



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

*Washington State
Performance Plan
(SPP)/Annual Performance
Report (APR) Part B: For
Reporting on FFY 2023*

2025

WASHINGTON STATE APR

PART B

For Reporting on Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2023

2025

Dr. Tania May

Assistant Superintendent of Special Education

Prepared by:

Dr. Cassie Martin, Executive Director, Special Education
cassie.martin@k12.wa.us | 360-362-5516

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 3, 2025

Table of Contents

Introduction	7
Indicator 1: Graduation.....	34
1—Indicator Data.....	35
1—Prior FFY Required Actions.....	36
1—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response	36
1—Required Actions.....	36
Indicator 2: Drop Out.....	37
2—Indicator Data.....	38
2—Prior FFY Required Actions.....	39
2—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response	39
2—Required Actions.....	39
Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs.....	40
3A—Indicator Data.....	41
3A—Prior FFY Required Actions.....	43
3A—OSEP Response.....	43
3A—Required Actions.....	43
Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)	44
3B—Indicator Data	45
3B—Prior FFY Required Actions	48
3B—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response.....	48
3B—Required Actions	48
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)	49
3C—Indicator Data	50
3C—Prior FFY Required Actions	54
3C—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response	54
3C—Required Actions.....	54
Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)	55
3D—Indicator Data.....	56
3D—Prior FFY Required Actions.....	58
3D—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response.....	58
3D—Required Actions.....	58
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion.....	59
4A—Indicator Data.....	61
4A—Prior FFY Required Actions.....	64

4A—OSEP Response	64
4A—Required Actions	64
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion	65
Instructions and Measurement	65
4B—Indicator Data	68
4B—Prior FFY Required Actions	71
4B—OSEP Response	71
4B—Required Actions	71
Indicator 5: Education Environments (Children Five (Kindergarten)–21)	72
5—Indicator Data	73
5—Prior Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) Required Actions	74
5—OSEP Response	74
5—Required Actions	74
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments	75
6—Indicator Data	76
6—Prior FFY Required Actions	78
6—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response	78
6—Required Actions	78
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes	79
7—Indicator Data	81
7—Prior FFY Required Actions	86
7—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response	86
7—Required Actions	86
Indicator 8: Parent involvement	87
Instructions and Measurement	87
8—Indicator Data	88
8—Prior FFY Required Actions	93
8—OSEP Response	94
8—Required Actions	94
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation	95
9—Indicator Data	97
9—Prior FFY Required Actions	99
9—OSEP Response	99
9—Required Actions	99
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories	100

10—Indicator Data	102
10—Prior FFY Required Actions	104
10—OSEP Response	104
10—Required Actions	104
Indicator 11: Child Find.....	105
11—Indicator Data	106
11—Prior FFY Required Actions	110
11—OSEP Response	112
11—Required Actions	112
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition.....	113
12—Indicator Data	114
12—Prior FFY Required Actions	119
12—OSEP Response	120
12—Required Actions	120
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition.....	121
13—Indicator Data	122
13—Prior FFY Required Actions	126
13—OSEP Response	128
13—Required Actions	128
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes.....	129
14—Indicator Data	132
14—Prior FFY Required Actions	136
14—OSEP Response	136
14—Required Actions	136
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions	137
15—Indicator Data	138
15—Prior FFY Required Actions	139
15—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response.....	139
15—Required Actions	139
Indicator 16: Mediation	140
16—Indicator Data	140
16—Prior FFY Required Actions	142
16—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response.....	142
16—Required Actions	142
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan	143

17—Indicator Data	146
17—Prior FFY Required Actions	178
17—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response.....	178
17—Required Actions	178
Indicator 18: General Supervision.....	179
18--Indicator Data	180
18 - OSEP Response.....	192
18 - Required Actions.....	192
Certification.....	193
DETERMINATION ENCLOSURES.....	194
RDA Matrix	194
Data Rubric.....	196
APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data	198
How the Department Made Determinations.....	199

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.

Washington's commitment to systemic improvement is strengthened by invested partners who build on existing successes, provide constructive feedback, and collaboratively improve processes. Over the past five years, efforts have been centered on enhancing inclusionary practices. This collaborative work has been a priority of divisions across the agency that work together to codesign systems that target key areas identified through data.

The outcomes are tangible and drive current and future efforts, with statewide data showing improvements and areas for growth highlighted through disaggregation. For instance, while placement data showed overall progress, disaggregated data revealed slower growth for Black students with disabilities and students spending less than 40% of their time in general education

settings and students with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities continuing to spend the majority of their days in separate educational settings. This realization refocused efforts to address the needs of the most marginalized students, paving the way for broader systemic improvements. This evolution is reflected in the Inclusionary Practices Project (IPP), which has grown into the Inclusionary Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN), ensuring a sustained and data-driven approach to fostering inclusivity for all students in Washington, by focusing on those students who continue to experience a lack of choice and opportunity across public education.

Over the course of the last five years and in response to both federal and local efforts to provide greater coherence, the SEA has continued to be deliberate and intentional about coordinated efforts to drive systemic change. 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 21, 2024, 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) 2022 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);
- Data Center for Addressing Significant Disproportionality (DCASD)
- 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;
- 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 strong, dynamic, and responsive. The Technical Assistance (TA) provided by OSEP continues to be instrumental in enhancing the capacity of State Education Agency (SEA) special education leadership. This partnership not only supports capacity building but also fosters meaningful changes in both practice and policy.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Continued from Executive Summary:

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 secondary IEP components, postschool outcomes, state assessments, early childhood outcomes, and overall high-quality instruction that can impact these outcomes. We are continuing work to improve our outcomes with increased alignment with 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 continued our efforts to team with family-focused community-based organizations to explore family navigator supports embedded within LEAs and ESDs.

The impact of technical assistance (TA) received over the past year continues to be evident in the strengthened analysis of outcome data for students with disabilities and the continued emphasis on instructional leadership. These efforts have been accompanied by a thorough review of additional research and policy, enabling informed decision-making, and comprehensive efforts towards universal guidance and targeted interventions. Coordinated efforts across divisions inside and outside the SEA that focus on promising practices and the identification of persistent barriers contribute to the understanding of Washington State's educational landscape, directly shaping the strategic priorities of the Special Education Division.

By addressing the root causes associated with observed outcomes, Washington State demonstrates a sustained commitment to driving meaningful and sustainable change. Through continuous collaboration with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and national technical assistance providers, the state maintains a dynamic cycle of analysis, refinement, and implementation. This ensures that improvement efforts remain targeted, relevant, and responsive to the evolving needs of the education system.

The partnership with OSEP has served as a catalyst for informed decision-making, evidence-based instructional leadership, and a shared commitment to improving educational outcomes for students with disabilities. TA efforts have been laser focused on building capacity and fostering a culture of continuous improvement, emphasizing a comprehensive approach that addresses systemic challenges and leverages promising solutions.

In the 2023-24 school year, Washington State continued its work with the Parent Engagement Focus Group, convened as part of the broader State Design Team (SDT). This group has focused on Indicator B-8, which emphasizes parent engagement in the special education process. During the 2023-24 school year, the team has continued its efforts by engaging partners on Indicator B-8 progress with diverse opportunities that allowed families to be contributors across a variety of areas integral to the special education process, including Individual Education Programs, Disproportionality, and Inclusionary Practices, just to name a few.

This year, the Special Education Division is prioritizing the full implementation of a new parent survey tool and process. Prioritizing the revision of this process is another indicator of the state's broader commitment to inclusivity, parent engagement, and the continuous improvement of systems and processes within special education. These efforts are central to advancing outcomes for students with disabilities and ensuring meaningful collaboration with families.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

287

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). Include a description of all the mechanisms the State uses to identify and verify correction of noncompliance and improve results. This should include, but not be limited to, State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which the State is able to determine compliance and/or issue written findings of noncompliance. The State should include the following elements:

Describe the process the State uses to select LEAs for monitoring, the schedule, and number of LEAs monitored per year.

Washington's Integrated System of Monitoring (WISM) monitors LEAs through a data-based system that includes Universal Monitoring (Desk Review), Targeted Review, and Intensive Risk-Based Review (Systems Analysis).

UNIVERSAL MONITORING REVIEWS: All LEAs in the state are monitored annually through a desk review that examines a number of fiscal, data, program, and dispute resolution factors, including but not limited to:

Fiscal:

- Section 611 and 619 budgets, spending plans, expenditure reports, and impact reports (describing, with data, how the LEAs use of funds contributed to improved outcomes both at the student and system levels) Maintenance of Effort documentation, including aggregated expenditure reports with MOE eligibility data
- Excess Cost verification worksheets
- General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) compliance
- Audits reports from the State Auditor's Office (SAO) and LEA resolution of audit findings
- Fiscal Risk Factors – review of LEA performance across 17 fiscal risk factors, which helps to inform OSPI of LEAs that may require deeper review

Data:

- Collection, review, and analysis of special education data reports from all LEAs, including data quality reviews
- Analysis of LEA performance across 17 fiscal risk factors and 13 program risk factors

Dispute Resolution:

- Analysis of dispute resolution trends within LEAs, across LEAs, and across regional Educational Service Districts (ESDs).

Program:

- Student-level IEP content
- Program Risk Factors – review of LEA performance across 13 program risk factors, which helps to inform OSPI of LEAs that may require deeper review
- Annual Determinations are calculated and issued for all LEAs in the state annually, and are reviewed to help inform OSPI of LEAs that require deeper review and/or technical assistance
- Parent engagement results are reviewed for every LEA once every two years to help inform OSPI of LEAs that may benefit from additional resources and/or technical assistance

OSPI's Universal Monitoring activities also include a process for responding to reported concerns, including deeper review when determined to be needed. Information regarding a reported concern may be received via calls and emails to OSPI from educators, parents, community members, education partners, media reports, or other sources.

The number of LEAs receiving Universal Monitoring per year is 287. Most Universal monitoring activities take place June through September, with some occurring at other times throughout the year.

TARGETED MONITORING REVIEWS: LEAs are selected for Targeted Monitoring based on specific

criteria such as Safety Net application, private schools and proportionate share, Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS)/Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS), dispute resolution, correction of non-compliance, disproportionality, etc. All LEAs that meet the criteria (for example, all LEAs that apply for Safety Net) participate in a Targeted Review. Approximately 200 LEAs in total receive Targeted Reviews each year. Targeted Reviews typically take place throughout the year depending on the area being reviewed (i.e., CEIS/CCEIS reviews occur quarterly, dispute resolution is ongoing, Safety Net reviews are in the spring, etc.).

Targeted monitoring reviews include, but are not limited to:

- Safety Net – 153 LEAs received a Targeted Safety Net review in the 2023-24 school year. The review included student IEPs (N=6,112 for 2023-24), billing percentage calculators, transportation cost calculators, purchase orders, contracts, invoices, teacher caseload reports, year-to-date detailed expenditure reports, and personnel reports.
- Private schools/proportionate share – 113 LEAs received a Targeted proportionate share review in the 2023-24 school year. The review included private school count data, LEA's consultation process, written affirmations, proportionate share carry-over, number of students receiving equitable services, what equitable services are being provided, and proportionate share expenditure detail reports.
- CEIS/CCEIS – 7 LEAs received a Targeted CEIS/CCEIS review in the 2023-24 school year. The review included quarterly check-in meetings with LEA program and fiscal staff, CEIS/CCEIS plans and budgets, student data reporting, detailed expenditure reports, and root cause analyses.
- Dispute resolution – 78 LEAs received a Targeted dispute resolution review in the 2023-24 school year. The review included school staff interviews, independent onsite visits (if necessary), student records, school records, data reports, and other relevant information.
- Correction of non-compliance – 121 LEAs received a Targeted correction of non-compliance review (verification/validation) in the 2023-24 school year. The review included corrected IEPs and other student records, updated data reports, information from the LEA's student record system, staff interviews, site visits, and review of other documentation (training materials, agendas, memos, procedural handbooks, etc.).
- Disproportionality – 106 LEAs received a Targeted Disproportionality review in the 2023-24 school year. The review included the results of the LEA's self-review of policies, procedures, and practices; analysis of data; identification of causal factors; and the LEA's plan for addressing the identified root cause(s).
- LEA policies and procedures – 29 LEAs received a Targeted special education policy/procedure review in the 2023-24 school year. The review included comparison of LEA procedures to ensure alignment with state and federal regulations, including any required revisions per changes to state/federal regulations.
- Annual Determinations (enforcement actions) – 18 LEAs received a Targeted Determination Level enforcement action review in the 2023-24 school year. The review included the LEAs implementation of technical assistance resources to address the area(s) in which the LEA did not meet requirements for multiple consecutive years, how the resource was implemented, and the current status of the implementation, including changes that have taken place due to implementing the resource.

