to gather survey information from the respondents, 3) are there specific disabilities, regions, or school sizes where the response rate is below the state response rate?</p> <p>We also hear from school districts that it is increasingly challenging to reach people by telephone. We're often asked if there are alternate methods of conducting the survey, such as email or text. While we encourage districts to use these preferred methods of communication to set up a phone call, the expectation is for the survey to be conducted over the phone. CCTS is interested in exploring additional survey options with OSPI if slippage continues in future years.</p>

Please select the reporting option your state is using:

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

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response rate	78.87%	77.93%

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

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

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

After the census was conducted, a Response Calculator from the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) was used to measure the representativeness of the respondent group. Calculations were made on the characteristics of disability type, race/ethnicity, gender, English language proficiency, and exit status to determine whether the leavers who responded to the interviews were similar, or different from, the total population of young adults with an IEP who exited school in 2021-22.

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

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

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

YES

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

As in previous years, post-school outcome data collection shows representativeness in areas of disability, gender, and ethnicity. Based on data collected since FFY 2013, this is the second time data were also representative of students who dropped out. Representativeness among these former students increased by 0.60 percentage points, or 25.42%, from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022 (-2.36% to -1.76%).

The increase in representativeness among students who drop out is due to updates in the TSF2 data collection platform made in FFY 2021 related to deleting leavers from the system. This was the second survey year where TSF2 users must provide a reason for deleting leavers from the system (e.g. student returned to school and is no longer considered a leaver). CCTS reviews the deleted leaver records and follows up with TSF2 users for further information as needed. In FFY 2022, there were 17 leavers who dropped out, were deleted from the TSF2 due to user error, and then added back to the system. If those 17 leaver surveys were permanently deleted, students who dropped out would be underrepresented in the data. This aligns with the data for deleted leaver surveys from FFY 2021. CCTS will continue to review deleted leaver records and ensure that students who drop out of school are not errantly deleted from the TSF2 platform.

In addition to reviewing deleted leaver records, CCTS will continue to provide training and online modules for districts that address the importance of response rates, emphasizing that higher response rates provide more reliable data. These trainings include resources that support districts in obtaining accurate contact information, ensuring that students and families are familiar with the Post-School Survey, and sending out reminders so families can expect contact from their school one year after leaving. CCTS recommends that districts make a minimum of three call attempts, varying the days and times of those attempts. While the survey is open, CCTS also sends targeted emails to districts with response rates below 70%, encouraging them to continue call attempts to increase their response rate. OSPI and CCTS continue to analyze the data to determine what areas to target for this work.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was

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

A total of 8,369 youth were eligible for the survey because they were age 16-21, permanently exited high school in the 2021-22 school year, and had an IEP in place at the time of exit. Among these 8,369 eligible youth, surveys were submitted for 8,341 leavers. Submitted surveys are separated into two categories: Respondents and Non-respondents.

A total of 6,522 Respondents were contacted for the survey and answered the survey questions. A total of 1,819 Non-respondents were contacted but did not answer the survey questions. Of the 1,819 Non-respondents, 270 were reached by phone but opted not to participate in the survey, and 1,549 were not able to be reached at all. Educators reported a variety of reasons for non-response, including poor or no contact information (17.81%), unable to reach after three attempts (63.33%), declined interview (14.84%), and other reasons (4.01%).

A total of 28 eligible leavers were not contacted by school district personnel for the survey. Surveys for these youth were never started, and they are not included in the total count of Non-respondents.

CCTS is working with school districts to reduce the number of students who are not contacted for FFY 2023 survey. CCTS will continue to provide training and technical assistance to district representatives throughout the survey process that emphasizes the importance of quality data and high response rates. CCTS will continue to reach out to districts that are below the recommended response rate of 70% and provide support as needed. In these instances, often it's a new employee who's taken on the responsibilities of conducting the survey, is feeling overwhelmed, and needs encouragement. CCTS is currently gathering feedback from TSF2 users to better understand technical assistance needs for the FFY 2023 survey.

Sampling question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

14—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14—OSEP Response

None

14—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 15: RESOLUTION SESSIONS

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision.

Results Indicator

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15—Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges.

Target Range not used.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	76
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	12

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2013	27.66%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	26.25%	26.50%	26.75%	27.69%	28.63%
Data	32.14%	38.89%	27.14%	26.58%	26.32%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
12	76	26.32%	29.57%	15.79%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

OSPI believes there are two primary causes of slippage in the number of resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements. First, OSPI has received anecdotal reports indicating an increase in the acrimony of due process disputes, with parties often entrenched in their positions and unwilling to compromise. This leads to an increasing number of resolution sessions that do not result in a resolution agreement. Second, the administrative law judges in Washington are offering “ALJ settlement conferences” as an additional alternative dispute resolution option; and while OSPI does not collect data on access to this option, OSPI believes that situations that are unresolved in a resolution session are at times then going to mediation or an ALJ settlement conference for further attempts to resolve. OSPI does not collect direct data on why resolution sessions are not successful

and proposes to begin collecting data in that area.

15—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response

The State provided targets through FFY 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

15—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 16: MEDIATION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision.

Results Indicator

Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16—Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges.

Target Range not used.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	47
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	7
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	33

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2013	78.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	75.40% - 85.40%	75.50% - 85.50%	75.60%-85.60%	82.40%	83.40%
Data	95.59%	87.50%	81.40%	81.08%	65.52%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status
7	33	47	65.52%	84.40%	85.11%	Met target

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

16—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response

None

16—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 17: STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

General Supervision.

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

Phase I: Analysis:

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

- Theory of Action.

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

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

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

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

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

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the state must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The state must report on whether the state met its target. In addition, the state may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal

activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

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

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17—Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

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

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

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

NO

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

YES

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

The State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Implementation Project, developed to assess the progress of the SiMR target for FFY 2022, included nine Educational Service District (ESD) regions (101, 112, 113, 114, 121,123, 105, 171, and 189). This represents a sample of 27 local districts from ESD regions across the state, hosting children with disabilities enrolled in preschool (PreK) programs between the ages of 3-5 years with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). This sample is pulled from 295 local districts and 6 State-Tribal Education Compact Schools statewide, representing 9% of the population.

This is an expansion of the project work first reported in the 2020 submission, which included samples from five ESDs statewide, which included 9 local districts. All local school districts recruited into the SSIP Implementation Project are contractors or subcontractors with the Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF) Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP), a State-funded preschool program; Head Start, a federally-funded preschool program; or a locally-funded community preschool program, which in most cases is also a licensed child care facility that enrolls children between 3 and 5 years of age with and without disabilities who have met specific enrollment criteria. To assess and monitor existing supports for children with disabilities in Indigenous Communities and to identify inequities in support systems for children in marginalized communities, we prioritize building relationships, utilizing Tribal Consultation, and collaborating with OSPI’s Office of Native Education, Center for the Improvement of Student Learning (CISL), and the Office of Elementary Education, Early Learning, and Special Programs and Federal Accountability. Additionally, we focus on analyzing data trends for children with disabilities in Washington’s State and Federal Preschool programs.

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

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

Washington SSIP 2021–2022 Theory of Action

<https://ospi.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/2022-12/WA-SSIP-2021-2022-Theory-of-Action.pdf>

Progress toward the SiMR

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

NO

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2019	49.00%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	53.25%	54.75%	56.25%	57.75%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

The # of students with IEPs entered K ready in SEL	The # of students with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
3,257	7,485	48.30%	53.25%	43.51%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable.

The SSIP cohorts expanded in the Spring of 2021 to include all 9 ESDs. The expansion of this cohort increased the number of local districts participating in the SSIP implementation Project from 9 to 27 sites. The SSIP state leads (SLs) believe the slippage is related to the significant increase in sample size. It is the belief of the SSIP SLs that as more local districts move from the Exploration-Planning and Installation (Stages 1-2 of Implementation Science) and transition into the more intensive work of the SSIP Implementation project, including Implementation, Initial to Full, and Scale Up, the SiMR data will improve significantly.

Additionally, the number of students reported on the Kindergarten Readiness Report Card who participated in WaKIDS 2022 state assessment was found to be 5,412 less than the 2019 total children statewide, dropping from 79,326 to 73,914 total children. It is hypothesized that the decline in enrollment was, in part, due to the impacts of the pandemic, families’ hesitancy to place young children back into existing structures due to lack of access of coordinated care (established child care located beyond school boundaries), fears of COVID exposure, and shifts in school routines due to staff shortages. As was expected, this decline in enrollment, paired with the

expansion of the SSIP Implementation cohort, resulted in slippage from the previous reporting year. The number of kindergarteners with IEPs on the November 2022 child count was 8,330, with 89.9% of students with IEPs taking the WaKIDS assessment. Based upon the state summary, 22.1% of children with disabilities met criteria for all six domains in the WaKIDS assessment. Of that percentage, only 23% of children with disabilities demonstrated skills of a kindergarten aged child.

According to the Annual Federal Child Count and Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Data, for the 2019 school year, 18,256 children between the ages of 3 and 5 years were reported to have an IEP in WA state with 11,900 of the children reported enrolled in preschool programs. Over the next two school years, the number of children eligible for IDEA, Part B, enrolled in a PreK program declined to 10,150 in 2020, and 9,565 in 2021. For the 2022 school year, it was reported that 10,822 children placed in PreK programs were found eligible for IDEA, Part B. This is an increase of 1,257 children enrolled in preschool placements from FFY 2021. Additionally, 179 (of 2,091) children with disabilities, ages 4 and 5 years who have been placed in Transition to Kindergarten (TK), a general education placement option, and are no longer included in the B6 PreK Environments data findings.

Lastly, district staff continue to report significant social emotional incidents (physical aggression, running away, unsafe behaviors) of children enrolled in Kindergarten and PreK programs, which correlated to young children and family's inability to assess structured learning environments during the COVID pandemic. Families' inability to access structured high-quality learning environments and data slippage were further compounded by:

- (1) An increase in exclusionary practices put upon the children exhibiting challenging behaviors in PreK and Kindergarten. It is the hypothesis that this is due in part to the disrupted instruction as a result of the COVID-19 school closures and impacts. It is not surprising that students with disabilities, who have higher learning needs, continued to experience an outsized impact (2.41% decrease) as a result of disrupted instruction. OSPI will continue to examine the assessment data for potential causal factors and implement actions to improve proficiency on state assessments for students with disabilities through inclusionary practices and instructional leadership.
- (2) Staff attrition within early childhood settings (state and federal preschool programs, child care, developmental PreK programs, TK, and traditional kindergarten settings), impacting districts ability to open and sustain inclusive classrooms, and
- (3) Failure to recruit new staff resulted in late hires, missed the training window, and incomplete assessment of all children entering kindergarten in the fall of 2022.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

WaKIDS Fall Kindergarten Entry Assessment SEL Domain.