INTENSIVE RISK-BASED (SYSTEMS ANALYSIS) REVIEWS: LEAs are selected for Intensive Systems Analysis reviews based on 17 fiscal and 13 program risk factors (described under the Universal

Monitoring section above). Additional factors are also considered, including reported concerns about the LEA, number of years since the LEA last participated in an intensive review, the LEA's size grouping, the LEA's trend data across the State Performance Plan Indicators, and more. Systems Analysis reviews may be conducted through an onsite visit, virtual visit, or self-assessment. In the 2023-24 school year, 37 LEAs participated in a Systems Analysis review. LEAs are selected for Systems Analysis reviews during the summer and notified in late August/early September. The core reviews typically take place November/December through April.

Systems Analysis reviews consist of three phases:

1. Pre-Review – Review of LEA data, documentation submitted by the LEA for the review, cross-divisional internal prep meetings, review of student files, and development of core review schedule.
2. Core Review – Onsite visit (if applicable), provider interviews, administrator interviews, private school administrator and non-traditional program director interviews, request for additional documentation. If onsite, the core review will also include management work sessions, classroom observations, focus groups, parent and student interviews/focus groups, and school-level interviews.
3. Post-Review – Review of additional requested documentation, development and issuing final report/summary of review (including commendations, recommendations, and required actions (if any)).

There are multiple types of Systems Analysis Reviews, including program only, fiscal only, combination program/fiscal, focused/limited, follow-up, exemplar, and self-assessment.

Describe how student files are chosen, including the number of student files that are selected, as part of the State's process for determining an LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements and verifying the LEA's correction of any identified compliance.

Student records, including IEPs and other related documentation, are reviewed as part of all three types of monitoring activities (Universal, Targeted, and Intensive). The number of student records reviewed depends on the specific area being reviewed. Below are some examples:

Universal Monitoring Reviews: We collect and review student IEP information through our new (beginning in 2024-25) statewide Indicator B13 reporting application as part of our Universal monitoring of all LEAs. The number of IEPs selected is based on the LEA's size (1-500 total students = 5 IEPs; 501-2,000 total students = 10 IEPs; 2,001-10,000 total students = 15 IEPs; over 10,000 total students = 20 IEPs). IEPs are selected by LEAs using detailed instructions (File Selection Calculator) provided by OSPI for selecting a set of IEPs that are representative of the LEA. The File Selection Calculator uses the LEA's most recent Child Count data for race/ethnicity, LRE, and disability category, and identifies what portion of the IEPs to be selected should come from each demographic category. For example, if students identified as having Autism represent 10 percent of the LEA's child count, then they should also represent approximately 10 percent of the IEPs to be reviewed.

Targeted Reviews: As part of Targeted Reviews, IEPs for students with high-cost needs submitted to Safety Net are reviewed for documentation of costs and services provided. In the 2024 Safety Net period, a total of 6,127 IEPs were reviewed. The IEPs were selected by the LEA based on the high costs of the student's needs and services.

Intensive Risk-Based (Systems Analysis) Reviews: As part of Systems Analysis reviews (with the exception of self-assessments), the WISM team reviews a stratified sampling of student files, including current and prior IEPs and evaluations, referral documentation, related notices and parent consent, progress reports, High School and Beyond Plans, private school service plans, student schedules, and more. The number of files selected is based on the LEA's size (1-500 total students = 5 files; 501-2,000 total students = 10 files; 2,001-10,000 total students = 15 files; over 10,000 total students = 20 files). The files are selected based on areas in which the LEA was flagged per the program risk assessment (i.e., those factors that contributed to them being selected for intensive review), such as LRE, secondary transition, C to B transition, discipline, disproportionality, etc.

Verification of LEA's correction of identified non-compliance: The verification of the correction of non-compliance includes the review of 100% of the student-level issues of non-compliance identified through any of the three tiers of monitoring, including fiscal, data, dispute resolution, and program improvement. In addition, a sampling of files and/or data are reviewed to ensure that the LEA is currently correctly implementing the identified regulatory requirements. Special education administrators from the LEA's local Educational Service District (ESD), under the direction of OSPI, complete the verification activities, which include onsite visits; review of corrected IEPs, evaluations, and other student-level documentation; meeting agendas; guidance documents; training rosters; interviews with service providers, etc. The documents reviewed as part of the verification depend on what actions the LEA took to correct. For example, if the LEA conducted a staff training, the ESD verifier will review the participant roster, along with the Powerpoint, agenda, and/or other training materials, to confirm that the training took place as described in the LEA's correction summary (including date). OSPI provides annual training and guidance documents to the ESD administrators to assist them in determining the scope of data/number of files to sample to determine if the LEA is correctly implementing the applicable regulatory requirements. ESD administrators review, at a minimum, one student record and/or data report for each individual area of non-compliance identified. The student records and data reports are those that were completed in the current school year and were NOT part of the original finding.

The LEA and ESD provide a detailed summary and assurances of the steps taken to correct the identified non-compliance and the activities completed to verify the correction of the non-compliance, including verifying the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements. OSPI special education program supervisors are assigned to complete the final approval (validation) process using an approval rubric. The LEA and ESD summaries are reviewed by OSPI to ensure:

1. all identified areas of non-compliance within each individual student record have been corrected;
2. the dates of correction and verification are included, are in alignment with each other, and are for the current school year;
3. the LEA has described the identified root cause(s) for any system-level non-compliance, and the actions taken to correct the system directly correlate to the identified root cause(s);
4. the sampling of documentation/data reports verifies the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements;
5. the ESD has verified all actions taken by the LEA; and
6. the LEA and ESD administrator have provided assurances that the information contained in the summaries is valid and accurate.

If any information is missing or concerns are noted, the OSPI program supervisor will contact the ESD director to let them know what is needed. The ESD director will work with the LEA to address the OSPI reviewer's concerns. OSPI reviewers receive annual training on how to review and approve the correction and verification of non-compliance.

Describe the data system(s) the State uses to collect monitoring and SPP/APR data, and the period from which records are reviewed.

LEAs may use any student information system (SIS) that they choose to collect data at the unit (student, teacher, course) level.

Washington's overarching data system is the Education Data System (EDS) – a centralized suite of web-based applications regarding Education Data. EDS has a number of applications under it, which are used for collecting, validating and reporting IDEA Data.

CEDARS is the Comprehensive Education Data and Research System, a longitudinal data warehouse of educational data. Districts report data on courses, students and teachers. Student data includes demographics, enrollment information, schedules, grades and program participation. (<https://ospi.k12.wa.us/data-reporting/reporting/cedars>). LEAs routinely submit data to CEDARS from their SIS. LEAs have a CEDARS Administrator who uploads the CEDARS submission and a District Data Security Manager (DDSM). The DDSM assigns privileges to individuals who would enter data into the SIS, and who have CEDARS permissions.

At a minimum data are submitted monthly, although some districts submit more often (daily or weekly), depending on LEA needs. Data may be submitted through the standard (CEDARS) process or through a CEDARS Non-standard process, depending on the SIS that the LEA uses. Validations are applied during the submission process to ensure valid and accurate data. Validations are outlined in the CEDARS manual. Data verification continues to occur as the data flow into the EDS applications. Within each individual EDS application additional validation and accuracy checks occur each time data are refreshed.

CEDARS creates error reports using the validations for data submitted. The CEDARS Administrators at each LEA then download the submission error reports from CEDARS, to review and correct the data within their SIS. Once data is corrected by the LEA and uploaded into CEDARS successfully, there are reports that summarize data for LEAs and allow LEAs to review aggregate counts and individual records.

After a successful submission to CEDARS, data also populate custom downstream applications under Special Education Reporting in EDS. There are 4 applications:

- Child Count (Indicators 5, 6, 9, 10 and significant disproportionality)
- Early Childhood outcomes (Indicator 7)
- Secondary IEPs (Indicator 13)
- Timeline and C to B Transition (Indicators 11 and 12)

Non-Special Education applications in EDS that collect data used by special education include:

- Behavior and Weapons (Discipline, Indicator 4A and B, and significant disproportionality)
- Graduation Cohort Rates (used to create FS 009 and Indicators 1 and 2 and the list of

- students for Indicator 14)
- Assessment (TIDE)
- WaKids Assessment (Indicator 17)

LEAs (often the special education director or their staff) must review, verify, and validate each student level record within these applications, by clicking each individual record prior to certification/submission. This process locks the record in for historical purposes, until the LEA resubmits the file.

The Special Education Data Team is notified by email when each LEA submits their verified data, in a shared email account. The application's admin tab keeps track of which LEA has submitted what data report. The Special Education Data Team reviews data for duplicate students. The Special Education Data Team reviews data for duplicate students as the data are submitted in the application and verified by LEAs.

Final data from CEDARS and other EDS applications are moved via ETL to Generate for Federal Reporting after data quality work is complete.

Describe how the State issues findings: by number of instances or by LEAs.

With regard to the correction of the identified non-compliance across any area (fiscal, program, data, etc.), findings are issued by the number of instances. LEAs are required to correct all individual instances of non-compliance, and the notification, correction, and verification of non-compliance is tracked at both the individual instance (i.e., student) and LEA level. For the purposes of summarizing the correction of non-compliance findings in the SPP/APR, Washington reports the findings by LEA.

If applicable, describe the adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction).

Washington does not have procedures that permit pre-finding correction.

General Supervision Overview (moved to this section from the "Describe the process the State uses to select LEAs for monitoring, the schedule, and number of LEAs monitored per year" section due to character limitations in the reporting platform):

Washington continues to remain curious about the data and is unwavering in our dedication to creating inclusive and effective learning environments for students with disabilities. The state takes a thoughtful and responsive approach, working to align systems across education, improve developmental, functional, and academic outcomes, and consistently meet 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. 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. In the 23-24 period we have ensured that members of Program Improvement and Dispute Resolution teams, cross-collaborate on a regular basis and as we improve upon measures, like the Systems Analysis review and ensure that the self-assessment addresses cross divisional priorities for effective general supervision.

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 the 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, that also includes a program supervisor that is collocated with Special Education and Learning Options. This lead also 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.

Describe the State’s system of graduated and progressive sanctions to ensure the correction of identified noncompliance and to address areas in need of improvement, used as necessary and consistent with IDEA Part B’s enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

Washington implements a system of sanctions to ensure correction of noncompliance and address areas in need of improvement. The particular sanction selected would depend upon a number of factors, such as the length of time the issue has occurred, the scope of the issue, the severity of the issue’s impact on the provision of FAPE to students. Below are descriptions of actions OSPI has taken, listed in graduated order of severity:

Notifications – Notifications of non-compliance or other required actions are sent via email or through the Education Grants Management System (EGMS) to the LEA’s special education and/or fiscal administrator and are often copied to the LEA’s regional ESD director. The Notifications include a description of the action needed, instructions for completing the action, technical assistance resources to help in completing the activity, and who to contact at OSPI if they need additional assistance.

Email notices/reminders – Sent to the LEA’s special education and/or fiscal administrator and copied to the LEA’s regional ESD director. These are most commonly used when an LEA is late on submitting a report, documentation related to a corrective action, or other required activity. If no adequate response is given to the initial notification emails, additional email(s) will include the LEA’s superintendent.

Requesting a phone call or meeting – If there is no response to the email notice/reminder and/or the LEA is experiencing additional difficulties in completing the required activity, OSPI will schedule a phone call or virtual meeting with LEA staff in order to discuss what is needed and the priority for completion. Technical assistance is also provided during the call/meeting, and could take the form of doing some or all of the required activity together during the call/meeting.

Determination level – The timely correction of non-compliance and other related compliance areas are part of the annual determination level designations for all LEAs. If the LEA has outstanding reports, incomplete required actions, or uncorrected issues of non-compliance, it will affect the LEA’s determination level. LEAs with uncorrected issues of non-compliance are automatically assigned a level 3 (needs intervention) or level 4 (needs substantial intervention). LEAs that are late on even one required federal data report are unable to receive a level 1 (meets requirements) determination. If the determination level is level 2 (needs assistance) for two consecutive years, level 3 (needs intervention) for three consecutive years, or below level 1 (meets requirements) for three consecutive years, additional enforcement actions are taken (see “Technical assistance review”, “Delay or withholding of funds”, and “Action plan” sections below).

Technical assistance review (TAR) – LEAs whose determination level is level 2 (needs assistance) for two consecutive years, level 3 (needs intervention) for three consecutive years, or below level 1 (meets requirements) for three consecutive years, are required to complete a Technical Assistance Review (TAR) worksheet. The TAR identifies the source(s) of technical assistance the LEA has chosen to implement to address the identified area(s) in which they did not meet requirements, describe the implementation of the activity/resource (including dates of implementation), and describe the

status of the activity (including outcomes).

Delay or withholding of Funds – During the review and approval process for the annual IDEA grant applications, each LEA is reviewed to ensure that all required reports/actions have been submitted prior to approving the grant. If the LEA has any outstanding reports or actions, the application will not be approved until the required documentation has been submitted. LEAs are notified of outstanding reports/actions through email notices/reminders and/or requesting a phone call/meeting (both of these are described above). If the LEA's application is already approved but are later determined to not be responding to required actions in spite of all of the activities described above, a hold may be placed on the LEA's federal funds until the actions are complete. In addition, LEAs who receive a Level 4 determination (Needs Substantial Intervention) will have some or all of their federal funds withheld until steps are taken to address the identified area(s).

Action Plan – If the identified issues are pervasive and/or occurring over an extended length of time, OSPI may require the LEA to complete an action plan that includes a root cause analysis (if not already identified), action steps to address the root cause(s), individual(s) responsible for completing each step, dates for completing each step, and evidence of completion. OSPI typically provides the template for the plan, and provides technical assistance and support, typically via virtual meetings, to assist LEAs in completing the plan. Regular check-ins are held with the LEA, either virtually or onsite, to discuss the status of the plan and review documentation to ensure each step is completed.

High-risk Grantee Status – If ongoing, pervasive issues continue to occur, the LEA may be identified as a high-risk grantee. This status typically requires the district to spend a certain amount of funds on a specific activity, such as an independent review of their systems/programs or hiring an expert consultant (with OSPI approval). Funds are typically either specifically directed or withheld until certain actions are taken, as identified in a comprehensive corrective action plan.

Describe how the State makes annual determinations of LEA performance, including the criteria the State uses and the schedule for notifying LEAs of their determinations. If the determinations are made public, include a web link for the most recent determinations.

LEA compliance with IDEA requirements is measured through annual LEA Determinations. All LEAs in Washington receive an annual determination level of (1) Meets Requirements, (2) Needs Assistance, (3) Needs Intervention, or (4) Needs Substantial Intervention. LEAs are notified of their annual determination level via email sent to the superintendent, special education director, and regional ESD director for each LEA in the state. The preliminary determinations are issued annually on November 1st.

The criteria for calculating LEA determination levels includes:

- Unresolved special education audit findings
- Timely correction of non-compliance (including information from ongoing monitoring activities and other public information related to LEA compliance with IDEA 2004)
- Timely and accurate data submissions
- Compliance on indicators B4 (significant discrepancy in discipline that is the result of non-compliance), B9/B10 (disproportionality that is the result of inappropriate identification), B11 (timely initial evaluations), B12 (timely Part C to Part B transition), and B13 (secondary transition IEP components)
- Performance on indicator B14C (post-secondary engagement rates), including post-school

- survey response rates
- Designation of Significant Disproportionality

As previously stated, preliminary determinations are issued annually on November 1st. For any LEAs that will be issued a preliminary determination of level 4 (needs substantial intervention), the Program Improvement Coordinator schedules a meeting with the LEA's special education administrator in October to let them know they will be receiving a level 4 determination and discuss how it was calculated, the ramifications, and the process for requesting a reconsideration.

LEAs have until the last business day of November to request a reconsideration of their determination level if they believe their level is incorrect as a result of OSPI error. The request for reconsideration must include a description of the reason for the request along with evidence/documentation to support the reconsideration. The requests are reviewed and summarized by the Program Improvement Coordinator in early December and shared with the Assistant Superintendent of Special Education and Executive Director of Special Education for discussion and decision regarding the LEA's final determination level.

Determination levels are considered final after the requests have been processed, and the list of final determinations for each LEA are posted by mid-December to OSPI's Determinations webpage: <https://ospi.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/program-improvement/annual-determinations>.

The link to the most recent (2023-24) determinations, issued November 1, 2024, are posted to OSPI's website here: <https://ospi.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/2023-08/idea-determinations.pdf>.

Provide the web link to information about the State's general supervision policies, procedures, and process that is made available to the public.

Revised Code of Washington (State Special Education Policy) – Title 28A.155:
<https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=28A.155>.

Washington Administrative Code (State Special Education Procedures) – Chapter 392-172A:
<https://apps.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=392-172A>.

Policy Guidance and Resources: <https://ospi.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/laws-and-procedures/policy-guidance-and-resources>.

Washington Integrated System of Monitoring (WISM) webpage: <https://ospi.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/program-improvement/washington-integrated-system-monitoring>.

OSPI's Dispute Resolution webpage: <https://ospi.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/dispute-resolution>.

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 ensuring that families, community partners, and individuals with lived experiences are directly informing statewide efforts. Continuous and regularly scheduled 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 the division has developed universal and more targeted guidance that is designed to meet Washington's unique strengths and needs and is driven by what we learn about what districts need to effectively access and implement technical assistance recommendations and resources that address needs informed by data. These decisions are also driven by what families and communities share as top priorities to ensure they can experience meaningful inclusion and a sense of belonging in Washington schools.

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) Focused monitoring in Washington highlights both strengths and challenges in special education, learning from exemplar districts to promote inclusion and addressing statewide efforts to reduce restraint and eliminate isolation.
- f) OSPI's Special Education Monthly Update disseminates guidance briefs and tips and both the OSPI webpage and the Inclusionary Practices Technical Assistance Webpage host resource centers that include technical assistance resources that are organized for eased usability from a variety of partners.

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 provided through semimonthly office hours, offering school and district leaders guidance on special education programming, fiscal matters, and data-related questions. These sessions, often supported by cross-content experts, address a range of critical topics, including graduation pathways, transition services for students with disabilities, and integrating specially designed instruction (SDI) into grade-level, standards-based instruction. These discussions and technical assistance go beyond compliance, reinforcing the state's commitment to improving student outcomes. Over the past year, these office hours have frequently drawn over 100 attendees, consistently engaging Special Education leaders statewide. Additionally, other teams within the Special Education division, including fiscal/data, program improvement, and early childhood special education, host their own office hours to ensure partners have continuous access to resources and guidance across all aspects of special education.

Technical assistance resources are delivered through Coordinated Service Agreements (CSAs) with the nine regional Educational Service Districts (ESDs) and the statewide Inclusionary Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN). The ESDs leverage their deep understanding of regional needs to align their support with indicators in the State Performance Plan and emerging local priorities, in close partnership with the State Education Agency (SEA). Recognizing the increasing demand for mental health and behavioral support, state-level activity funds have been allocated to strengthen partnerships with ESDs to enhance therapeutic programs. These initiatives aim to provide robust alternatives to Non-Public Agencies (NPAs) by focusing on intensive behavioral and mental health supports for students so that educators and systems are equipped to keep students at their neighborhood schools. Additionally, significant efforts have been made to address educator recruitment and retention challenges, particularly in special education, by promoting collaboration between the SEA, ESDs, and local districts. Cross-divisional partnerships, such as with the Office of System and School Improvement, have enhanced School Improvement Plans (SIPs) and strategies to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. Over the past year, ESDs have worked collaboratively, pooling resources to provide more cohesive and comprehensive services. This coordinated effort reflects a commitment to improving student outcomes and fostering equitable, inclusive educational environments across the state.

The Inclusionary Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN) builds on the foundation of the former Inclusionary Practices Project (IPP) while expanding its scope and partnerships. The IPTN now includes the professional development organizations, partners from the State Needs Project, Educational Service District (ESD) leadership, other state agencies, and a dedicated advisory group. This expanded network operates collaboratively, significantly enhancing statewide capacity-building efforts. The IPTN continues its focus on identifying and utilizing data that reflect family and student experiences and outcomes, aligning priorities and efforts to demonstrate how meaningful inclusion is being realized beyond Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) reporting. By leveraging the strengths of the IPP, the IPTN aims to address persistent inequities, eliminate barriers that exclude students, and shift the focus from merely implementing inclusionary practices to achieving measurable inclusionary outcomes.

The IPTN collaboration is a statewide comprehensive effort that is building capacity for sustainable, high-fidelity implementation of effective education practices to maximize academic and social outcomes for all P-12 students, with a focus on who data shows is most marginalized and has the least access to general education within Washington public schools. 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 engages 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.

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 continuous improvement, promote collaboration, and prioritize a cohesive approach across the education system. Strategic alignment addresses both state and local needs, prioritizing family involvement in educational design and content. Key features include:

Data-Driven Approach: Design and implementation of PD structures are informed by thorough data analyses that help 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 align 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 improving individual skills around instructional leadership but also on engaging leaders in the development of effective system processes and support structures.

Culture of Collaboration: A key goal of the PD 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 PD 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. The goal is for everyone to see that they have a role in improving student outcomes.

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.

Our partnership with the CEEDAR Center has been instrumental in advancing our efforts to support instructional leadership for students with disabilities across the state. Together we have delved deeply into innovation configurations and analyzed statewide data to inform partnerships and

practices with our educator preparation programs (EPPs). This collaboration focuses on developing an Inclusive Educator Profile, which integrates the Advanced Inclusive Principal Leadership work undertaken with CCSSO into our own initiatives. By fostering a shared understanding among agencies, organizations, EPPs, and PK-12 schools, we aim to identify existing pathways and pipelines, enhance recruitment strategies, and conduct comparative analyses of programs to strengthen inclusive education statewide.

The Keeping Exceptional Special Educators (KESE) grant continues to provide valuable context and support to Washington's special education recruitment and retention efforts by providing PD, technical assistance, and workforce data analyses. The KESE team supports goals like expanding the hiring pool, improving certification pathways, enhancing induction for novices, and improving 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), and OSPI Departments (Native Education, BEST, School Improvement, Certification, Bilingual, ELL & Dual Language). Together with the Title IIA office at OSPI, the KESE team provides grant funding to LEAs who are committed to improving recruitment and retention among their special education teams. Through these efforts more than 30 districts have attracted new teacher candidates, guided and funded paraeducators through certification, built cross-school support teams, developed teacher incentive programs, and provided crucial PD Opportunities.

Partners in Related Initiatives: 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 coordinated efforts and the strengths of organizations across the state. 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 continues to analyze statewide data and operates under the following network 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 IPTN engaged 623 district level administrators, 706 building

level administrators, 2,128 education staff associates (those in roles such as counselors, speech language pathologists, social workers, and nurses), 6,799 general education teachers, 3,885 special education teachers, 1,706 paraeducators, and almost 200 family and community partners, from over 238 districts statewide. These numbers don't include the close to 4,000 educators whose roles were not documented and the additional 100 educators who were IPP partners, higher education partners, preservice teachers and administrators, board members and students. These numbers illustrate a reach of almost 20,000 educators, over just the past year, directly engaged in IPTN professional development opportunities and efforts.

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 and are learning new ways to provide services to districts that are not reliant on state funds. 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 as are continued efforts to coordinate efforts and learn from one another, which is prioritized within the network and across the SEA.

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 State Design Team (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, and other accommodations as needed.

Focus Groups & Areas of Analysis: 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. The focus groups met several times during the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years.

Since target setting, the SDT continued to meet in the 2022-23 and 2023-24 school years to receive indicator data/target updates, review indicator data and SPP/APR findings, and to provide feedback on priority areas, such as the IPTN and the OSPI Special Education Systemic Equity Review (SER).

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).

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) Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Inclusion Champions Network: This network focuses on promoting inclusive practices in all early childhood learning environments considered placement options for children with disabilities. (PreK, TK, Kindergarten, etc.).

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.

University of Denver PELE Center BB4B Sites: The UD PELE Center offer intensive technical assistance to local districts currently engaged in the state systemic improvement plan (SSIP) and are currently exhibiting readiness for stages 3 (implementation-full) and 4 (scale up) of Implementation Science relating to inclusion and inclusionary practices.

Regional ECSE Inclusion Champions: ECSE Implementation Specialists from 9 ESDs facilitate monthly collaborations with local districts offering technical assistance, professional development, and coaching on a variety of topics (Pyramid Model, K-12 MTSS alignment, discipline interventions, data analysis).

Community Inclusion Teams: As part of the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) grant supporting efforts to scale up and sustain inclusion policies and procedures, ECSE Implementation Specialists and local district teams have created Community Inclusion Teams, extending their implementation practices beyond the school boundaries to include the larger vision of inclusion and inclusionary practices within the infrastructures of a community based program and/or agency.