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

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

academic needs.

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

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

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

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

YES

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

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

- (1) The State Infrastructure Leadership Capacity Assessment adapted from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA). This assessment, completed by individual State Design Team (SDT) members annually at the start of each calendar year, evaluates the impact of the state infrastructure related to collaboration, motivation and guidance, vision, and direction. This assessment includes SDT demographic data collection including gender, race, ethnicity, and dual language speaker SDT information.
- (2) State Indicators of High-Quality Inclusion support state and local program leaders to examine and implement strategies that strengthen their capacity to provide high quality inclusive

options in their communities to improve and increase inclusive opportunities for young children with disabilities and their families, through system and practice refinements.

- (3) The Local District Preschool Inclusion Self-Assessment (LDPIISA). This self-assessment tool evaluates partnerships among schools, early care, and education providers to promote the inclusion of young children with disabilities. Programs are required to conduct an initial assessment to collect a baseline data within eight weeks of the start of the current school year and to then engage planning activities based upon the stage of implementation they are found to be in. Districts are asked to revisit the LDPIISA at the end of each school year to assess progress and to support strategic planning for the year to come.
- (4) The Parent Survey Instrument: Schools Efforts to Partner with Parent Scale: This nationally normed evaluation instrument was administered in correlation to the parent engagement strand of the theory of action annually across all participating programs. This data provides valuable information about the extent of parental involvement within the context of Indicator B-8 on the State Performance Plan. These results indicate how much parents believe that school districts have facilitated their involvement in their child's education to improve student outcomes. The Parent Survey has historically been shared to families of children with IEPs in the SSIP Implementation programs in the spring of each implementation cycle.

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

NO

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

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

<https://ospi.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/2024-01/attachment-special-ed-ssip-eval-plan.pdf>

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

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

Edits were made to the existing Evaluation Plan to reflect the expanding work in Washington state relating to inclusion and inclusionary practices, as well as to expand the performance indicator data reviewed by the SSIP SDT.

Targets for APR Indicator 11 (Child Find) and Targets for APR Indicator 12 (Early Childhood Transition) were added to assess the number of children enrolled in State and Federal PreK programs with IEPs, as well as to assess the number of children in these programs that were identified before or after enrollment took place, and the timeliness of their evaluation for Part B. The SSIP SDT will also begin attending to the number of children transitioning from IDEA, Part C, who qualify for IDEA, Part B, as well as those children not deemed 'potentially eligible' and not

referred to Part B to support considerations for longitudinal supports for children in existing State and Federal PreK programs.

With the support of the University of Denver, PELE Center, 10 local districts have engaged in LEAP replication work across 5 ESD regions. The fidelity metrics known as the Quality Program Indicators (QPI), associated with this project work were not included in the earlier version of this plan, as the implementation work as a pilot and isolated to one of the nine ESDs in WA state.

Additionally, the State Benchmarks of Quality was removed as an evaluation metric, as it was found to only measure the implementation of Washington Pyramid Model (WAPM), an evidence-based practice that is not currently being implemented by all 27 local districts engaged in the SSIP Implementation Project.

Lastly, the Indicators of High-Quality Inclusion (state, community, and program -HQI) were added to the Evaluation Plan. Washington state was awarded the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) intensive technical assistance grant to support the scale up and sustainability of inclusion across state systems. The State-HQI will offer the SSIP State Design Team (SDT) a better understanding of the effectiveness of SSIP Implementation Project, while still maintaining the assessment criteria for WAPM implementation.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

It was requested by the SSIP Regional Leads (RLs) and local districts that the Evaluation Plan be better aligned with the evidenced based practice, the Stages of Implementation Science, and the corresponding scope of work outlined within the ECSE Inclusion Champions grant used to facilitate the SSIP Implementation Project. Additionally, WA state received the ECTA intensive technical assistance grant supporting the scale up and sustainability of inclusion. The grant and related fidelity metrics shared above will allow the SSIP SLs to better assess the fidelity of implementation of inclusion and inclusionary practices at the state, regional, and local levels. For this reason, the Evaluation Plan be updated to reflect fidelity metrics associated with the grant work, namely the Indicators of High-Quality Inclusion; State, Community, and Local program. These metrics will include the indicators captured in State and Early Childhood Program Wide Benchmarks of Quality and address more intentionally systemic barriers presented to local districts. More importantly, the use of these tools will allow the SSIP SDT to assess the needs of the children and families navigating early learning systems within WA state's mixed delivery system.

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

The improvement strategies continue to be identified with the support of the SSIP SDT (CP, families, DCYF ECEAP, Head Start, ESIT, parent advocates, higher education reps, and local districts), with direct input from the SSIP RLs and guidance from National Technical Assistance State Liaisons representing the IDEA Data Center (IDC), the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), ECTA, and University of Denver – PELE Center.

The infrastructure improvement strategies prioritized by the SDT include family and community partner engagement strategies, synchronous and asynchronous facilitated training, coaching, and efforts dedicated to sustainability and scale-up practices. The strategies outlined focus on

promoting state, regional, and local district efforts to integrate the frameworks of inclusion, inclusionary practices, trauma informed care, and race and equity considerations throughout the implementation activities. A deeper explanation of the improvement strategies within the 2022 SSIP cycle are as follows:

(1) Family and community partners engagement strategies continue to be a primary focus for the SSIP SLs as efforts continue to be made to increase access to existing State and Federal PreK programs as well as child care settings. As more local district contract or subcontract with DCYF ECEAP and Head Start, the access for children with disabilities to RECPs has increased significantly. These partners have stemmed conversations with local districts and CPs to consider alternative methods of delivering specially designed instruction (SDI) as well as how local districts might align efforts with CPs to strengthen wrap around services for both children and families served. A EBP that has been instrumental in guiding this partnership is Implementation Science, which has proven itself to be an essential component of the project work, laying out the necessary steps to when first exploring the possibilities of system change and establishing relationships with commitments of both heart and mind.

(2) The deployment of synchronous and asynchronous training to support knowledge bases of early learning practitioners has increased significantly along with intentional data use to inform decision making. This was found to be most impactful with the union of the SSIP RLs, with the Regional PreK-3 Coordinators, to support the Inclusive Transitional Kindergarten (ITK) grant, an initiative funded by ESSER dollars to support the expansion of placement options for children with disabilities and alignment of PreK to kindergarten systems. Together, RLs and PreK-3 Coordinators championed local school districts to achieve positive student outcomes with the deployment of inclusionary practices within school districts utilizing the Stages of Implementation Science.

SSIP SLs then worked to build opportunities for proficiency of content among coaches, specialists, and educators using Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) frameworks, such as WAPM and PBIS. To further enrich the learning opportunities of the local districts, the SSIP RLs and higher education partners have created and began the dissemination of training opportunities relating to IDEA performance indicator, B6 PreK Environments. This learning content, first developed in 2020, has since been moved to a canvas platform and converted to a learning module that will be used as a training tool for new and existing ECSE professionals to better understand the relationship between LRE, creating an expansive continuum of placement options, and inclusionary practices.

(3) The statewide ECSE Inclusion Champions Training and Coaching Network, previously referred to the WAPM Training and Coaching Network, was initially developed in partnership with OSPI, the University of Washington Haring Center, Regional ESDs, and in collaboration with DCYF ECEAP, Head Start, ESIT, and licensed care, to support the implementation and scale up of WAPM. In an effort to be responsive to the needs of the RLs and broader needs of the ECSE community, OSPI leadership, in partnership with SSIP SLs, have worked to expand training opportunities to licensed care, and more specifically, Part C early intervention provider locations. OSPI also worked to secure multiple contracts with external partners to support the refinement of the ECSE Coaching and Training Network in an effort to ensure that the RLs not only have up to date training content, but have access to proprietary training material (Prevent Teach Reinforce for Young Children, Practice Based Coaching, Teaching Pyramid Model Observation Tool), and establish communities of practice

led by statewide leaders in inclusion, Pyramid Model and LEAP Replication practices. Lastly, the SSIP SLs intend to ensure that the Stages of Implementation Science parallel the coaching and training structures. At each stage of implementation, criteria will be defined for both the RL and local district to ensure full understanding of their roles and responsibilities. This would include utilization of fidelity metrics, strategies for support in person and remote coaching, as well as opportunities to bridge technical assistance and professional learning to prime local districts for the scale up and scale out of inclusionary practices, MTSS frameworks and more.

(4) An ongoing focus on sustainability and scale-up practices to support knowledge of systems change and leadership practices remains a top priority for the SSIP SDT. One method of supporting this has been through the engagement of the SSIP RLs on a monthly basis to connect with key SSIP SLs and cross-agency partners in an effort to create a community of belonging. The steps taken to support the RLs has resulted in gained confidence in their understanding of the SSIP Implementation project, the desired outcomes for the local districts they serve, and their ability to successfully demonstrate to their local CPs the benefits of cross collaboration. This growth has been seen in their understanding of the stages of implementation and their ability to define their roles and responsibilities within the larger infrastructure improvement process. The SSIP SLs have seen significant positive changes in the early learning landscape. It is because of the commitment of this network, and their commitment to improving their internal and external systems for young children with disabilities, that WA state was recently awarded an intensive technical assistance grant provided by ECTA and funded by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to scale up and sustain policies supporting inclusion. Over 18 months, ECTA's TA experts will work with the SSIP SLs to assess their state, program, and community level practices using the fidelity metrics known as the Indicators of High-Quality Inclusion. Additionally, ECTA will assist the SSIP SLs in creating a statewide MOU (memoranda of understanding) supporting the refinement of policies and practices to better serve children with disabilities across Washington's early learning landscape. Lastly, ECTA will lead RLs and local districts in strengthening their relationships with families and community partners through a community inclusion project model that will result in interagency agreements defining each partners role is supporting children with disabilities within their community.