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 2023-24, the IPTN engaged almost 20,000 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.

During the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school years, 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 sustained and ongoing 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:

142

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.

Since target setting, the SDT continued to meet in the 2022-23 and 2023-24 school years to receive indicator data/target updates, review indicator data and SPP/APR findings, and to provide feedback on priority areas, such as the IPTN and the OSPI Special Education Systemic Equity Review (SER).

In 2022-23 and 2023-24, 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 and are included across activities, including our continued work on statewide IEP improvements and cross divisional collaborations that are highlighted below. Furthermore, the IPTN Family Engagement Collaborative continues to engage across critical drivers for change that directly target our priorities, targets and goals related to the activities that started 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 IPTN Family Engagement Collaborative continues to play a pivotal role in providing leadership to other 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. One of the drivers that communities of practice are engaged in to disrupt segregated systems of disproportionality as part of the IPTN includes innovative family and community engagement, recognizing that this is necessary across all other 5 drivers as well.

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. In 2023-24, there were ongoing efforts to engage these partners in improvement efforts based on their engagement in the SDT. Over the 2023-24 school year, this included engagement in a special education systemic equity review, opportunities to provide experiences and input to a statewide IEP feasibility study, and partnership in the development of universal guidance that was developed in partnership with the TIES Center.

Cross-divisional SEA Family Engagement: Leadership from the Special Education Division actively collaborates with other divisions across the agency to ensure students with disabilities are meaningfully included in broader efforts to improve student outcomes. These efforts are rooted in a commitment to co-design and authentic collaboration, intentionally involving families and individuals with lived experiences to guide our work.

Examples of this collaborative approach include: Reducing Restraint and Eliminating Isolation Partnership: Partnering with the Student Engagement and Supports Division, we engage families and individuals with lived experiences in focus groups and as ongoing reviewers, ensuring their insights shape our efforts. This partnership focuses on building systems grounded in positive behavior support practices, reducing reliance on restraint, and eliminating isolation in schools statewide.

Standards Review Team: Our team plays a key role in working with OSPI content leads in literacy, math, and science to ensure revised standards reflect diverse learners. This includes creating a family and caregiver guide to support understanding and implementation of the updated standards.

Partnership with the Office of System and School Improvement: Through regular data analysis, we identify professional development needs and prioritize support for students with disabilities in school improvement plans, ensuring these efforts are data-driven and impactful.

These examples demonstrate our commitment to integrating the needs of students with disabilities into agency-wide efforts to improve student outcomes and engage families as an integral part of those efforts.

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 played 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 2023-24 partners were asked to provide feedback and make adjustments to the draft memo that was part of the Systemic Equity Review (SER) and to continue to engage in activities that are tied to our division priorities and are ongoing, including statewide IEP feedback while exploring a feasibility study, the agencies work to reduce restraint and isolation and to engage in learning about inclusive systems that are showing improvement and/or serve as exemplars across our state, based on the experiences in Washington, to more intentionally inform our guidance.

Additional information:

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 IPTN partner organizations in 2023-24 were featured and hyperlinked on the main webpage for the statewide IPP (www.k12.wa.us/IPTN) and have resources they have developed highlighted on the webpage as part of a central resource center.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2022 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 2022 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 2022 APR in 2024, 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 2022 data were posted (<https://ospi.k12.wa.us/student-success/special-education/special-education-data-collection>) in March 2024. 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 (RSS feeds, Facebook, Instagram) and available to the media and families. This information is also distributed in the Special Education Monthly update, through the Partnerships for Action Voices for Empowerment (PAVE) PTI Center, to partner committees who are active in the activities described in this report, and to the SEAC. This information is also presented at regional ESD meetings and when sharing data and priorities at statewide and national conferences.

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 "Score 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 "Score 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 "Score 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 "Score 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 "Score Details".

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

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 *EDFacts* file specification FS009.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	58.10%	61.30%	71.00%	72.00%	73.00%
Data	69.86%	62.24%	73.91%	76.13%	75.87%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) above in the Introduction for a detailed description.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	6,553
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	71
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	2,007

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
6,553	8,631	75.87%	74.0%	75.92%	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 2023:

1. Develop a High School and Beyond Plan (HSBP) - All students, with the help of educators and students' families, if possible, must build a HSBP that shows how they will meet state and local graduation requirements and prepare for what they want to do following high school. A student's HSBP, which starts no later than 8th grade, is annually revised by students throughout high school to adjust for changing interests and goals.
2. Complete a Graduation Pathway - Students will complete one or more graduation pathways to demonstrate their preparation for a meaningful first step after high school, which could include engaging in work, starting an apprenticeship, attending college, or joining the military. The graduation pathway(s) chosen by a student must be aligned with their HSBP. Pathways for the Class of 2023 included:
 - a. Career/Technical Education (CTE) Sequence
 - b. Military - ASVAB Exam (AFQT Section only)
 - c. English Language Arts (ELA) and Math Courses and Exams (including ACT, SAT, AP/IB/Cambridge, CTE Dual Credit, Running Start, Smarter Balanced Assessment, WA-AIM (alternate state assessment), and transition courses).
3. Complete High School Subject Area Requirements - All students must complete specific course requirements, including any Personalized Pathway Requirement courses, and other credit requirements established by their local districts.

Through course completion and credit-earning opportunities aligned to the state's Learning Standards, students gain the needed communication and subject area knowledge and skills outlined in Washington's Goals of Basic Education. The total credits required for the Class of 2023 was 24 credits, plus any additional LEA requirements.

For more information on these requirements, see the Class of 2023 Graduation Toolkit:

https://ospi.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/2023-08/graduation_toolkit_class_of_2023_final.pdf

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

NO

1—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

Response

None

1—Required Actions

None

INDICATOR 2: DROP OUT

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

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

Data Source

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

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 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target <=	5.45%	5.45%	31.00%	30.50%	29.0%
Data	6.61%	6.81%	25.75%	23.63%	23.94%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) above in the Introduction for a detailed description.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	6,553
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	71
SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	02/21/2024	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	2,007

FFY 2023 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 2021 data	FFY 2022 target	FFY 2022 data	Status	Slippage
2,007	6,553	23.94%	27.5%	23.25%	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

2—Required Actions

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 = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment}}{\text{total \# of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window}} \right]$. 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](#) above in the Introduction for a detailed description.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from ED*Facts*

Data Source: SY 2023–24 Assessment Data Groups—Reading (ED*Facts* file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date: 01/10/2025

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	14,519	11,333	11,142
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	6,835	4,847	5,241
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	6,064	4,635	3,249
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	837	644	773

Data Source: SY 2023–24 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*	14,515	11,328	11,130
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	7,519	4,115	4,959
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	5,367	5,303	3,355
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	835	642	773

- (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 2023 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs participating	Number of children with IEPs	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	13,736	14,519	94.07%	95%	94.61%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	10,126	11,333	88.31%	95%	89.35%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	9,263	11,142	82.55%	95%	83.14%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group name	Number of children with IEPs participating	Number of children with IEPs	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	13,721	14,515	93.82%	95%	94.53%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	10,060	11,328	87.51%	95%	88.81%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	9,087	11,130	80.62%	95%	81.64%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

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

Choose Student 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

3A—Required Actions

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](#) above in the Introduction for a detailed description.

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2023 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Date Source: School Year (SY) 2023–24 Assessment Data Groups—Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date: 01/10/2025

Reading Assessment Proficiency 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	12,899	9,482	8,490
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,338	1,045	1,416
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	686	349	541

Date Source: SY 2023–24 Assessment Data Groups—Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date: 01/10/2025

Math Assessment Proficiency 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	12,886	9,418	8,314
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,544	680	414
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	492	184	72

(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 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3,024	12,899	23.68%	70.3	23.44%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,394	9,482	14.91%	70.3	14.70%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,957	8,490	22.02%	70.3	23.05%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3,036	12,886	23.8%	69	23.56%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	864	9,418	8.34 %	69	9.17%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	486	8,314	5.8%	69	5.85%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

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

Choose Student 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>.

3B—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

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

3B—Required Actions

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](#) above in the Introduction for a detailed description.

FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from ED*FACTS*

Data Source: School Year (SY) 2023–24 Assessment Data Groups—Reading (ED*FACTS* file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date: 01/10/2025

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	837	644	773
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	242	243	289

Data Source: School Year (SY) 2023–24 Assessment Data Groups —Math (ED*FACTS* file spec FS185; Data Group: 583)

Date: 01/10/2025

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	835	642	773
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	290	219	406

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	242	837	33.72%	70.3	28.91%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	243	644	37.06%	70.3	37.73%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	289	773	41.76%	70.3	37.39%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

In the area of reading, for both grade 4 and high school, our FFY 2023 data indicates that slippage occurred.

In a review of the two previous years of data it is important to note the following:

- In FFY 2021 slippage occurred in the area of reading for all tested grades, in the current year slippage is only seen in grade 4 and high school.
- In the two previous years (FFY 2021 and 2022) the data for grade 8 reading and math showed slippage which is not present in the current year (FFY 2023).
- The number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment remains relatively consistent between years.

There are several key factors that contributed to observed slippage in performance data for students with the most complex disabilities who participated in the alternate state assessment, particularly in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math for grades 4 and high school which show slippage. These factors are multifaceted, encompassing educational, developmental, and assessment-related considerations.

- Washington state continues to observe an increase in the level of support needs for all students, including students with disabilities. This impact has been observed most acutely in students with the most extensive support needs who participate in the alternate state assessment.
- Additionally, the SEA has been working with partners in our agency's Assessment office and with schools and districts statewide to reexamine the profile of students participating in the alternate state assessment, including reducing the number of students who do not meet eligibility criteria, such as students who are eligible under Specific Learning Disability and Communication Disorder. The reduction of students who are not correctly identified as eligible for the alternate state assessment impacts the overall proficiency scores.
- It should be noted that due to ongoing impacts related to COVID-19, aggregated test performance results from 2021-2024 WA-AIM administrations remain lower than pre-pandemic levels and thus should be interpreted in the context of several factors, including possible disrupted learning during previous school years, differences in instructional delivery methods (e.g., online, in-person, or hybrid model), and higher absence rates for both students and staff, contributing to the slippage in proficiency rates.

In FFY 2020: Reading G4: 41.51%, G8: 46.22%, HS: 40.08% & Math G4: 41.65%, G8: 44.00%, HS: 58.70%

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

N/A

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

See information provided in Group A.

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	290	835	37.53%	69	34.73%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	219	642	34.26%	69	34.11%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	406	773	56.95%	69	52.52%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

In the area of math, for both grade 4 and high school, our FFY 2023 data indicates that slippage occurred.

In a review of the two previous years of data it is important to note the following:

- In FFY 2021 slippage occurred in the area of reading for all tested grades, in the current year slippage is only seen in grade 4 and high school.
- In the two previous years (FFY 2021 and 2022) the data for grade 8 reading and math showed slippage which is not present in the current year (FFY 2023).
- The number of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment remains relatively consistent between years.

There are several key factors that contributed to observed slippage in performance data for students with the most complex disabilities who participated in the alternate state assessment, particularly in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math for grades 4 and high school which show slippage. These factors are multifaceted, encompassing educational, developmental, and assessment-related considerations.

- Washington state continues to observe an increase in the level of support needs for all students, including students with disabilities. This impact has been observed most acutely in students with the most extensive support needs who participate in the alternate state assessment.
- Additionally, the SEA has been working with partners in our agency's Assessment office and with schools and districts statewide to reexamine the profile of students participating in the alternate state assessment, including reducing the number of students who do not meet eligibility criteria, such as students who are eligible under Specific Learning Disability and Communication Disorder. The reduction of students who are not correctly identified as eligible for the alternate state assessment impacts the overall proficiency scores.
- It should be noted that due to ongoing impacts related to COVID-19, aggregated test performance results from 2021-2024 WA-AIM administrations remain lower than pre-pandemic levels and thus should be interpreted in the context of several factors, including possible disrupted learning during previous school years, differences in instructional delivery methods (e.g., online, in-person, or hybrid model), and higher absence rates for both students and staff, contributing to the slippage in proficiency rates.

In FFY 2020: Reading G4: 41.51%, G8: 46.22%, HS: 40.08% & Math G4: 41.65%, G8: 44.00%, HS: 58.70%

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

N/A

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

See information provided in Group A.

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

None

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

3C—Required Actions

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 *EDFacts* 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 2023-2024 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 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 2023-2024 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](#) above in the Introduction for a detailed description.

Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2023 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source: School Year (SY) 2023–24 Assessment Data Groups—Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date: 01/10/2025

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	77,154	76,057	77,714
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	12,899	9,482	8,490
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	37,506	37,386	50,806
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	862	517	682
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,338	1,045	1,416
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	686	349	541

(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 2023–24 Assessment Data Groups—Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 583)

Date: 01/10/2025

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	77,215	75,828	76,821
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	12,886	9,418	8,314
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	37,273	26,716	25,584
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	632	278	113
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,544	680	414
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	492	184	72

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	23.44%	49.73%	26.51	17.10pp	26.29pp	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	14.70%	49.83%	36.47	28.90pp	35.13pp	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	23.05%	66.25%	43.91	32.90pp	43.20pp	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	23.56%	49.09%	25.63	17.90pp	25.53%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	9.17%	35.60%	26.08	24.40pp	26.43%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5.85%	33.45%	27.51	23.50pp	27.60%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

3D—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

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

3D—Required Actions

INDICATOR 4A: SUSPENSION/EXPULSION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

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

Results Indicator

Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), 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 2022-2023 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2022-2023 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2023-2024, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2022-2023 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 2023 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2022-2023 (which can be found in the FFY 2022 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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2021
Target <=	2.50%	2.25%	3.16%	2.91%	2.66%
Data	1.79%	3.19%	0.71%	0.00%	2.12%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) above in the Introduction for a detailed description.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State’s n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State’s cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

LEAs must have a minimum cell size of at least two students with out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days, and a minimum "n" size of 10 total students with IEPs enrolled in the LEA.

If yes, the State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy.

The minimum n and cell sizes were determined through a comprehensive process involving the State Design Team (SDT) as described in the "Description of Stakeholder Input" section above. The SDT's Disproportionality (Indicator 4-9-10) Focus Group consisted of 44 members, including 8 individuals with disabilities, 14 parents/family members, 8 community partners, 5 advocates, 6 state agency personnel, and 33 educational staff and administrators (note: many participants had multiple roles).

Over the course of several meetings, with homework in between, the focus group participants reviewed the indicator definition, historical data, and different methodologies for calculating and determining a significant discrepancy. A comparison of the results of the various methodologies was also conducted and reviewed by this focus group.

The recommendations of the focus group, including the minimum n and cell sizes, were reviewed and approved by the state's Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC).

The focus group and SEAC determined that a n size of 10 aligned with data suppression rules and was the same as n sizes used for other data analyses and indicators. It was determined that a cell size of 2 eliminated the possibility of an LEA being identified as significantly discrepant due to the suspension of a single student, but was also small enough to ensure the state and LEAs were sufficiently examining potential concerns related to discipline practices.

It is important to note that all LEAs are examined under this indicator regardless of their n or cell sizes. However, LEAs that do not meet the n or cell size after OSPI's initial examination are not required to take any additional actions.

If yes, the State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

No change from FFY 2022.

If yes, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

No change from FFY 2022.

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n/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.

1

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the state's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
4	285	2.12%	2.41%	1.40%	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. One district was excluded from the FFY 2023 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 2023 using 2022–2023 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", four districts had a rate difference over 2.0 and were therefore identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2023 (using school year 2022-23 data).

For all four 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 2023, 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 four 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 2022

Findings of noncompliance identified	Findings of noncompliance verified as corrected within one year	Findings of noncompliance subsequently corrected	Findings not yet verified as corrected
6	6	0	0

4A—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A—OSEP Response

4A—Required Actions

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 = [(# 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) divided by the (# of LEAs 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 "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State must provide a

definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, by race and ethnicity, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA, by race and ethnicity).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), 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:

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the 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.

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and

expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

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 2022-2023 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2022-2023 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2023-2024, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2022-2023 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 2022-2023 (which can be found in the FFY 2022 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 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 Memorandum 23-01, dated July.

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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable

indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target <=	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State’s n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State’s cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities, by race and ethnicity, who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

LEAs must have a minimum cell size of at least two students with out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days, and a minimum "n" size of 10 total students with IEPs enrolled in the LEA.

If yes, the State also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy.

The minimum n and cell sizes were determined through a comprehensive process involving the State Design Team (SDT) as described in the "Description of Stakeholder Input" section above. The SDT's Disproportionality (Indicator 4-9-10) Focus Group consisted of 44 members representing 6 of

the 7 federal race/ethnicity groups, including 8 individuals with disabilities, 14 parents/family members, 8 community partners, 5 advocates, 6 state agency personnel, and 33 educational staff and administrators (note: many participants had multiple roles).

Over the course of several meetings, with homework in between, the focus group participants reviewed the indicator definition, historical data, and different methodologies for calculating and determining a significant discrepancy. A comparison of the results of the various methodologies was also conducted and reviewed by this focus group.

The recommendations of the focus group, including the minimum n and cell sizes, were reviewed and approved by the state's Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC).

The focus group and SEAC determined that a n size of 10 aligned with data suppression rules and was the same as n sizes used for other data analyses and indicators. It was determined that a cell size of 2 eliminated the possibility of an LEA being identified as significantly discrepant due to the suspension of a single student, but was also small enough to ensure the state and LEAs were sufficiently examining potential concerns related to discipline practices.

It is important to note that all LEAs are examined under this indicator regardless of their n or cell sizes. However, LEAs that do not meet the n or cell size after OSPI's initial examination are not required to take any additional actions.

If yes, the State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

No change from FFY 2022.

If yes, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

No change from FFY 2022.

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.

22

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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
38	0	264	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

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

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. Twenty-two districts were excluded from the FFY 2023 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 2023 using 2022–2023 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", 38 districts had a rate difference over 2.0 and were therefore identified as having a significant discrepancy in FFY 2023 (using school year 2022-23 data).

All 38 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 2022

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

4B—Required Actions

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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	2020	Target >=	55.00%	57.00%	60.00%	61.70%	63.4%
A	59.99%	Data	56.63%	57.73%	59.99%	59.99%	62.37%
B	2020	Target <=	12.96%	12.75%	12.20%	12.13%	12.06%
B	12.15%	Data	12.83%	12.43%	12.15%	12.15%	11.65%
C	2020	Target <=	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	0.99%
C	0.98%	Data	0.89%	0.95%	0.98%	0.98%	0.96%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) above in the Introduction for a detailed description.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	147,652
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	96,042
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16,003
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	935
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	208
SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/31/2024	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	167

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 2023 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 2022 data	FFY 2023 target	FFY 2023 data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	96,042	147,652	62.37 %	65.10%	65.05%	Did Not Meet target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16,003	147,652	11.65 %	11.99%	10.84%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged five (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.	1,307	147,652	0.96%	0.99%	0.86%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator. (Optional)

5—Prior Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) Required Actions

None

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 *EDFacts* file specification FS089.

Measurement

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

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 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	Target >=	29.20%	29.20%	21.04%	23.24%	25.44%
A	Data	25.29%	26.39%	21.04%	25.71%	31.09%
B	Target <=	37.80%	37.80%	53.50%	51.40%	49.3%
B	Data	40.71%	39.03%	53.50%	49.41%	43.28%
C	Target <=			1.00%	0.90%	0.80%
C	Data			0.53%	0.59%	0.45%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) above in the Introduction for a detailed description.

Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

Inclusive Targets—6A, 6B

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

Inclusive Targets—6C

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

Prepopulated Data

Data Source: SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date: 7/31/2024

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 Total
Total number of children with IEPs	4,428	6,736	1,262	12,426
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	1,252	2,412	458	4,122
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,981	2,397	417	4,795
b2. Number of children attending separate school	98	142	36	276
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	4	14	0	18
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	19	28	10	57

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 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 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	4,122	12,426	31.09%	27.64%	33.17%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	5,089	12,426	43.28%	47.20%	40.95%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	57	12,426	0.45%	0.70%	0.46%	Met target	No Slippage

6—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response

6—Required Actions

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:

- 1) Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- 2) Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- 3) Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- 4) Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- 5) 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A1	2020	Target >=	83.60%	83.70%	87.00%	87.40%	87.90%
A1	87.01%	Data	91.00%	89.59%	87.01%	87.29%	83.72%
A2	2020	Target >=	51.20%	51.20%	38.10%	39.30%	40.40%
A2	38.14%	Data	47.89%	44.43%	38.14%	40.69%	37.85%
B1	2020	Target >=	82.60%	82.70%	86.00%	86.50%	87.00%
B1	86.01%	Data	88.97%	88.77%	86.01%	86.71%	83.60%
B2	2020	Target >=	52.20%	52.20%	37.56%	38.80%	40.10%
B2	37.56%	Data	48.74%	44.77%	37.56%	38.39%	38.30%
C1	2020	Target >=	81.60%	81.70%	86.65%	87.10%	87.50%
C1	86.65%	Data	89.50%	88.91%	86.65%	86.81%	82.63%
C2	2020	Target >=	66.20%	66.20%	48.06%	49.30%	50.40%
C2	48.06%	Data	60.43%	54.74%	48.06%	48.92%	45.92%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) above in the Introduction for a detailed description.

FFY 2023 State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR) Data

Number of preschool children aged three through five with IEPs assessed

5,603

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	117	2.09%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	567	10.66%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,775	49.53%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,571	28.04%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	543	9.69%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 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>	4,346	5,060	83.72%	88.30%	85.89%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$</i>	2,114	5,603	37.85%	41.60%	37.73%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

Outcome B progress category	Number of children	Percentage of children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	85	1.52%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	721	12.87%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,690	48.01%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,626	29.02%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	481	8.58%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 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:</i> <i>(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	4,316	5,122	83.60%	87.50%	84.26%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> <i>(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,107	5,603	38.30%	41.30%	37.60%	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	108	1.93%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	719	12.87%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,271	40.53%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,744	31.13%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	761	13.58%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 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>	4,015	4,842	82.63%	87.80%	82.63%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$</i>	2,505	5,603	45.92%	51.60%	44.71%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C2	<p>District staff continue to report significant social emotional incidents (physical aggression, running away, unsafe behaviors) of children enrolled in preschool programs, which correlates with a reported increase in exclusionary practices put upon the children exhibiting challenging behaviors in kindergarten. The continued challenge of families' inability to access structured high-quality learning environments with their local district boundaries and data slippage were further compounded by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued staff attrition within district led and community based early childhood

	<p>settings (state and federal preschool programs, child care, developmental preschool programs, transitional kindergarten, and traditional kindergarten settings), impact districts ability to enroll children with disabilities within high quality inclusive settings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts ability to transport and provide services to children with IEPs enrolled in early learning programs across boundaries is limiting and inhibiting children’s ability to access specially designed instruction with their same aged peers within a learning environment that allows for instruction and practice of appropriate behavior skills to meet their needs across settings.
--	--

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

Was sampling Used? (Yes / No)

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 2023 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2023 response rate to the FFY 2022 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

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

YES

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) above in the Introduction for a detailed description.

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2011	21.10%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	22.30%	22.50%	33.10%	33.80%	34.60%
Data	30.27%	32.34%	41.99%	30.16%	28.16%

Targets

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

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
495	1,650	28.16%	35.3%	30.00%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

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: 11,568

Percentage of respondent parents: 14.3%

FFY	2022	2023
Response rate	14.17%	14.3%

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 language), and the potential of non-response bias.

The analyses for the FFY 2023 survey data demonstrated that one race/ethnicity group (parents of students with IEPs identified as Hispanic, -4.45 percentage points) and one disability category (students eligible under the category of Specific Learning Disability, -6.68 percentage points) were underrepresented in the response data. It is important to note that the underrepresentation of these two categories is less than the previous year (FFY 2022). Last year, parents of students with IEPs identified as Hispanic were underrepresented by 9.62 percentage points and students identified as SLD by 10.18 percentage points.

The survey response data were determined to be over-representative of parents of students identified as White/Caucasian (+5.73 percentage points), students eligible under the disability category of Autism (+3.48 percentage points). This was also a decrease in overrepresentation from last year (White was +7.09 percentage points and Autism was +6.05 percentage points).

The results were found to be representative across all of the other disability categories and race/ethnicity groups. In addition, the results were representative across all areas of LRE, grade levels, and survey language.

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

OSPI will be piloting a new parent survey tool and process during the 2024-25 school year, with plans to implement statewide in 2025-26. The state believes that this new comprehensive process, including expanding languages and methods for accessing the survey, will increase the representativeness of the parent survey results moving forward.

Background and Development of New Tool/Process

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.

Previously 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.

As previously stated, the new parent survey tool and process will be piloted during the 2024-25 school year, and will be implemented statewide in 2025-26.

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 described in the section above, the state believes that the new, comprehensive parent survey tool and 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 and students eligible as having a specific learning disability.