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

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

(1) Ongoing focus on family and community partner engagement strategies, including how the SSIP SDT might increase opportunities for participation in cross-sector state work groups, WAPM and LEAP Replication training events, along with representation on local districts Program-Wide Leadership Teams (PWLTS), has been successful.

Data captured within the Local District PreK Inclusion Self-Assessment (LDPISA), which asks questions such as,

- “Do your schools and early childhood programs intentionally plan and assess how they are partnering with families?
- Do your schools and early childhood programs include families in advocacy efforts, and public information initiatives, including inclusion forums and conferences?
- Do your schools and early childhood programs have partnerships with community organizations that provide services to children with disabilities to promote inclusion?
- Do your schools and early childhood programs have formal agreements to guide the provision of services to children with disabilities?”

has indicated that local districts' efforts to engage families and CPs have increased over the course of the SSIP Implementation project. Reported methods of engagement include evening training events, increased access to interpreter services, strategic hiring and placement of special education staff to support itinerant service delivery, and the establishment of external partnerships with healthcare providers, and social service agencies.

(2) Offering facilitated synchronous and asynchronous training, including WAPM, LEAP Replication, and other associated trainings has resulted in the increased knowledge of inclusion, inclusionary practices, trauma informed care, and race and equity frameworks. During this reporting cycle, SSIP state and regional partners hosted over 35 synchronous training opportunities to local districts, families, child care providers, and CPs. This captures roughly 210 hours of training led statewide and delivered either in person and virtually with modified training schedules based upon the content, audience, and frequency of contacts RLs had with their participants. Additionally, OSPI with eLearning for Educators, a member of the statewide Inclusionary Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN), collaborated to increase training opportunities related to IDEA performance indicators B6 to expand regional technical assistance provisions to local districts. The development of this training module and later delivery of content have created multiple opportunities for cross-regional collaboration while leveraging current initiatives to ensure successful execution, and monitoring of program improvements systemwide. Employing this framework has bolstered accountability and monitoring of practice, as recorded through ongoing bi-monthly ECSE check-ins and current technical assistance modules.

(3) Focused coaching activities, including the utilization of EBPs to support increased knowledge of fidelity criteria and systems infrastructure, trauma-informed practices, race and equity practices, and increased family and community provider engagement within local EL programs have continued. In 2021 a certification process for RLs (5/9 ESDs) was created to gain mastery of WAPM and LEAP training, coaching, and utilization of evaluation metrics. By 2022, 9/9 RLs have completed the certification process. Expansion of the WAPM certification process for SSIP RLs has led to increased training occurring statewide. To guarantee that all local district teams were able to access required training throughout the implementation year regardless of their RLs certification status, SSIP RLs not yet WAPM certified were able to partner with 'master trainers' as their neighboring ESDs. This also ensured that SSIP RLs engaging in the WAPM certification process could audit required training and co-facilitate with the master trainers while moving along the certification process. What's more, monthly coaching calls for RLs and local district coaches were facilitated by

OSPI ECSE coaching and training mentors to offer ongoing technical assistance to promote fidelity in implementation and best practice for coaches supporting all 27 participating programs. Steps will be taken in the 2023 SSIP cycle to create training and coaching model outlining each EBP by coaching and training need, use of fidelity metrics (ex: TPOT, QPI), and method of training and coaching (in person vs. virtual) with the various stages of implementation. By providing varying dimensions related to the statewide network, the SSIP SDT is better equipped to provide both programmatic, fiscal, and governance recommendations to support future implementation. Data collected by the Program Wide Benchmarks of Quality (PW BoQ) indicates 84% of (a 14% increase) participating programs having met fidelity per the prescribed training and coaching sequence. The SSIP RLs remain dedicated to the project work and embraces the benefits of actively engaging practitioners and leaders, including family partnerships and community partners.

(4) Centering sustainability and scale-up considerations were adopted by the SSIP SDT in the early stages of the SSIP Implementation project. This was done by including documentation of alignment and collaboration within the cross-sector work found to integrate a comprehensive scale-up plan and offered criteria for fidelity and ongoing action planning. Continued implementation of this strategy has increased knowledge of fidelity criteria and systems infrastructure, along with knowledge of systems change and leadership practices. The strengthening of partnerships with external early learning content experts to support the integration and collaboration of new landmark initiatives with SSIP activities has been particularly beneficial. With the ongoing utilization of tools such as the SSIP Evaluation Plan, Theory of Action, and Logic Model, the SSIP SLs have successfully empowered both regional and local school district partners to leverage the frameworks of implementation science within their current infrastructures, identifying the necessary steps to meet full implementation of evidence-based practice across sites. Employing implementation science to guide practice resulted in 27 participating programs creating alignment to the stages of implementation science, with 20 local districts engaging in initial and/or full implementation practices, and 7 local districts engaging in scale up and sustainability practices. Targeted improvements to the system infrastructure, utilizing EBPs paired with scale up and sustainability practices are expected to continue to yield knowledge of both system change and leadership practice(s) as measured through data collected. The implementation of this improvement strategy is imperative in supporting the system sustainability necessary to achieve the SiMR, along with establishing and promoting accountability and monitoring program practices. With these continued measures in place, improvement in the performance rates in social-emotional development among students with and without disabilities is expected, as are increases in performance rates of both populations in other domain areas, including mathematics and literacy.

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

NO

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

The 2022 SSIP infrastructure improvement strategies will continue to focus on:

(1) Increased family and CP engagement strategies to promote knowledge of regional and local early learning systems, including the continuum of LRE placements and child outcomes relating to

demonstration of social emotional learning. Intermediate outcomes outlined in the SSIP Evaluation Plan support both sustainability of improvement efforts and scale-up through strategic and intentional collaboration to enhance technical assistance and fidelity in implementation. Through data collected and anecdotal reports offered, the initial hypothesis of the SSIP SDT that with intensive technical assistance along with system-level coaching for program staff within integrated early learning environments, there will be an increase in family and CP engagement across all participating SSIP sites. Within the upcoming year, families and CPs living within 4 of the 9 ESDs statewide will be recruited to participate on a Community Inclusion Team with their local district partners. All district teams will be implementation sites currently participating within the SSIP project work, have an established PWLT, and coaching protocol in place. Each project site will be paired with a SSIP RL, an ECTA TA lead, and will receive guidance from an external expert relating on how best to engage with their local Tribal Nations.

(2) The continued deployment of both asynchronous and synchronous training within the current school year to offer professional learning related to the training topics mentioned previously. Current data reported by the EC PW BoQ indicated that 42% of SSIP Implementation sites that engage in WAPM frameworks, had 42% of the critical elements in place, while an additional 43% of the SSIP Implementation sites have critical elements partially in place. This data finding is important because it correlates with the training and coaching efforts of the SSIP RL's and affirms their ability to transfer their knowledge to their PWLTs, resulting in a successful infrastructure redesign. Going into the next SSIP implementation year, SSIP RL's will continue to disseminate training content to their local districts, CPs, families, and child care providers. Subject matter includes the WAPM Modules 1-2, PWLT Strategic Planning, B6 LRE Coding, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), Equity and Diversity training, amongst other essential topics. It is the continued belief of the SSIP SDT that statewide trainings, aligned across the early learning landscape, paired with intensive data analyses, monitoring, and with broad community partner input will result in an increase in access to inclusive settings, improved academic settings, and a decrease in reported suspensions and expulsion rates of children as they enter the larger K-12 system.

(3) Enhancing the WAPM coaching and training network in the upcoming SSIP implementation year. To further support RLs and local districts in the implementation of the outlined infrastructure improvement strategies, OSPI in partnership with an external partner from higher education institutions will engage in a review of their current training and coaching structures. The purpose of this systems review will be to ensure that the current statewide coaching structure is put through "diagnostics" check to assess efficiencies of how the SSIP Implementation project is meeting the current and future needs of CPs, local districts, and families. Expected outcomes of this partnership will be to:

- Organize support for WA Coaching & Training Network to support a scaffolded support system for Regional ESD ECSE Implementation Specialists.
- Differentiate guidance by in-person and virtual coaching.
- Special considerations for integrated programs, Tribal programs, and rural/remote settings. Establish criteria for Stages of Implementation when facilitating WAPM, LEAP, and/or the Community Inclusion Project.

(4) Internal and external strategic planning to maximize the allocation of resources across multiple

funding streams to support procedures and policies. Anticipated alignment activities planned for the upcoming SSIP implementation year include:

- a. The deployment of a March 2023 contract with Pyramid Model Consortium (PMC), to access licenses to the Pyramid Model Implementation Database (PIDS). The acquisition of this license ensured that the SSIP SLs have a vetted data submission platform for all local districts engaging in inclusionary practice and MTSS project work. This also ensured that the SSIP state data manager had a streamlined tool for data submission and later data analysis.
- b. Continued efforts to scale up and sustain the ECSE Inclusion Champions Network, and larger community of local districts (46), CPs, and families engaged in the activities prescribed within the SSIP Implementation project.
- c. Expansion of the PreK Inclusion Champions Network to include Inclusive Transitional Kindergarten grantees, bringing together school district leaders from across Washington state that are committed to expanding the continuum of placement options for all children through the implementation of inclusionary practices and MTSS frameworks. This partnership will be strengthened with the expansion of the LEAP Replication project into the first TK program over the course of two years.
- d. Continued strengthening of OSPI's partnership with DCYF to integrate WAPM training and coaching practices into their existing coaching framework known as Early Achievers, which serves children ages 0–5 years enrolled in state and federal PreK programs, as well as licensed childcare.

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

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

- (1) Washington Pyramid Model (WAPM)
- (2) Learning Experiences: An Alternative Program for Preschoolers and Parents (LEAP Replication)
- (3) Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)
- (4) The Stages of Implementation Science

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

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

(1) The Pyramid Model is a framework of evidence-based practices for promoting young children's healthy social and emotional development. With the support of the National Center for Pyramid Model Innovations (NCPMI), Washington state initiated the process to become a Pyramid Model state (WAPM). The SSIP SLs support the implementation of WAPM across Washington state's complex mixed delivery system. This framework is tailored to meet state-specific needs, promote inclusionary practices, and enhance social and emotional competence in infants, toddlers, and young children. The WAPM vision is aligned with the commitment to increase opportunities for all children to receive high-quality, early learning services in integrated and inclusive environments. WAPM is not a curriculum package, but a collection of programs and evidence-based classroom practices, selected by experts in early childhood research, to support optimal development and prevent challenging behaviors.