Current and previously implemented 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.

As described previously under this indicator, the SDT's Parent Focus Group assisted OSPI in the development of a 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.

We will carefully examine the results of the first years of implementation of the new survey tool to evaluate whether the new process is resulting in an increase in response rate, particularly for parents of Hispanic students and students with SLD.

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 language), and the potential of non-response bias. The review considered the results to be statistically representative of the target population if the response data was +/- 3.0 percentage points of the target population for each characteristic.

With regard to race/ethnicity, the analyses for the FFY 2023 survey data suggest that the results of the survey are statistically underrepresented for parents of students with IEPs identified as Hispanic/Latinx (-4.45 percentage points), and overrepresented for parents of students identified as White/Caucasian (+5.73 percentage points). When examining the survey results for these two groups, it was noted that 31.83 percent of the surveys from parents of Hispanic students reported the school made efforts to partner with them, which is higher than the aggregate survey results for the state (30.00 percent). Conversely, 28.43 percent of parents of White students, who were overrepresented in the survey data, reported the school made efforts to partner with them. This is lower than the state's overall results (30.00 percent). 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. Therefore, the state determined that nonresponse bias with respect to race/ethnicity was impacting the accuracy of overall state results.

With regard to disability categories, The analyses for the FFY 2023 survey data demonstrated that parents of students with IEPs identified under the category of SLD were underrepresented (-6.68 percentage points), and parents of students identified under the category of Autism were overrepresented (+3.48 percentage points). When examining the survey results for these two groups, it was noted that 30.91 percent of the surveys from parents of students with SLD reported the school made efforts to partner with them, which is slightly higher than the aggregate survey results for the state (30.00 percent). For parents of students with Autism, 28.13 percent reported the school made efforts to partner with them, which is lower than the state's overall results (30.00 percent). 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. Therefore, the state determined that nonresponse bias with respect to disability was not impacting the overall state results.

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. 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 piloted in 2024-25 and fully implemented statewide in 2025-26, and will include online versions of the tool in multiple languages, as well as other strategies for increasing response rate 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 also participated 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. A copy of the new instrument, being piloted during the 2024-25 school year, will be submitted with the state's FFY 2024 APR.

8—Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

The analyses for the FFY 2023 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, -4.45 percentage points) and one disability category (students eligible under the category of Specific Learning Disability, -6.68 percentage points). It is important to note that the underrepresentation of these two categories is less than the previous year (FFY 2022). Last year, parents of students with IEPs identified as Hispanic were underrepresented by 9.62 percentage points and students identified as SLD by 10.18 percentage points.

The results were determined to be over-representative of parents of students identified as White/Caucasian (+5.73 percentage points) and students eligible under the disability category of Autism (+3.48 percentage points). This was also a decrease in overrepresentation from last year (White was +7.09 percentage points and Autism was +6.05 percentage points).

The results were found to be representative across all of the other disability categories and race/ethnicity groups. In addition, the results were representative across all areas of LRE, grade levels, and survey language.

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 new parent survey tool and process will be piloted during the 2024-25 school year, and will be implemented statewide in 2025-26. 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.

8—OSEP Response

None

8—Required Actions

In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2024 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 2023 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2024).

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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2023 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.

8

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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
9	0	279	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 LEAs in the state each year with regard to disproportionate representation. The first step of this process includes a data analysis of all LEAs conducted by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). The state utilizes risk ratios and 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 2023 were the Total Enrollment Report submitted by every LEA in the state in October 2023, and the November 2023 Federal Special Education Child Count and Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Report submitted by every LEA in the state.

It is important to note that all LEAs are examined under this indicator regardless of their n or cell sizes. However, LEAs that do not meet the n or cell size after OSPI's initial examination are not required to take any additional actions.

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 nine districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation under Indicator B-9. The state analyzed the nine districts identified through the FFY 2023 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 of 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. If the LEA also completed a self-assessment in the prior year, they were required to provide an update on the status of the activities described in the previous self-assessment as well as describe any changes they have seen as a result of those activities. If revisions were made to the LEA's policies, procedures, or practices as a result of this review, the LEA 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. Four of the identified LEAs reported revisions to their policies, procedures, and practices as a result of this review, including refining MTSS practices through curriculum development, implementing supports and checklists to assist teams in the intervention and evaluation/eligibility processes, professional development, implementation of instructional coach supports, and more. Four of the identified LEAs made revisions to their board-approved special education procedures and submitted a copy to OSPI for review.

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 student record review within the disproportionate cells across designated districts. Following this process, the state determined that all nine 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 2022

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

9—Required Actions

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 2023 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2024).

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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific

regulatory requirements.

10—Indicator Data

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2020	0.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2023 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.

18

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 2022 data	FFY 2023 target	FFY 2023 data	Status	Slippage
48	0	269	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 LEAs in the state each year with regard to disproportionate representation. The first step of this process includes a data analysis of all LEAs conducted by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). The state utilizes risk ratios and alternate risk ratios (RR) for the purpose of determining whether the LEA 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 2023 were the Total Enrollment Report submitted by every LEA in the state in October 2023, and the November 2023 Federal Special Education Child Count and Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Report submitted by every LEA in the state.

It is important to note that all LEAs are examined under this indicator regardless of their n or cell sizes. However, LEAs that do not meet the n or cell size after OSPI's initial examination are not required to take any additional actions.

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 48 LEAs were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation under Indicator B-10. The state analyzed the 48 LEAs identified through the FFY 2023 data review as having disproportionate representation to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

The identified LEAs were required to complete a self-assessment (Disproportionality Workbook). As part of the self-assessment, LEAs were required to conduct a self-review of 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 LEA's plan to address it in the upcoming school year. If the LEA also completed a self-assessment in the prior year, they were required to provide an update on the status of the activities described in the previous self-assessment as well as describe any changes they have seen as a result of those activities. If revisions were made to the LEA's policies, procedures, or practices as a result of this review, the LEA 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. Twenty-one of the identified LEAs reported revisions to their policies, procedures, and practices as a result of this review, including refining MTSS practices through curriculum development, implementing supports and checklists to assist teams in the intervention and evaluation/eligibility processes, professional development, implementation of instructional coach supports, clarification of Section 504 planning versus special education qualification, implementing family nights for multi-language learners and their families, creation of

a family advisory committee, implementation of the Critical Data Review process, development of a new equity policy, and more. Twenty-seven of the identified LEAs made revisions to their board-approved special education procedures and submitted a copy to OSPI for review.

The state examined the results of each LEA’s self-assessment, including the results of the LEA’s self-review of child find, referral, evaluation, and eligibility policies, procedures, and practices. The state provided feedback and technical assistance to LEAs 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 LEA-reported results. The state also completed a student record review within the disproportionate cells across designated districts. Following this process, the state determined that all of the 48 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 2022

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

10—Required Actions

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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

11—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2005	98.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.36%	99.37%	99.72%	98.94%	98.92%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
31,697	31,478	98.92%	100%	99.3%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

219

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 219 children whose evaluations were not completed on time or under federal exception:

- 57.53% (126) were late due to district scheduling and/or staffing issues with no agreement to extend;
- 27.40% (60) agreement to extend did not meet requirements;
- 9.59% (21) were due to data/tracking errors;
- 5.48% (12) were late due to other issues not specified by the district.

Regarding the range of days for the 219 students reported above, a total of 61.64 (135) were delayed 15 school days or less and 38.36% (84) 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 2022

Findings of noncompliance identified	Findings of noncompliance verified as corrected within one year	Findings of noncompliance subsequently corrected	Findings not yet verified as corrected
68	68	0	0

FFY 2022 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 2023 to 68 LEAs that were determined to not meet the IDEA implementation requirements for Indicator B-11 (i.e., all LEAs that were not at 100% for this indicator) for the 2022-23 school year per the Indicator B-11 report submitted by LEAs on July 15, 2023.

In order to verify that the LEAs were correctly implementing the identified regulatory requirements related to C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1), verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the LEA’s regional Educational Service District (ESD), under the direction of 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 included a review of documentation, including updated data reports for the 2023-24 school year showing evidence of timely initial evaluations; student records; information from the LEA’s student information system; and more.

The LEA and ESD provided a detailed summary and assurances of the actions taken to correct the identified non-compliance and the activities completed to verify the correction of the non-compliance, including verifying the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements. These were submitted by LEA and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from LEAs as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2024, and from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 3, 2024). OSPI special education program supervisors reviewed the LEA and ESD summaries to ensure:

1. all identified areas of non-compliance within each individual student record had been corrected;
2. the dates of correction and verification were included, were in alignment with each other, and were for the current school year (i.e., after the finding was issued);
3. the LEA described the identified root cause(s) for any system-level non-compliance, and the actions taken to correct the system directly correlated to the identified root cause(s);
4. the sampling of documentation/data reports verified the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements;
5. the ESD verified all actions taken by the LEA; and
6. the LEA and ESD administrator provided assurances that the information contained in the summaries was valid and accurate.

If any information was missing or concerns were noted, the OSPI program supervisor contacted the ESD director to let them know what was needed. The ESD director then worked with the LEA to address the OSPI reviewer's concerns.

The results of these verification and validation activities showed 100% compliance; all 68 LEAs 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*

LEAs identified with non-compliance under Indicator B-11 conducted a root cause analysis to identify the cause(s) for each individual instance of non-compliance, which included a review of policies, procedures, and/or practices that contributed to the noncompliance. Actions were taken by each LEA 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 (due from LEAs as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2024). Actions taken by LEAs were specific to the identified root cause(s) and included activities such as:

- a) providing professional development to LEA 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 LEA's procedures manual/standard operating procedures;
- d) implementing a new LEA practice or form to timely document an agreement to extend the evaluation timeline;
- 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 LEAs corrected the identified non-compliance, verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the LEA's regional Educational Service District (ESD), under the direction of OSPI. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings; staff interviews; data reviews; student record reviews; observations; guidance documents provided to staff; professional development materials and attendee rosters; updated/revised policies, procedures, and practices manuals; staff meeting agendas; and more. The documents reviewed as part of the verification depended on what actions the LEA took to correct. For example, if the LEA conducted a staff training, the ESD verifier reviewed the participant roster, along with the PowerPoint, agenda, and/or other training materials, to confirm that the training took place as described in the LEA's correction summary (including date).

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 LEAs and ESDs administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 3, 2024). OSPI special education program supervisors reviewed the LEA and ESD summaries to ensure:

- a) all identified areas of non-compliance within each individual student record had been corrected;
- b) the dates of correction and verification were included, were in alignment with each other, and were for the current school year (i.e., after the finding was issued);
- c) the LEA described the identified root cause(s) for any system-level non-compliance, and the actions taken to correct the system directly correlated to the identified root cause(s);
- d) the sampling of documentation/data reports verified the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements;
- e) the ESD verified all actions taken by the LEA; and
- f) the LEA and ESD administrator provided assurances that the information contained in the summaries was valid and accurate.

If any information was missing or concerns were noted, the OSPI program supervisor contacted the ESD director to let them know what was needed. The ESD director then worked with the LEA to address the OSPI reviewer's concerns.

The outcomes of these verifications demonstrated that all 68 LEAs 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 LEA'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 2022 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

As described previously in this indicator, OSPI issued a written notification of non-compliance in September 2023 to 68 LEAs that were determined to not meet the IDEA implementation requirements for Indicator B-11 (i.e., all LEAs that were not at 100% for this indicator) for the 2022-23 school year per the Indicator B-11 report submitted by districts on July 15, 2023.

In order to verify that the LEAs 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 LEA'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 2023-24 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 LEA's and ESD's administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 3, 2024). 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 68 LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1).

The identified LEAs corrected and accounted for each individual; child-specific instance of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. Special education representatives from the LEA's regional ESD, in partnership with OSPI, verified that the 68 LEAs' 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 LEA'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 LEA 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 68 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 LEA'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 2022 for Indicator B-11 was corrected within one year of identification.

11—OSEP Response

11—Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.53%	97.93%	98.43%	92.41%	91.43%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2023 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.	4,072
b. Number of those referred determined to be not eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	572
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	3,159
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.	98
e. Number of children who were referred to IDEA Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	68
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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 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. Calculation: (c)/(a-(b-d-e-f))	3,159	3,334	91.43%	100%	94.75%	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.