(2) The Learning Experiences: An Alternative Program for Preschoolers and Parents (LEAP Replication) PreK model reflects both a behavioral and developmentally appropriate approach for teaching children with and without disabilities within an inclusive early childhood environment. In LEAP Preschool Models, typically developing peers are trained how to communicate and engage in reciprocal social relationships with their classroom peers with autism spectrum disorder (ASD). The LEAP PreK Model also uses an integrated curriculum approach (i.e., designing learning experiences that promote children’s skill development across multiple domains) to provide opportunities related to all areas of development (e.g., social/emotional, language, adaptive behavior, cognitive, and physical). OSPI has contracted with the University of Denver to implement LEAP PreK Models across Washington state and is currently being implemented in 6/9 ESD regions, with plans to expand into the remaining ESD regions by 2026.

(3) A Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) is a framework for enhancing the adoption and implementation of a continuum of evidence-based practices EBPs through data-based decision making to achieve rigorous, yet achievable outcomes for every student. The MTSS framework builds on a public health approach that is preventative and focuses on organizing the efforts of adults within systems to be more efficient and effective. MTSS helps to ensure students benefit from nurturing environments and equitable access to universal instruction and supports that are culturally and linguistically responsive, universally designed, and differentiated to meet their unique needs. MTSS integration involves coordination of tiered delivery systems, including Academic Response to Intervention (RTI), Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), Washington Pyramid Model (WAPM), and Social and Emotional Learning (SEL).

(4) The state continues to employ implementation science to build organizational commitment, capacity, and systems so that children, families, and communities' benefit from implementation practices and improved outcomes are sustained. Using the Statewide Implementation Guide (SIG) created by ECTA, with NCMPI, OSPI adopted the Stages of Implementation to lay out the necessary steps, stage-by-stage, for full implementation of evidence-based practices, scaling-up practices, and sustaining the effort. Each Implementation stage identifies specific activities, outcomes, and unique challenges associated with the implementation process and help in the planning, communication, resource allocation, and evaluation of SSIP implementation. The Stages of Implementation are:

Stage 1: Exploration and Planning

Stage 2: Installation

Stage 3: Implementation: Initial to Full

Stage 4: Scale Up

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

The impact related to each EBP (e.g., WAPM, MTSS, Implementation Science, LEAP) includes improvements to the state system’s infrastructure by way of the installation of family and CPs engagement strategies, synchronous and asynchronous facilitated training and coaching, data-based decision making, and sustainability and scale-up activities.

Data sources informing EBPs impact currently include the Local District Preschool Inclusion Self-Assessment (LDPIISA), and in some cases, the Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT), the Early Childhood Program Wide Benchmark of Quality (EC PW-BoQ), and the Behavior Incident Report System (BIRS). These sources continue to highlight local district policies and practices for targeted intervention and ongoing action planning and progress monitoring. These tools also allow local districts and PWLTs to see their strengths, which can be built upon to positively impact identified areas for improvement (e.g., partnering with families, enhancing professional development, develop collaborations with CPs).

Washington state's efforts to increase high-quality, integrated, and inclusive early learning settings for young children is supported by a combination of data aggregated over the last 4 years, continuous implementation of WAPM, paired with inclusionary practices and other crucial frameworks. The utilization of data-based decision-making and comprehensive training and coaching are the heart of WAPM fidelity in practice. OSPI ECSE began hosting 'office hours' at the start of the 2022 SSIP cycle. This created a direct access point to the SSIP leads and the ECSE Inclusion Champions Network. bi-weekly check ins (14), provides local districts and CPs participating in the statewide deployment of WAPM, LEAP Replication, and/or engaging in the initial stages of systems redesign, an opportunity to seek technical assistance on topics such as navigating the PIDS data system, guidance on IDEA performance indicators, State and Federal PreK program integration, and more.

The fidelity metrics shared above also inform ongoing practice-based coaching and immediate feedback to the fidelity of implementation for SSIP RLs and local districts. Furthermore, they guide the training and coaching network to assess, and provide ongoing support to participating programs based on direct observational data collected during PWLT meeting and classroom observations. Ongoing analysis and data collection processes are intended to impact the SiMR by changing local district policies directly related to critical elements such as: staff buy-in, establishing leadership teams, and promoting family engagement.

Data indicates that the EBPs shared within the SSIP Implementation project continues to positively impact classroom level practices specifically related to trauma-informed practices, race and equity, and inclusion as recorded through direct observation data collected within the PIDS platform and reported by evaluation tools such as the TPOT and LDPIISA. The SSIP SDT have worked to create processes to identify areas for statewide improvement (e.g., family/CP engagement, alignment of professional development opportunities, increased access to RECPs, timely evaluations within Child Find) and plan to engage in monthly action planning meetings facilitated by ECTA to address low-score indicators as collected via the newly adopted fidelity metric, the State Indicators of High-Quality Inclusion.

The SSIP SLs continue to refine the WAPM Training and Coaching Network. In an effort to streamline the ECSE inclusion projects moving forward, OSPI created two activity grants for local districts and ESD ECSE Coordinators. The local district grant was titled the ECSE Inclusion Champions Grant (\$570,000 allocated annually), which outlines the scope of work required to move through the stages of implementation, 1-4, allowing district teams to build strong foundations in systems analysis, data literacy, and later supporting their efforts to implement and scales out

inclusionary practices throughout their early learning programs, PreK – 3rd grade.

The ECSE Implementation Specialists Grant (\$845,00 allocated annually), which was offered to ESDs, provides the funding necessary for the ECSE Implementation Specialist to gain mastery in WAPM training and coaching practices, and allows ESDs to train regionally in inclusionary practices and WAPM frameworks to community partners and local districts teams not currently in the ECSE Inclusion Champions Network. This grant also allows the ESDs to facilitate regional PIC (PreK Inclusion Champions) Network Communities of Practice, and to engage in Scale Up activities offered through contracts with the Universities of Washington (Haring Center) and Denver (PELE Center) to refine their coaching practices using the frameworks of Practice Based Coaching, WAPM, and LEAP, to serve local districts in both urban and rural settings, remotely and in-person.

Utilizing the components of ECTA's SIG, specifically the Stages of Implementation and the Essential Support Structures, the 619 Coordinator has created a scaffolded system of support offered to local district teams. This allows them to grow at their pace, with the utilization of evidence-based practice and infrastructure improvement strategies to prioritize the relationship between social emotional development and embedded inclusionary practices in early childhood programs. Within the WA state ECSE Inclusion Champions grant, local districts utilize technical assistance, professional learning, and associated coaching efforts, while collaborating with their regional ECSE Implementation Specialists to increase the continuum of alternative placement options within each region, creating greater access to high-quality early learning and elementary programs with strategic utilization of Evidence Based Practices (EBP), including WAPM, multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) frameworks, Implementation Science, and LEAP Replication strategies.

Integrating WAPM, MTSS, LEAP Replication, and Implementation Science frameworks into the overarching vision of the SSIP Implementation project has provided the SSIP SDT opportunities to assess progress based towards the long-term goals captured in the SSIP Logic Model. Additionally, at the end of each funding year, local districts must submit an end-of-year report, reflecting their experiences throughout the grant and their plans for continuing efforts into the next funding year. Local districts are also asked to share back any findings based upon the PWLT's analysis of their B6 PreK Environment data, along with any findings when compared with the ECSE evaluation metrics (ex: TPOT, BIRS EC PW BoQ, or LSDPISA) that helped them to drive system change.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Through the data collected by the SSIP implementation sites, the SSIP SDT has been able to create a strong narrative outlining how, when data is used with intention, educational systems can be positively impacted, and children farthest from opportunity can gain access to high-quality learning environments. The state evaluated the outcomes of each improvement strategy through various data collection instruments.

Indicator B7A (1) targets an increase in positive social emotional skills as measured by individual rate of growth with a proposed future target of 89.2% across a six-year period. Indicator B7A (2), targeting an increase in positive social emotional skills, as measured within age expectations yielded 37.85 in 2022–23 with a proposed future target of 43.9% in 2025–26.

In 2021, 9,565 children ages 3 to 5 were reported to have an IEP in the state of Washington. Of those identified, 25.7% of these children had access to a RECP(B6a) while 49.4% of these children were reported to be enrolled in either a separate class or program (B6b). It was determined that 24.3% of the children reported were either enrolled in a RECP with services provided elsewhere or received specially designed instruction via a service provider location. When compared to the performance indicator B6 data for 2020, there is a positive increase of 4.7% for B6a (from 21%) and decrease of 4.1% (from 53.5%) for B6b. There was also a reported increase of the number of children in a RECP with services provided elsewhere or via service provider location in 2020 from 12.5%.

In the winter of 2021, Special Education SDT proposed that the B6 baseline and corresponding targets for B6a and B6b increase year to year with the duration of the implementation cycle by 1.5%. Upon release of the 2022 Federal LRE and Child Count Data, B6a data improved from 21% to 31.1% (10% positive increase) and B6b data decreased from 53.5% to 43.3% (10.2% decrease). These data illustrate the impacts of the SSIP RLS' efforts to facilitate intensive technical assistance, coaching (systems level and instructional), and professional development to support IDEA for amongst programs participating in the SSIP Implementation Project.

Analysis of the State Infrastructure Leadership Capacity Assessment indicates stable maintenance across all three domain areas. Acquisition in the leadership area of collaboration yielded a mean score of 3.42. A mean score of 3.42 in motivation and guidance and 3.42 in vision and direction were recorded. A demographic analysis of the SDT indicates that 83% identify as female and 17% as prefer not to report. Additionally, 67% identify as not Hispanic or Latino of any race, 11% identify as Hispanic or Latino of any race and 22% prefer not to report. Eleven percent of SDT members indicated Yes to Dual Language Speaker Status (DLL), 72% indicated No, 17% preferred not to report.

The Local District Preschool Inclusion Self-Assessment (LDPIISA) yielded an 85% instrument response rate, indicating an average of 39% of indicators "in place" with an average 45% of indicators "in process but not in place," .08% of indicators planned but not implemented, and .02% "not in place." Statewide analysis indicates developing formal collaborations with community partners and enhancing professional development as areas for future growth. Reviewing and modifying resource allocation and adhering to legal provisions of support and services in inclusive settings with Individualized Education Programs have been identified as statewide implementation strengths.

The Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT) yielded a 35% response rate, in which 85 cumulative TPOT observations were completed. An analysis of the data indicates 79% of key practices were observed including indicators related to teacher engagement in supportive conversations with children, collaborative teaming, teaching behavior expectations and connecting with families. 89 red flags (RFs) were recorded, with the primary red flag attributed to most of the day spent in teacher-directed activities. An increasing trend in supporting interventions for children with persistent challenging behavior was reported and stable implementation in teachers engage in supportive conversations with children and connecting with families was reported.

The Early Childhood Program Wide Positive Behavior Support Benchmark of Quality (EC PW BoQ)

yielded a 74% instrument response rate. Forty-two percent (42%) of indicators were reported to be "in place," 42% were "emerging and/or needed improvement," and 15% were "not in place." This improvement reflects a 7% decrease for indicators "not in place" compared with the previous year. A statewide analysis of the data aggregated across the implementation cycle indicates monitoring implementation and outcomes and staff buy-in as areas for future growth. Analysis indicates that procedures for responding to challenging behavior and establishing leadership team critical elements have been implemented with the highest percentage of fidelity.

The Behavior Incident Report System (BIRS) When analyzing the frequency of BIRS for children with and without an IEP, disaggregated by race/ethnicity, the risk ratio for children who identify as Black is 1.48. Children who identify as Asian have a 2.83 risk ratio, and children who identify as American Indian have a 6.85 risk ratio. Children who identify as Latino or Hispanic have a 0.90 risk ratio, and children who identify as White have a 0.72 risk ratio (all other risk ratios yielded a score of 0). These findings show a positive decrease for children identified as Black (-1.56) and a negative increase for children identified as Native American (+6.85) from the previous reporting year. Of the children reported to have an IEP (33.8%), 17 were reported to have received school suspension (ISS). Children identified as having an IEP are 1.28 times more likely to have at least one ISS than other children. Additionally, children with an IEP are 3.91 times more likely to have at least one out-of-school (OSS) than all other children.

The percentage of BIRS attributed to dual language learners (DLL) is 25.2% and 74.8% for non-DLL children. Data generated the percentage of BIRs that were attributed to children who belonged to the following student groups: Asian (3%), American Indian (21.7%), Alaskan Native (0%), Black or African American (45.8%), Latino or Hispanic (10.8%), Native Hawaiian, (0%), Two or more races (0%), Pacific Islander (0%), White (18.7%), Other (0%), and Prefer not to report (0%). Data indicate 29.3% of children with a BIR identify as female, 0% identify as Gender Nonconforming/Transgender, 70.7% identify as male, 0% identify as non-binary, and 0% identify as Other.

The Parent Survey Instrument: School Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale results indicate that 37.7% of the parent respondents believe that schools have facilitated their involvement in their child's education. This report yielded a 14.4% response rate (69 responses/479 total). The total sample of parents surveyed included parents of students identified as Hispanic (23%), American Indian/Alaska Native (4%), Asian (4%), Black (3%), Pacific Islander (0%), Two or More Races (9%), and White (57%).

Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

Additional data metrics have been reviewed by the SSIP SLs and are believed to support further movement towards scale up and sustainability of the SSIP Implementation project to meet the SiMR target. What's more, with the recent partnership of OSPI and the SSIP SDT with ECTA to begin the refinement of Washington's mixed delivery system to integrate inclusion and inclusionary practices across the early learning landscape, the SSIP SLs have considered collecting supplementary reports, performance indicator data, and fidelity metrics to support decisions to continue the ongoing use of the EBPs outlined in this report.

Examples of this data include:

(1) Federal and State preschool data management annual reports pinpointing the number of children enrolled into program with an IEP, and the program type children with disabilities are enrolled in. For children enrolled in WA state's Head Start programs, the Program Information Report (PIR) will be a great source of information for the SSIP SDT. The PIR is an annual report providing comprehensive data relating to services and staff, children and families participating in Head Start programs (and Early Head Start) was first reviewed at the August SSIP SDT meeting. It was shared at this time that 113 children identified as American Indian/Alaskan Native had an IEP. Of the children enrolled in this program, 129 were referred for a special education referral, with 96 receiving an evaluation for IDEA, and 33 not receiving an evaluation. Of the 33 children who did not receive an evaluation, 16 of the evaluations did not take place due to parent refusal. Of additional interest is the referral and evaluation trends of children enrolled in the Migrant/Seasonal Programs (50 children were referred, 49 children did not receive an evaluation).

(2) Social Emotional Learning performance rate of entering TK students with disabilities (based on WaKIDS fall assessment data) Currently 179 (of 2,091) children with disabilities, ages 4 and 5 years who have been placed in Transition to Kindergarten (TK), a general education placement option, and are no longer included in the B6 PreK Environments data findings. Initial data collected on this population is showing performance rates of 45.2% in the area of SEL compared to their nondisabled peers, demonstrating a 15.8% achievement gap. This contrasts trends observed over the course of the SSIP cycle for children entering Kindergarten with disabilities, when compared to their nondisabled peers, demonstrating a >29% achievement gap in SEL.

Other essential data metrics, performance indicators, and assessment targets that will be considered for review for the 2023 SSIP cycle include:

- B11 Child Find
- B12 Early Childhood Transition
- C8 Early childhood Transitions data
- State Indicators of High-Quality Inclusion
- Local Program Indicators of High-Quality Inclusion
- Community Indicators of High-Quality Inclusion

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Within the next reporting period, OSPI Special Education, in partnership with internal and external experts, plan to leverage the existing infrastructure improvement strategies mentioned in this report to further enhance Washington's PreK-21 educational systems with targeted intensive technical assistance, professional learning and coaching, and scale up and sustainability practices. The SSIP SLs acknowledge the power of belonging and the need to build strong foundations for the child and family as they navigate what should be an inclusive system connecting them to their communities and schools.

Decades of rigorous research show that high-quality, inclusive, early learning in a least restrictive environment contributes to a child's lifelong ability to learn and relate to others. Our state has a diverse mixed delivery system of public and private early learning and preschool programs to build upon. However, there are vast variations in resources and quality. Information about available places to enroll is spread out, so families have difficulty finding services. There are dramatic

shortages in some communities and competitive pressures in others. That is why the Governor and Legislature have asked the Washington State Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF) and the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to align services for children ages 3 to 5, so families get what they need – when and where they need it.

The SSIP SLs will continue to prioritize the cross sector partners between DCYF and OSPI and anticipated outcomes of this collaborative work include increased family and community provider engagement in the co-creation of state, regional, and local systems, including coordinated recruitment and engagement activities meant to expand the continuum of LRE placements in early learning programs as well as coordinated cross agency policy and procedures modifications meant to expand access for students with disabilities across early learning programs. This will increase integrated programming opportunities for local districts contracting or subcontracting with DCYF for ECEAP slots and associated funding.

To further enhance the current WAPM training and coaching Network, the SSIP SLs will be working in collaboration with the University of Denver-PELE Center, SSIP SL (State Leads), and SSIP RLs, to establish an ECSE Training and Coaching Network to amplify their existing coaching networks, support community-led inclusion, honor tribal traditions through culturally responsive-sustaining HQI, and support local districts and CPs towards inclusive environments via collaborative state partnerships and policies. The SSIP RLs will also be collaborative partners with the OSPI Early Learning division and PreK-3 Coordinators, as efforts are made to create TK Rulemaking and corresponding guidance resources that will be developed in the next reporting year to encourage inclusion and implementation of the shared EBPs.

In an effort to ensure children and families have access to inclusive environments, PreK – 21, OSPI Executive Leadership have taken several action steps to refine the larger educational system. As part of our 2023-24 Decision Package, the agency is asking to continue Inclusionary Practices funding and is requesting a feasibility study for a statewide Individual Education Program (IEP). While the Legislature made some progress on the Inclusionary Practices Project (IPP) in the 2023 Legislative Session, OSPI continues to seek full funding of the work. This proposal would add an additional \$5 million per year for ongoing access to high-quality technical assistance providers in support of inclusionary practices, ensuring schools and districts across the state have equitable access to these benefits. Along with increasing inclusion, this is a cost-effective way to help prevent issues related to disproportionate identification of students for special education services.

The agency is also asking for a feasibility study for a statewide IEP system. Funding would support OSPI in contracting with an external entity to conduct a feasibility study on a statewide IEP system that would provide a consistent, integrated system to benefit students with disabilities, their families, educators, and schools. This system would have compliance mechanisms built in and would provide opportunities for educators, families, and students to focus on results and interact with the IEP in the way it was intended, as an instructional framework.

As part of our statewide inclusion efforts, the OSPI Special Education division has continued to partner with schools, districts, and professional development providers, and other divisions within the agency to deliver coaching and mentoring to classroom teachers in support of high- quality instructional leadership, differentiated and individualized instruction. As Washington State

continues to identify new ways to measure impact, leverage data, and effectively use that information for implementation, the movement and infrastructure is relying on inclusive leadership across all levels of the system within a MTSS framework. The efficacy and outcomes of the Inclusionary Practices Professional Development Project shows that building a network utilizing diverse perspectives is crucial for creating sustainable and systemic inclusion. The past four years of IPP provided valuable information to support the development of a technical assistance network that accounts for the interdependence required to create a robust educational system that is equitable and inclusive.

The Inclusionary Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN) is the expansion from the former Inclusionary Practices Project (IPP) and in addition to the professional development organizations that were part of the IPP, the network now includes organizations from the State Needs Project and ESD partners. This network operates collaboratively, contributing significantly to statewide capacity-building. Endeavoring to pinpoint the kinds of data that center around family and student experiences and outcomes, the IPTN collaborates to align priorities and efforts to dive deeper and show how meaningful inclusion is being realized beyond the reporting of LRE. As the IPP has transitioned to the IPTN we have been harnessing the strengths of the IPP to expand the network to address persistent inequities and to eliminate barriers that continue to exclude students, shifting the focus from evidence of implementing inclusionary practices to fostering inclusionary outcomes.