175

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 175 children whose evaluations were not completed on time or under federal exception:

- 33.71% (59) were due to district scheduling or staffing issues;
- 28.00% (49) were because the student was referred late to IDEA Part B;
- 14.86% (26) were due to the family and district agreeing to extend the timeline;

- 10.29% (18) were due to the transition meeting not occurring at least 90 days prior to the student's third birthday; and
- 9.14% (16) were due to data entry or tracking errors; and
- 4.00% (7) were due to issues for which districts did not provide explanations;

Regarding the range of days for the 175 students reported above:

- 35.43% (62) were completed 1–15 calendar days beyond the child's third birthday;
- 18.29% (32) were completed 16–29 calendar days beyond the child's third birthday; and
- 46.29% (81) 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.

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 2022

Findings of noncompliance identified	Findings of noncompliance verified as corrected within one year	Findings of noncompliance subsequently corrected	Findings not yet verified as corrected
68	68	0	0

FFY 2022 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 2023 to 48 LEAs that were determined to not meet the IDEA implementation requirements for Indicator B-12 (i.e., all LEAs that were not at 100% for this indicator) for the 2022-23 school year per the Indicator B-12 report submitted by LEAs on July 15, 2023.

In order to verify that the LEAs were correctly implementing the identified regulatory requirements related to C.F.R. §300.124(b), verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the LEA's regional Educational Service District (ESD), under the direction of 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 included a review of documentation, such as updated data reports for the 2023-24 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, and more.

The LEA and ESD provided a detailed summary and assurances of the actions taken to correct the identified non-compliance and the activities completed to verify the correction of the non-compliance, including verifying the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements. These were submitted by LEA and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from LEAs as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2024, and from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 3, 2024). OSPI special education program supervisors reviewed the LEA and ESD summaries to ensure:

- 1) all identified areas of non-compliance within each individual student record had been corrected;
- 2) the dates of correction and verification were included, were in alignment with each other, and were for the current school year (i.e., after the finding was issued);
- 3) the LEA described the identified root cause(s) for any system-level non-compliance, and the actions taken to correct the system directly correlated to the identified root cause(s);
- 4) the sampling of documentation/data reports verified the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements;
- 5) the ESD verified all actions taken by the LEA; and
- 6) the LEA and ESD administrator provided assurances that the information contained in the summaries was valid and accurate.

If any information was missing or concerns were noted, the OSPI program supervisor contacted the ESD director to let them know what was needed. The ESD director then worked with the LEA to address the OSPI reviewer's concerns.

The results of these validations showed 100% compliance; all 48 LEAs 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 LEAs corrected and accounted for each individual, child-specific instance of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings.

LEAs 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 LEA 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 (due from LEAs as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2024). Actions taken by LEAs 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 LEA 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 LEA's procedures manual/standard operating procedures;
- e. implementing a new LEA 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 LEAs corrected the identified non-compliance, verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the LEA's regional Educational Service District (ESD), under the direction of OSPI. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings; staff interviews; data reviews; student record reviews; observations; guidance documents provided to staff; professional development materials and attendee rosters; updated/revise policies, procedures, and practices manuals; staff meeting agendas; and more. The documents reviewed as part of the verification depended on what actions the LEA took to correct. For example, if the LEA conducted a staff training, the ESD verifier reviewed the participant roster, along with the PowerPoint, agenda, and/or other training materials, to confirm that the training took place as described in the LEA's correction summary (including date).

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 LEAs and ESDs administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 3, 2024). OSPI special education program supervisors reviewed the LEA and ESD summaries to ensure:

- 1) all identified areas of non-compliance within each individual student record had been corrected;
- 2) the dates of correction and verification were included, were in alignment with each other, and were for the current school year (i.e., after the finding was issued);
- 3) the LEA described the identified root cause(s) for any system-level non-compliance, and the actions taken to correct the system directly correlated to the identified root cause(s);
- 4) the sampling of documentation/data reports verified the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements;
- 5) the ESD verified all actions taken by the LEA; and
- 6) the LEA and ESD administrator provided assurances that the information contained in the summaries was valid and accurate.

If any information was missing or concerns were noted, the OSPI program supervisor contacted the ESD director to let them know what was needed. The ESD director then worked with the LEA to address the OSPI reviewer's concerns.

The outcomes of these verifications demonstrated that all 48 LEAs 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 LEA'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 2022 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

As previously described under this indicator, OSPI issued a written notification of non-compliance in September 2022 to 48 LEAs that were determined to not meet the IDEA implementation requirements for Indicator B-12 (i.e., all LEAs that were not at 100% for this indicator) for the 2022-23 school year per the Indicator B-12 report submitted by districts on July 15, 2023.

In order to verify that the LEAs 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 LEA'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 2023-24 school year showing evidence of timely Part C to Part B transitions; student records including transition planning meetings; information from the LEA'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 LEA and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 3, 2024). 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 48 LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.124(b).

The identified LEAs 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 48 LEAs' 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 LEA'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 LEA 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 48 LEAs 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 LEA'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 2022 for Indicator B-12 was corrected within one year of identification.

12—OSEP Response

12—Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

13—Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2009	83.70%

FFY	2019	2020	2021	2021	2022
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.47%	99.08%	98.04%	98.17%	98.17%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
27	36	98.17%	100%	75%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Prior to the 2023-24 school year, Indicator B-13 data were collected from two primary sources - (1) Systems Analysis reviews conducted as part of the Washington Integrated System of Monitoring (WISM) and (2) Safety Net. An overwhelming majority of the files reviewed for B-13 were from Safety Net. For example, in the 2022-23 school year, 1,362 of the 1,423 files reviewed for B-13 (95.7%) came from Safety Net. In the spring of 2024, the Washington State Legislature directed the Safety Net Committee to cease reviewing IEPs for Indicator B-13 (and certain other IEP compliance areas) as part of the Safety Net reviews. Therefore, Indicator B-13 elements were not reviewed in IEPs as part of the 2024 Safety Net cycle. This resulted in a dramatic drop in the number of files reviewed for this Indicator. In addition, the rates of compliance for Indicator B-13 in WISM Systems Analysis reviews has traditionally been lower than in the Safety Net reviews. This is likely due to the fact that LEAs selected for the intensive Systems Analysis reviews are those who have been identified as high risk across a number of performance areas, including graduation and dropout rates and other areas.

For several years, OSPI has been preparing to move to a new, statewide data collection for Indicator B-13. We were able to pilot the new data application in the spring/summer of 2024. Beginning with the 2024-25 school year, the results for Indicator B-13 will come directly from this new statewide data collection. Therefore, in next year's (FFY 2024) APR, Washington will be establishing a new baseline for this indicator based on the results of the new statewide data collection.

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

State monitoring

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

These data are collected from the State's monitoring activities, which include Systems Analysis on-site visits and off-site desk reviews. Regarding selection of LEAs 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 Systems Analysis monitoring review, a comprehensive student file review is conducted which includes IEPs of students turning 16 and above to determine whether the elements described below are appropriately documented in the IEP:

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

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

NO

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Findings of noncompliance identified	Findings of noncompliance verified as corrected within one year	Findings of noncompliance subsequently corrected	Findings not yet verified as corrected
17	17	0	0

FFY 2022 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 2023 to 17 LEAs that were determined to not meet the IDEA implementation requirements for Indicator B-13 (i.e., all LEAs that were not at 100% for this indicator) for the 2022-23 school year, as identified through monitoring reviews and Safety Net completed in spring/summer 2023.

In order to verify that the LEAs were correctly implementing the identified regulatory requirements related to C.F.R. §300.320(b) and 300.321(b), verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the LEA’s regional Educational Service District (ESD), under the direction of 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 included a review of updated documentation, including IEPs developed during the 2023-24 school year (i.e., after the original finding was issued), showing evidence that the LEA was correctly implementing the applicable regulatory requirements for secondary transition.

The LEA and ESD provided a detailed summary and assurances of the actions taken to correct the identified non-compliance and the activities completed to verify the correction of the non-compliance, including verifying the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements. These were submitted by LEA and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from LEAs as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2024, and from ESDs as soon as possible but no later

than June 3, 2024). OSPI special education program supervisors reviewed the LEA and ESD summaries to ensure:

1. all identified areas of non-compliance within each individual student record had been corrected;
2. the dates of correction and verification were included, were in alignment with each other, and were for the current school year (i.e., after the finding was issued);
3. the LEA described the identified root cause(s) for any system-level non-compliance, and the actions taken to correct the system directly correlated to the identified root cause(s);
4. the sampling of documentation/data reports verified the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements;
5. the ESD verified all actions taken by the LEA; and
6. the LEA and ESD administrator provided assurances that the information contained in the summaries was valid and accurate.

If any information was missing or concerns were noted, the OSPI program supervisor contacted the ESD director to let them know what was needed. The ESD director then worked with the LEA to address the OSPI reviewer's concerns.

The results of these validations showed 100% compliance; all 17 LEAs 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 LEAs corrected and accounted for each individual, child-specific instance of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings.

The LEAs provided a summary of the actions taken to correct each individual instance of non-compliance to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from LEAs as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2024).

In order to verify that the LEAs corrected the identified non-compliance, verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the LEA's regional Educational Service District (ESD), under the direction of OSPI. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings; staff interviews; data reviews; student record reviews (including current IEPs/IEP amendments); observations; 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 specific actions taken to correct the child-specific non-compliance, and the documentation and activities completed to verify the corrections, were submitted by LEAs and ESDs administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 3, 2024). OSPI special education program supervisors reviewed the LEA and ESD summaries to ensure:

1. all identified areas of non-compliance within each individual student record had been corrected;
2. the dates of correction and verification were included, were in alignment with each other, and were for the current school year (i.e., after the finding was issued);
3. the LEA described the identified root cause(s) for any system-level non-compliance, and the

- actions taken to correct the system directly correlated to the identified root cause(s);
4. the sampling of documentation/data reports verified the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements;
 5. the ESD verified all actions taken by the LEA; and
 6. the LEA and ESD administrator provided assurances that the information contained in the summaries was valid and accurate.

If any information was missing or concerns were noted, the OSPI program supervisor contacted the ESD director to let them know what was needed. The ESD director then worked with the LEA to address the OSPI reviewer's concerns.

The outcomes of these verifications demonstrated that all 17 LEAs corrected each individual case of non-compliance, unless the student was no longer under the LEA'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 2022 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR

As previously described under this indicator, OSPI issued a written notification of non-compliance in September 2023 to 17 LEAs that were determined to not meet the IDEA implementation requirements for Indicator B-13 (i.e., all LEAs that were not at 100% for this indicator) for the 2022-23 school year, as identified through monitoring reviews and Safety Net completed in spring/summer 2023.

LEAs 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 LEAs as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2024).

In order to verify that the LEAs 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 LEA'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 2023-24 school year, showing evidence that the LEA 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 LEAs and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 3, 2024). 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 17 LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.320(b) and 300.321(b).

The identified LEAs corrected and accounted for each individual, child-specific instance of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings. Special education representatives from the LEA's regional ESD, in partnership with OSPI, verified that the 17 LEAs' 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 LEA'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 LEAs 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 17 LEAs 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 2022 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 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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 = [(# 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) divided by the (# 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 = [(# 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) divided by the (# 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 = [(# 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) divided by the (# 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 2024 on students who left school during 2022-2023, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2022-2023 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 2023 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2023 response rate to the FFY 2022 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
A	2013	Target >=	26.10%	26.20%	19.75%	20.50%	21.40%
A	23.74%	Data	20.45%	19.50%	16.74%	16.87%	17.40%
B	2013	Target >=	49.95%	52.21%	54.00%	55.40%	57.40%
B	52.11%	Data	56.64%	52.95%	43.91%	47.61%	58.36%
C	2013	Target >=	67.53%	70.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.5%
C	65.13%	Data	74.68%	72.04%	69.93%	74.27%	72.86%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) above in the Introduction for a detailed description.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	9346
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	7171
Response rate	76.73%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1299
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2282
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)	305
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).	1062

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 2022 data	FFY 2023 target	FFY 2023 data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education.	1,299	7,171	17.40%	22.40%	18.11%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.	3,581	7,171	58.36%	59.40%	49.94%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment.	4,948	7,171	72.86%	77.50%	69.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	In FFY 2022, Competitive Employment was 40.95%, the highest rate of Competitive Employment on record (since digital data collection began in FFY 2009). In FFY 2023, Competitive Employment decreased to 31.82%, a change of -9.13 percentage points, or -22.30%. The rate of Competitive Employment in FFY 2023 aligns more closely with the 10-year average rate of 33.02%. Given that the rates of Higher Education, Other Education, and Other Employment increased from FFY 2022 to 2023, it may be that some leavers who would have engaged in Competitive Employment participated in postsecondary education or Other Employment activities instead.
C	In FFY 2022, Other Employment was 10.63%, the lowest rate of Other Employment since FFY 2013 (when it was 9.76%). In FFY 2023, Other Employment increased to 14.81%, a change of 4.18 percentage points, or 39.32%. Again, the rate of Other Employment in FFY 2023 aligns more closely with the 10-year average rate of 14.17%. Also, for the FFY 2023 survey, overall engagement dropped to 69.00%, below the 69.93% engagement rate of FFY 2020, and the lowest engagement rate since FFY 2014 (67.38%). FFY 2023 also had the highest number of special education leavers on record. While rates of Higher Education, Other Education, and Other Employment increased from FFY 2022 to

	<p>FFY 2023, Competitive Employment dropped.</p> <p>The state-level data indicates that major shifts are still happening with postsecondary engagement for special education leavers post-COVID. These changes are most notable in employment outcomes—both Competitive Employment and Other Employment. It’s important to note that the U.S. rate of unemployment increased from 2023 to 2024 at the time that many students are graduating. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, unemployment was 3.5% in July 2023 and 4.3% in July 2024. Moving forward, CCTS plans to partner with Educational Service Districts (ESDs) to examine their data on a local level in hopes of better understanding these changes and how to respond.</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	2022	2023
Response rate	77.93%	76.73%

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 2022-23.