The IPTN seeks to end systemic social injustices caused by ableist systems that define students receiving special services as “other” or “less than” by providing educators with professional learning on how to provide inclusive, individualized instruction to students with a wide range of needs and abilities. At their core, inclusive practices center equity, recognize the strengths and cultural assets of diversity, work to remove structural and other barriers to access, and examine intersectionality and ways students and families can be marginalized in our education system. As Washington becomes more proficient in data-based decision-making and the provision of early interventions for all students as part of a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) framework, schools and districts are better positioned to guard against overidentification, and other issues related to disproportionality. The MTSS framework demonstrates how special education services are integrated into each tier so that general education and special education instruction and support are aligned. This improves services for students with disabilities and creates a framework of schoolwide interventions and support which lessens the reliance on student referrals for special education.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

The testimony of the ECSE Inclusion Champions, paired with submitted data of these local districts, is showing that the current methodology outlined above is effective in offering districts the opportunity to assess current practices, create viable improvement strategies, and increase access to high-quality learning environments for all children when they are provided with intensive professional learning and technical assistance related to inclusion, inclusionary practices, and social emotional learning. Local districts that paired this technical assistance with system level and

instructional coaching found greater buy-in from program staff, community partners, and families, as well as positive outcomes for children engaged integrated learning environments.

Local districts shared that:

"At the Early Learning Center, we have been working to move towards classrooms that are more inclusive. Looking at the data, specifically Indicator B6, the number of students receiving their services in a general education setting has increased from 9.3 % to 28.6%. Next year, the structure of our preschool classrooms will allow for even more students receiving their education in general ed settings."

"Our efforts toward peer supported learning have shown a strong increase in social skills and all areas of learning. We feel these improvements are a direct result of our intentional efforts and changes in practice that have evolved as part of our PIC work."

"I think the biggest eye opener was our reflection and learning over the year. We see the importance of defining terms and procedures and making things more visible for all. This is reflected in the scores. Individually, we may think we have things in place, but as a whole, we are still working on many of the areas."

In the spring of 2021, OSPI contracted with the Pyramid Model Consortium to purchase licenses for all local districts engaged in the ECSE Inclusion Champions activities to access the Pyramid Model Implementation Database (PIDS) system. This data system is designed to capture fidelity metrics (EC PW BoQ, TPOT, BIRS) aligned with the infrastructure improvement strategies and EBPs described in this report. SSIP SLs hypothesized that the PIDS platform would support the increase in statewide data submission and inevitably create a seamless data collection and submission plan that would allow immediate access to student and program level data to partners across WA state at all levels of access. Initial access to the PIDS platform was paired with state level training to build proficiency of the tool input and report features. Within the first year, use of the tool was not required but recommended. It was not until the 2022 SSIP cycle that data submission was required within the PIDS system instead of via submission to the SSIP leads using methods outside the platform. This shift of expectation yielded an 85% usage rate by the SSIP local districts by, which was an increase from the previous submission periods, which presented a 68% data submission rate by districts.

Additional testimony from the SSIP RLs and coaches about the SSIP Implementation project were:

"Having the opportunity and framework to come together as a leadership team and have critical conversations about topics and indicators of high-quality inclusive practices that may not have been discussed before has been an amazing benefit of this work! Listening to each other and hearing differing perspectives, while agreeing on our common vision for our early learning program has been a process that has grown over the year! The result is a more focused vision and energy to do the good work!"

"Being able to participate in the Preschool Inclusion Champions grant project has been a positive experience. I appreciated the opportunity to train in the Pyramid Model. Training in the Pyramid Model reminded me of when Teaching Strategies Gold came out with their first expanded curriculum and online assessments. The feeling was FINALLY something that professionally shows the standards we are teaching.

The Pyramid Model is similar to giving light to the work we do every day surrounding challenging behaviors. It gives voice and infrastructure to train staff on the work that is early learning. Through the work we did with the PIC grant, we are revamping our positive behavior support plans and working more closely with our Special Education department on the language used in IEP's. I'm thankful to have had this

opportunity."

"We are seeing AMAZING student growth in students that would have been traditionally in a self-contained classroom. Staff are realizing the "potential" of ALL students to participate with General Education students no matter what their ability."

Data shared by one region's SSIP RL offered a cumulative review of ECSE Inclusion Champions engaged the SSIP Implementation project. Of those engaged in stages 3 and 4 of implementation science, a mean baseline was reported on the LSDPISA of 63.12%. In 2021, implementation to fidelity increased to 84.8%, and to 88.5% in 2022, demonstrating that efforts maintained over time resulted in scale up and sustainability of infrastructure improvement strategies across the local district's educational system.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

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

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

Essential partners enlisted to improve the overall quality of early childhood programming in WA state has increased significantly in the past year due to intentional alignment with internal and external cross-sector strategic planning. Representatives identified within each partner group below were actively engaged throughout the project work with special consideration made to ensure equitable representation and opportunities for co-creation at each level of implementation. As shared earlier in this report, the SDT captures a wide variety of partners, including practitioners and leaders from our state parent advocacy groups, State and Federal PreK programs, Part C State Agency representatives, higher education, ESDs, local districts, Tribal Partners, and Child Care Aware of WA.

Using the SSIP Logic Model as a guide, the SLs continued efforts to make meaningful progress towards identified outcomes in the 2022 school year. To support the expansion of inclusive EL settings, and to increase access to intensive technical assistance for local practitioners relating to inclusionary practices, trauma informed care, WAPM, MTSS, and LEAP replication frameworks, as well as race and equity considerations, OSPI Special Education, Early Learning, Office of Native Education, along with DCYF ECEAP and Head Start took the necessary steps to align training practices and communications related to inclusion and least restrictive environment.

Expanding on DCYF ECEAP and Head Start actions from the 2021-22 school year to promote integrated programs and inclusive settings, the ECEAP & Head Start Saturation Study of 2021–22, published on November 9, 2022, served as a valuable tool. It aided in broadening access by sharing with potential ECEAP contractors the definition of least restrictive environment (LRE) and incorporating B6 PreK Environments data, broken down by ELL status, race/ethnicity, and age. Shifting the focus of priority groups to include local districts with the lowest B6a data increases opportunities for districts to access additional funding and integrated programming. This was the first time many local districts will be placed in the position to access ECEAP funding. Braiding funds that allow districts and community ECEAP programs to work collaboratively to better serve children with disabilities across learning environments. Within this annual recruitment cycle, the B6a data

improved by 5.4%, which the SSIP SDT credits to this partnership and anticipates further growth in the FFY 2023 reporting period.

Other essential partners that have supported statewide efforts to increase access to inclusive EL settings and the expansion of local districts' continuum of alternative placement options includes the WA state ECSE Coordination Team, the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), The PreK and Transitional Kindergarten (TK) Inclusion Champions Network, the Association of Educational Service Districts (AESD) Special Education Directors, and OSPI's Division of Early Learning, Center for the Improvement of Student Learning (CISL), and the UW IPP PreK Demo Sites. Each community represents an essential partner of the SSIP implementation process that has been developed to scaffold the learning of regional ESDs, local districts, community partners, and families, as they navigate the Stages of Implementation Science, MTSS implementation, and other identified EBPs.

To increase family and CP engagement at the local level, OSPI has leveraged Federal Special Education 619 activity funds to incentive local districts to hold permanent positions for families and CPs on their Program Wide Leadership Teams (PWLTs) and to include them in all relevant training and technical assistance opportunities related to the implementation of WAPM, inclusionary practices, race/equity, and/or the impacts of trauma. ECTA recently awarded WA state an intensive technical assistance grant to support the scale up and sustainability of inclusion across state systems. It is expected that this grant award will create opportunities for local districts and CPs to authentically co-create policies and procedures that positively support the needs of all children and families.

Project outcomes cited by district partners engaged in the WA state PreK Inclusion Champions (PICs) Initiatives, a grant intended to support local districts as they work to increase the continuum of alternative placement options and to increase student access to high-quality early learning with strategic utilization of EBPs, included:

"The ECSE Inclusionary Practice initiative provided critical funding for curriculum that was used in early childhood collaboration PLCs. The developmental PreK teachers, TK teachers, and Kindergarten teams collaborated on a monthly basis to examine the GOLD curriculum, create anchor assessments and documents, and create common documents for family outreach. WaKIDS data for fall 2022 for entering Kindergarten students showed gains in physical (+10%), language (+11%), cognitive (23%), and math skills (16%)."

"As (we) moved its entire early learning program to an inclusive learning environment for all, we have been able to witness excellent growth in our social and emotional outcomes, our mathematics, and literacy outcomes from our fall to spring checkpoints. Some of this growth has been as high as 41.6% increase. The peer support that our students are able to offer to each other has allowed students on IEPs to flourish in an inclusive setting with those supports and interventions. The vetted instruments that (we) have been trained in through the ECSE Inclusionary Practices Initiatives has allowed our teaching teams to become stronger in supporting students in a rich, inclusive environment with their peers to help model for them the highest opportunities of success."

The WA state ECSE Coordination Team continues to be an essential partner group, with intentional efforts made to assess current technical assistance and professional learning. With the support of

national technical assistance partners from ECTA, NCSI, IDC, and DaSy, the WA state ECSE Coordination Team has been responsive to the needs of the practitioners in the field of early learning by developing technical assistance materials supporting federal indicators: B6, B7, B11, and B12. Members of this partner group have also taken the steps to meet criteria to be identified as WAPM Implementation Specialists and SSIP Regional Leads and, in turn, have become the master trainers and coaches within their regions, ensuring that all training and technical assistance is aligned across regions, regardless of geographic location and local district size. This shift in engagement has empowered the ECSE Coordination Team to become the leaders of early childhood MTSS, WAPM, and LEAP Replication frameworks within their agencies. This has also ensured the successful integration of each EBP within cross-divisional project work. By shifting training and coaching practices from singular learning hubs to an aligned system of support across the state of Washington, there has been a paradigm shift as regional ESDs welcome practitioners from diverse communities outside their boundaries bringing the SSIP SDT closer to their long-term goals outlined in the SSIP Logic Model.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (Yes / No)
YES

Describe how the state addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

With the engagement of CPs, local districts, SSIP RLs, and families, the SSIP SLs continue to take significant steps to move the implementation of inclusion, inclusionary practices, and MTSS in early childhood programs across the complex mixed delivery systems for children, 0–5 years. Each advisory group has been actively engaged in collective influence, identifying issues, solving problems, and ensuring all students have access to high-quality early learning environments across Washington state. Engagement opportunities have varied. In an effort to be responsive to the needs of CPs at the state, regional, and local levels, efforts include offering monthly network meetings, bi-weekly OSPI ECSE updates on hot topics, editing and writing sessions for upcoming guidance, access to statewide advisories, including the Coordinated Recruitment and Enrollment (CRE), and Integrated Early Childhood Programming in partnership with DCYF.

Decades of rigorous research show that high-quality early learning inclusive of children with disabilities in a least restrictive environment contributes to a child's lifelong ability to learn and relate to others. WA state has a diverse mixed delivery system of public and private early learning and preschool programs to build upon. However, there are wide variations in resources and quality.

Accordingly, an analysis of identified CP concerns include the following:

- (1) Increased understanding of inclusion, inclusionary practices, and serving children with disabilities across an early learning mixed delivery system.
- (2) Equitable considerations for Tribal children, including children with disabilities, children impacted by intergenerational trauma, including Black children, and practitioners living within these communities.
- (3) Leveraging existing data sources to avoid the weaponization of data, especially when considering our most marginalized community members.

(4) Addressing the number of children in ECEAP and Head Start referred but not evaluated for special education services, especially children enrolled in Head Start's Tribal, and/or Season and Migrant Programs.

Within this reporting cycle, the SSIP SDT and SLs have worked to address these critical concerns with the following actions:

(1) Led by the SSIP RLs and in collaboration with the University of Washington Inclusionary Practice Project (IPP) PreK Demo Team, and OSPI, created "Myths & Facts about Inclusionary Practices in PreK". This document works to dispel seven prevalent myths in early childhood education including: Placing students being supported by an Individualized Education Program (IEP) in a Regular Early Childhood Programs (RECP) always costs more than placing those students in self-contained preschool programs., Special education teachers are the only teachers who can provide specially designed instruction (SDI), Children with disabilities must show they are ready for regular early childhood programs (RECP). While there is no roadmap or "one size fits all" process to achieving inclusive education, the intent is for providers to use this document as a way to engage in conversation and inquiry to better understand what best practice and implementation of inclusion looks and feels like.

(2) OSPI has maintained relationships with Swan Innovations and are in communications to expand the work initiated by Dr. Martina Whelshula and Cree Whelshula to audit the inaugural training and coaching network, established in 2021 to assist regional ESDs to deploy training and coaching frameworks related to WAPM, MTSS, inclusionary practices, race and equity, and data-based decision making. The proposed contract, which would be executed in FFY 2023-24, would address key recommendations from Swan Innovation's to adapt professional development materials to support both Native American educators and non-Native educators. Recommendations include: trauma-informed care, culturally responsive relationships, supportive environments, social-emotional learning, and current efforts are underway to develop additional professional development opportunities for participating programs that supports a deeper understanding of cultural bias and how individuals who come from western European cultures (which includes mainstream American culture) may mistake their own cultural values, beliefs, and paradigms as universal behavior and values. The SSIP SLs intend to report on progress related to this CP concern in the subsequent reporting cycle.

To truly engage in practices that create systems of support and infrastructure improvement, local districts must first examine their current practices to build understanding of the implications of disproportionate representation within their educational systems by race and equity and/or specific disability category (performance indicator B9 and B10). Referral for special education is a result of well-intended adult responses to student needs. Disproportionality is a measure of those adult decisions' impact on the lived experiences of students, particularly students of color. It is critical that partners across education understand that these decisions can cause harm when actions do not address the root causes of student need and are not culturally affirming.

(1) Equally essential is the need for local district staff to have a strong understanding of the communities they serve, the potential trauma experienced over the course of the pandemic on both children and families, and the impacts of intergenerational trauma on Black, Indigenous, and other persons of color. To better serve the SSIP Implementation districts, the SSIP SLs have continued efforts to collaborate with experts in the field who are successfully making positive

changes for children and families farthest from opportunity.

(2) Within this reporting cycle, OSPI has partnered with the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), a federally funded technical assistance center, to co-design a systemic equity review. The systemic equity review's priorities include centering students with disabilities, partner voice, racial equity, and inclusionary practices. It has been hypothesized that data yielded from the systemic equity review will better inform current beliefs, processes, and practices as it relates to the SiMR. Additionally, the SSIP SLs expect that this analysis of the state's current systems will more effectively inform future changes across Washington State related to data impact and systems development that avoids the weaponization of data. Future efforts are underway to create SSIP SDT professional development opportunities that explore the three pillars of culturally responsive data literacy (culturally responsive pedagogy, data-decision making, and equitable instruction) in subsequent SSIP SDT workgroups and/or bi-monthly convenings facilitated by Dr. Alexandria Harvey, NCSI Senior Program Associate. The SSIP SLs intend to report on progress in the subsequent reporting cycles.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the state intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

Washington continues to embrace the opportunity to reimagine a stronger, more aligned early learning and education system that prioritizes quality, inclusion, and family choice. High-quality early learning programs promote children's development, learning, health, and safety.

It is the hope of the SSIP SLs that with the support ECTA and our existing State Design Team, Washington State will be positioned to increase cross agency policy and procedures to expand access to students with disabilities across early learning programs as seen in the SSIP Logic Model with special care offered to our Tribal children living in or near Tribal communities. Collectively, we recognize that shared guidance to align current early childhood initiatives with existing legislation found in our K-12 systems supporting inclusionary practices, system development, and data management will positively impact the lives of the children in our state as they move along their educational journey.?

Sustainability and scale-up efforts will continue to be a priority for the SSIP SDT as they elevate the relationship between community partners, families, and local districts. As the work to expand WAPM, MTSS, and the implementation of inclusionary practices continues, it is paramount that districts and community partners take intentional efforts to understand the implications of personal biases of staff and the lived experiences of the children and families they serve.

Within the 2021 legislative session, the WA state Governor requested a technical report of agency actions and legislative recommendations for programs regulated by the state and/or government-to-government responsibilities that must be met for children aged 3–5. As described in the Advancing Integrated and Inclusive Programs for Preschool-Aged Children report released in November 2022, DCYF and OSPI have listened carefully and learned from Tribes, families, and providers about what it will take to improve services and reduce the barriers and disincentives necessary to realizing our goal of a highly integrated and inclusive PreK system. Both agencies plan to further expand opportunities to engage, gather, and implement community-based feedback and

human-centered design principles moving forward. As shared previously, the agencies are beginning work on a DCYF and OSPI MOU that codifies the ongoing joint and individual work that OSPI and DCYF will undertake to align and integrate services for preschool-aged children. The state agencies are also working together to create a shared definition of quality so that we have a clear and unified understanding about the programmatic experiences that will best promote children's learning and development. DCYF is making careful plans for ECEAP expansion and bolstering the child care market. To further expand these efforts, DCYF in partnership with Child Care Aware of Washington, established a pilot project amongst licensed care facilities overseeing children 0–3 years of age. As the project moves into its second year of implementation, it is anticipated that the DCYF leads will work towards scale out of WAPM practices within their current program structure before expanding outside the region's boundaries, further aligning instructional practices across systems.

OSPI is engaging in rulemaking to clarify the requirements for school districts implementing TK, building on the Five Pillars of TK. Addressing some of the biggest challenges will require legislative action and funding. These range from enacting ways to support timely renovation of small provider/family home child care provider facilities to support small providers in making renovations needed to accommodate children with disabilities, to increasing access to high-quality preschool by increasing ECEAP slot rates. Taken together, these actions will help our state advance our goals of equitably serving PreK-aged children and their families. DCYF and OSPI are committed to building an aligned inclusive early learning system and to the long-term work of shifting systems, creating momentum and support, and organizing communities towards high quality inclusive preschool settings for all children. Now is a critical time to assure communities that we are working together to accomplish what both we and they know: inclusive settings are best for all children.

As shared earlier in this report, to further support RLs and local districts in the implementation of the outlined infrastructure improvement strategies, OSPI in partnership with an external partner from a higher education institution, will engage in a review of their current training and coaching structures. The purpose of this systems review will be to ensure that the current statewide coaching structure is put through a “diagnostics” check to assess efficiencies of how the SSIP Implementation project is meeting the current and future needs of CPs, local districts, and families.

SSIP SLs reported that, “We will know that we’re going where we want to go, and we will know that we are making the impact we want this project to make, when these action items are addressed:

- (1) Organize support for WA Coaching & Training Network to support a scaffolded support system for Regional ESD ECSE Implementation Specialists.
- (2) Differentiate guidance by in-person and virtual coaching.
- (3) Special considerations for integrated programs, Tribal programs, and rural/remote settings.
- (4) Establish criteria for Stages of Implementation when facilitating WAPM, LEAP, and/or the Community Inclusion Project.
- (5) Create engagement plan with ECSE Implementation Specialists to create WA state Coaching Network structure.
- (6) Support OSPI’s CoP targeting program and practitioner coaches, along with ECSE Implementation Specialists

(7) Build a process for supporting ECSE and related service providers as coaches in the mixed delivery system. "

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

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

To address the long-term outcomes outlined in the Logic Model SSIP SLs continue to examine and engage in comparative analysis of state and federal data sources that capture the number of children with IEPs enrolled in PreK programs, the number of special education referrals made, and other factors, including timely evaluations. These efforts directly correspond to the SSIP Theory of Action which works to strengthen infrastructures for effective implementation of education innovations, increase knowledge of fidelity criteria and systems infrastructure, and increase family and community provider knowledge of regional and local EL systems directly impacting the SiMR. Additionally, with the support of the ECTA grant, the SSIP SLs will engage in monthly calls with national partners to begin the process of building state partnerships, processes and policies that support inclusion across agencies and environments (specifically state guidance and LEA/community guidance working toward HQIs)

To meet the intermediate outcomes and to further strengthen existing infrastructures that increase and sustain SEL and academic skills as measured in the SiMR, the SSIP SLs, in partnership with ECTA and other cross sector partners, will engage in monthly convenings. This has been done to build LEAP, WAPM, and sustainable inclusionary practices supporting coaches in implementing HQI at program and environment levels, as well as by integrating HQI supports with Tribal systems to build out opportunities for children with disabilities, their families and the providers who serve them. RLs and local districts will also engage in convening with ECTA leadership to support communities in the co-creation of an integrated system for HQI at community level in 4 ESD regions.

The larger SSIP Implementation project sites will benefit from monthly connections with the SSIP SLs and RLs. Further, they have opportunities to engage in state and national professional learning opportunities including the inaugural Northwest Early Learning and Pyramid Model Summit, hosted by the University of Washington, in collaboration with the Idaho, Alaska, Washington, and Oregon Department of Educations in the fall of 2023. The Infant and Early Childhood Conference, a statewide conference supporting practitioners and families of children, 0-5 years, with disabilities, has also been a platform for SSIP Implementation teams to share their journeys of inclusion and systems refinement. Annually, this conference brings together over 1,000 participants over five days. Once in-person, this event has now become a virtual event, hosting professional learning

opportunities throughout the day to accommodate professionals and families' schedules.

To meet the short-term outcomes outlined in the SSIP Evaluation Plan, OSPI modified its training structure, moving the weight of the training responsibilities from the SLs to the RLs, offering them the flexibility to modify the training sequence, when allowable, to better meet the needs of the local districts. This change in practice has prioritized the value of the relationship between the RL and PWLTs. To further this commitment, OSPI has invested additional funds in the training and coaching model to allow 2 RLs to become Certified TPOT statewide trainers. To further support the SSIP SLs commitment to better serve the Tribal children living within the SSIP Implementation project sites, OSPI will continue to contract with Swan Innovations.

Efforts are underway to develop both synchronous and asynchronous professional development opportunities that supports a deeper understanding of cultural bias as it relates to inclusionary practices within a MTSS framework. Training topics will also include educational considerations, training related to Tribal language and culture, and behavioral health impacts. OSPI is also asking that Swan Innovations engage in collaboration with SLs to review the Systemic Equity Review with Wested, sit on the SSIP SDT, and support monitoring practices, to ensure that systems are inclusive of Indigenous students and families. Swan Innovations will also partner with the ECTA grant to offer guidance relating to Tribal engagement in support of the implementation of the Community Inclusion Project.

Proposed data collection measures to identify the effectiveness of this project work include the knowledge gain survey assessment metric related to the short-term and intermediate outcomes as featured in the SSIP Evaluation Plan (knowledge gain related to inclusionary practices, race/equity practices and trauma-informed practices) Additionally, Swan Innovations will offer OSPI mid-year and end of year reports within the lifespan of the grant.

With the expansion of the ECSE Inclusion Champions Network, and with the partnership gained with the ECTA technical assistance team, the SSIP SLs continue leverage their partnership across the early learning landscape to support the outcomes predicted within the SSIP Logic Model, Evaluation Plan, and Theory of Action. The SSIP SDT understands that supporting a child with an IEP is not the sole responsibility of special education staff, but rather is the responsibility of the greater mixed-delivery system in Washington State.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

It was shared during numerous community forums (PWLT, SSIP SDT, and PIC Networking meetings) that the greatest challenges when creating a high quality integrated and inclusive early learning program are related two factors; braiding funds to cover program costs and navigating competing policy and procedural requirements of the different funding sources. Furthermore, it was shared by the CPs that:

- (1) Intentional connections and leveraging of current K–12 practices and initiatives with early childhood to harness district level support must require the offering of shared professional learning amongst general and special education practitioners.
- (2) A continued emphasis on Washington state's public school system as an inclusive 3–21 system is needed to ensure scale up and sustainability of EBPs systemwide,

- (3) Access to equitable funding to support the alignment for early childhood programs must take place across the early learning landscape, including child care, state and federal PreK, and district run programs (PreK, TK, K), to counter exclusionary enrollment practices for children with disabilities.
- (4) Finally, streamlined data access must be made so that the stories of local districts, community programs, and children and families seeking their services can be told. Proposed data sources include k-12 discipline data, WaKIDS data for children enrolled in TK and kindergarten, as well as the IDEA performance indicators; B3, B4, B5, B9, and B10.

Current efforts to address these concerns include the following:

- (1) As cited in Section C of this report, the expansion of MTSS through WAPM welcome partners representing WAMTSS to support the development of the SSIP Logic Model, Evaluation Plan, and Theory of Action to further enhance alignment. The goals of this project include leveraging current K–12 practices to harness district level support to ensure sustainability. As a key strategy notated in the SSIP Logic Model, alignment to WA ECSE initiatives and cross sector partners is essential to sustainability and scale-up practices. The SSIP SLs understand that these efforts are actualized when systems to support are developed with the use of fidelity metrics and data-based decision making.
- (2) OSPI supports and empowers students, educators, families, and communities through equitable access to high-quality curriculum, instruction, and support. OSPI's shared focus is supporting all of Washington's learners by providing coordinated, data-driven resources and support to school districts and programs. OSPI is committed to providing equitable access to strong foundations. OSPI's strategic goals are deliberately aspirational, and leaders understand that progress will require continued, effective collaboration and advocacy with CPs. OSPI has identified their first strategic goal to focus on increasing student access to and participation in high-quality early learning and elementary by amplifying and building on inclusive, asset-based policies and practices. Initial objectives for this goal include providing universal access to PreK, New K–3 literacy focus, and universal access to dual language learning by elementary. Activities to support this practice include the utilization of implementation science to increase knowledge of systems change and leadership practices as cited in the SSIP Logic Model: Sustainability and Scale-Up.
- (3) Across the state, many of Washington's schools do not have the necessary resources to provide students with disabilities with the services to which they're legally entitled. At the same time, students with disabilities who are served outside of traditional K–12 public schools in authorized (nonpublic) agencies do not currently benefit from consistent state oversight. Washington has made recent policy shifts to support the inclusion of students receiving special education services in general education settings, but the financial support needed to implement these shifts with fidelity has not kept pace. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) requests that the Legislature remove the 15% cap on state special education funding, further invest in inclusionary practices, and fund state-level oversight of authorized nonpublic agencies serving our students.
- (4) Under state and federal law, all public-school students who qualify for special education services are entitled to those services at no cost to their families. School districts receive a

combination of federal and state special education dollars to support students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). Special education funding is allocated in addition to, or in “excess” of, the full basic education allocation (BEA) available for each student. The result is that school districts have two primary sources of revenue to support services to students with IEPs, however the total district allocation of state special education dollars is capped at 15% of the resident K–21 full time enrolled student body, regardless of how many students with disabilities are enrolled in a given school district. Data from July 2023 show that 107 of Washington’s 295 school districts have a population of students with IEPs that total more than 15% of their overall student population, meaning that those districts do not receive adequate funding to provide each of their students with disabilities with the services and supports to which they are entitled.

- (5) Recognizing the need to drive inclusion in Washington schools, the Legislature provided OSPI with \$37 million over the past four years to train educators across the state in support of inclusionary practices. Data from the first three years of IPP training show that Washington is having success building inclusive educational cultures and systems. If current IPP funding is not maintained, Washington’s progress in inclusionary practices will falter, which will risk the state’s full return on its investments to date. Because of the IPP, Washington no longer ranks in the bottom 10 states on student inclusion, PreK-21.
- (6) Washington's inclusion projects have ignited systemic change by partnering across systems to build educator capacity, and will continue to integrate HQI practices, and champion policies that empower young children with disabilities (and their families) to thrive. To do this, Washington will amplify their existing coaching networks, support community-led inclusion, honor Tribal traditions through culturally responsive-sustaining HQI, and support local districts and communities towards inclusive environments via collaborative state partnerships and policies.
- (7) Moreover, OSPI with the support of ECTA will develop an MOU and corresponding state guidance on interagency collaboration at the state level with recommendations for LEAs and community partners to implement inclusion in a mixed delivery system.

17—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

Response

None

17—Required Actions

None

CERTIFICATION

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the state's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Dr. Tania May

Title:

Assistant Superintendent Special Education

Email:

tania.may@k12.wa.us

Phone:

253-245-9541

Submitted on:

01/30/24 3:09:29 PM and 04/18/2024 01:07 AM ET

DETERMINATION ENCLOSURES

RDA Matrix

2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination¹

Percentage (%)	Determination
82.50%	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	13	65.00%
Compliance	20	20	100.00%

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4	94%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	88%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	32%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	89%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	31%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	89%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4	94%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	88%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	44%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	87%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	24%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	90%	1

Exiting Data Elements

¹ For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2023: Part B."

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	24	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	76	1

*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator ²	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	98.92%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	91.43%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	98.17%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

² The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

Data Rubric

FFY 2022 APR³

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data		
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1
	Subtotal	21
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
	Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

³ In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

		618 Data ⁴		
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 4/6/22	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22	1	1	1	3
			Subtotal	21
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

Indicator Calculation		
A. APR Grand Total		26
B. 618 Grand Total		26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =		52.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator		0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator		0.00
	Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator*) =		1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =		100.00

***Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

⁴ In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2023 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all EDFacts files or the entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	5/3/2023

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to EDFacts aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>

LEGAL NOTICE



Except where otherwise noted, this work by the [Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction](#) is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution License](#). All logos and trademarks are property of their respective owners. Sections used under fair use doctrine (17 U.S.C. § 107) are marked.

Alternate material licenses with different levels of user permission are clearly indicated next to the specific content in the materials.

This resource may contain links to websites operated by third parties. These links are provided for your convenience only and do not constitute or imply any endorsement or monitoring by OSPI.

This resource was adapted from original materials provided by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. Original materials may be accessed at [Special Education Data Collection | OSPI \(www.k12.wa.us\)](#).

OSPI provides equal access to all programs and services without discrimination based on sex, race, creed, religion, color, national origin, age, honorably discharged veteran or military status, sexual orientation including gender expression or identity, the presence of any sensory, mental, or physical disability, or the use of a trained dog guide or service animal by a person with a disability. Questions and complaints of alleged discrimination should be directed to the Equity and Civil Rights Director at 360-725-6162 or P.O. Box 47200 Olympia, WA 98504-7200.

Download this material in PDF at [Special Education Data Collection | OSPI \(www.k12.wa.us\)](#). This material is available in alternative format upon request. Contact the Resource Center at 888-595-3276, TTY 360-664-3631.



**ESTD
1889**

*All students prepared for post-secondary pathways,
careers, and civic engagement.*



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Chris Reykdal | State Superintendent
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building | P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200