According to the NTACT:C 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 NTACT:C Response Calculator includes eight categories of respondents for measuring representativeness: Specific Learning Disability, Emotional Behavioral Disability, Intellectual Disability, All Other Disabilities, Female, Non-white, Limited English Proficiency, and Dropped 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 third consecutive year data were also representative of special education leavers who dropped out. While representativeness among leavers who dropped out decreased by -0.28 percentage points (or 15.91%) from FFY 2022 to FFY 2023 (-1.76% to -2.04%), it is still within the threshold of $\pm 3\%$.

To increase the likelihood of representativeness among students who drop out, starting in FFY 2021 Transition Systemic Framework 2 (TSF2) users must provide a reason for deleting leavers from the data collection platform (e.g. student returned to school and is no longer considered a leaver). In FFY 2023, CCTS added additional language to the platform to emphasize that students who drop out are considered leavers and should be surveyed. CCTS will continue to review all deleted leaver records, follow up with TSF2 users for further information as needed, and add leaver surveys back to the system if they were deleted incorrectly. CCTS will also work closely with newer districts and those with new leadership. New districts typically have lower response rates as they learn the survey process. Data shows that newer districts and those with new leadership can take two to three years to achieve target response rates.

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 9,346 youth were eligible for the survey because they were aged 16-21, permanently exited high school in the 2022-23 school year, and had an IEP in place at the time of exit. Among these 9,346 eligible youth, surveys were submitted for 9,317 leavers. Submitted surveys are separated into two categories: Respondents and Non-respondents.

A total of 7,171 respondents were contacted for the survey and answered the survey questions. A total of 2,146 non-respondents were contacted but did not answer the survey questions. Educators reported a variety of reasons for non-response, including poor or no contact information (17.99%), inability to reach after three attempts (61.04%), declined interview (14.31%), and other reasons (6.66%).

A total of 30 eligible leavers were not contacted by school district personnel for the survey (i.e., surveys for these youth were never started). These students are leavers and therefore were included in the total denominator, but since they were not given a chance to respond to the survey, they are not considered to be non-responders and were not included in the total count of non-responders. CCTS is working with school districts to reduce the number of students who are not contacted for the 2025 survey. Because respondent data were found to be representative with respect to disability, gender, ethnicity, and exit status, nonresponse bias related to these categories is not currently a concern in the data. The high response rate (76.72%) also helps to minimize the potential for bias in the data due to nonresponse.

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

14—Required Actions

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 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2024	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	61
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2024	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	8

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](#) above in the Introduction for a detailed description.

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2013	27.66%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	26.50%	26.75%	27.69%	28.63%	15.79%
Data	38.89%	27.14%	26.58%	26.32%	29.57%

Targets

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

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
8	61	15.79%	30.51%	13.11%	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 that indicate a continued 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. OSPI has begun collecting data on when individuals elect to use the ALJ settlement conference but does not yet have data on the outcomes. However, 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

15—Required Actions

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 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1 Mediations held	50
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	4
SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/13/2024	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	40

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](#) above in the Introduction for a detailed description.

Historical Data

Baseline year	Baseline data
FFY 2013	78.00%

FFY	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Target >=	75.50% - 85.50%	75.60%-85.60%	82.40%	83.40%	84.40%
Data	87.50%	81.40%	81.08%	65.52%	85.11%

Targets

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

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
4	40	50	85.11%	85.40%	88.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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

16—Required Actions

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 2023 included nine Educational Service District (ESD) regions (101, 112, 113, 114, 121, 121,123, 105, 171, and 189). This represents a sample of 34 (from 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 11.5% (+2.5%) of the population. This is an expansion of the project work first reported in the 2020 submission, which included samples from five ESDs statewide, and 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 better assess and monitor supports for children with disabilities in Indigenous communities and to address the ongoing inequities impacting marginalized communities, we are prioritizing the development of a deeper understanding of the historical traumas experienced by Tribal Nations. Additionally, we are committed to strengthening collaborations with OSPI’s Office of Native Education, the Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF) Tribal Relations Office, the Center for the Improvement of Student Learning (CISL), and the Office of Elementary Education, Early Learning, Special Programs, and Federal Accountability.

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

YES

Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

Edits were made to the existing Theory of Action to reflect the expanding work in Washington state

relating to inclusion and inclusionary practices and efforts to better align both early learning and special education. Edits were also made to reflect the SSIP SLs efforts to encourage exploration and analysis of data trends that cross programs, age bands, and systems. IDEA, Part B, ensures a free and appropriate public education for children 3-22 years in WA state. The revised SSIP TOA encourages the use of data to drive system change reflecting the vision of the Inclusive Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN). The IPTN envisions a future where every student in Washington state has improved access to rigorous and standards-based instruction and improved postsecondary outcomes based on their strengths, preferences, goals, and needs. 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. All actions, outputs, and outcomes were reviewed and approved by the SSIP State and Regional Leads, with consultation from IDEA Data Center technical assistance providers.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<https://ospi.k12.wa.us/sites/default/files/2025-01/wa-ssip-theory-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	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	54.75%	56.25%	57.75%

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

The # of students with IEPs entered K ready in SEL	The # of students with IEPs tested	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
3,818	7,290	43.51%	54.75%	52.37%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable.

Not applicable

Provide the data source for the FFY 2023 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 (PWLT) members. By creating this data review process, the SSIP State Leads (SLs) have ensured a mechanism for the development of data literacy nurtured at the local, regional, and state levels, enabling these different levels of systems to engage in root cause analysis relating to the SiMR outcomes in their program and/or region. The SSIP SLs partner with regional and local districts to 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 to build a comprehensive improvement plan. Data findings elevated at the state, regional, and local levels are then leveraged for deeper reflection and inevitably create greater collaboration opportunities with communities, Tribal, and other essential cross sector partners to strengthen 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 Local District Preschool Inclusion Self-Assessment (LDPISA). 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.

2) 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.

NOTE: 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.

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. Additionally, the performance indicator data reviewed by the SSIP SDT was expanded.

To align with the expansion efforts of Transition to Kindergarten (TK) in Washington, the target for APR Indicator 5 was added. This addition allows the SDT to monitor the access of children as they

transition from PreK environments to school-aged programs (TK, Kindergarten, and beyond). Indicator 4, suspension and expulsion was also added to ensure that PreK program leads have systems data trends to compare to behaviors incidents and social-emotional learning outcomes as children above beyond their current placement (indicator 7 and WaKIDS data trends). Furthermore, include significant disproportionality data was incorporated, as the desired outcome of this project work is to decrease suspension and expulsion rates and increase overall academic success for all children, PreK-3rd grade, with a specific focus on student groups who continue to experience the highest levels of exclusion from choice and opportunity.

With the support of the University of Denver's PELE Center, six local districts have engaged in LEAP replication work across six 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 was initially a pilot limited to one of the nine ESDs in WA state. Although WA state is moving away from the LEAP Replication practices in favor of the broader work of system wide implementation of inclusionary practices from PreK-22 years, it was important to maintain this tool for those district that had met certification.

Lastly, the Indicators of High-Quality Inclusion (HQI), which assess inclusion at the state, community, program, and early childhood education environmental levels, 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.

The SSIP Regional Leads (RLs) and local districts requested 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.

WA state received the ECTA intensive technical assistance grant to support 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, Local program, and Early Childhood Education Environment. These metrics will include the indicators captured in State and Early Childhood Program Wide Benchmarks of Quality and address more intentionally systemic barriers faced by local districts.

Edits were also made to reflect the SSIP SLs efforts to encourage exploration and analysis of data trends that cross programs, age bands, and systems. IDEA, Part B, ensures a free and appropriate public education for children 3-22 years in WA state. The revised SSIP Implementation Plan encourages the use of data to drive system change reflecting the vision of the Inclusive Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN). The IPTN envisions a future where every student in Washington state has improved access to rigorous and standards-based instruction and improved postsecondary outcomes based on their strengths, preferences, goals, and needs.

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 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 2023 SSIP cycle are as follows:

- 1) Family and community partners engagement strategies continue to be a priority 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, access for children with disabilities to regular early childhood programs (RECPs) has increased significantly. It was reported that the percentage of children with IEPs enrolled in ECEAP programs shifted from 11.7% in 2018 to 17.6% in 2023. 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 as led to this significant increase. Utilizing the frameworks of Implementation Science has proven to be an essential catalyst for change, laying out the necessary steps to these partners when exploring the return on investment of system change.
- 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. One example that has led to positive systems change is the union of the SSIP RLs with the Regional PreK-3 Coordinators, a group of professionals posed to support general education services for children, prenatal to age 8. Initially funded in fiscal year 2021, this initiative which was funded by ESSER dollars was posed to support the expansion of Transitional Kindergarten. Leveraging the existing work of the RLs, PreK-3 Coordinators championed local school districts to achieve positive student outcomes with the deployment of inclusionary practices within school districts utilizing the frameworks of Pyramid Model (WAPM).

SSIP SLs then worked to build opportunities for proficiency in training content among this elite group of educational leads, using Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) frameworks. 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, B7 Child Outcomes, and the WAPM Program Coach and Data Manager Trainings. This learning , 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 Additionally, to further strengthen the skills of the SSIP RLs and local leaders, The OSPI contracted with Swan Innovations to lead a 3-part series titled, Understanding Deep Culture, with an emphasis on language, culture, mental health and behavioral supports.

- 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. Expanded training opportunities have been supported through federal grants (PreK Development Grant- PDG) and state legislation (Senate House Bill 5237), which prioritizes the dissemination of WAPM instructional practice and data training to providers within licensed child cares, state, and federal PreK programs. 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, With the University of Denver, the SSIP SLs have created a Coaching Practice Guide intended to outline how the Stages of Implementation Science parallel with the coaching and training structures of the SSIP Implementation process. 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 inclusionary practices, MTSS frameworks and more. The final iteration of this document is expected to be finalized by the summer of 2025, and will be updated to include the structures required to create community inclusion teams, bridging the support of school, home, and community-based programs.
- 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 monthly to connect with key SSIP SLs and cross-agency partners to create a community of belonging. The steps taken to support the RLs have 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 has increased 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 to improve their internal and external systems for young children with disabilities that WA state was 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 the last 12 months, ECTA's TA experts have worked with the SSIP SDT to assess their state, program, and community level practices using the fidelity metrics known as the Indicators of High-Quality Inclusion. Additionally, ECTA has assisted the SSIP SLs in working towards the creation of 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 has worked with 6 (of 9) SSIP RLs and 6 (of 34) local districts to strengthen their relationships with families and community partners through the development of a community inclusion team. The SSIP SLs have also worked to refine the Inclusionary Practice (IP) Demonstration sites to include

ECSE Inclusion Champions (4 of 6), as well as to spotlight districts across WA state that have exemplary inclusionary practices across their PreK to 12 continuums, avoiding siloed inclusion efforts within programs and grade bands.

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 include increasing opportunities for participation in cross-sector state work groups, WAPM and ECSE Inclusion Champion training events. Within current grant activities associated with this project, local districts are required to include the representation of families and community partners within their Program-Wide Leadership Teams (PWLTS). Using the Local District PreK Inclusion Self-Assessment (LDPIISA), and capturing anecdotal data from the ECSE Inclusion Champions End of Year Report, it's evident that not only had local districts increased their efforts to engage families and CPs. 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 these indicators have continually increased over the course of each year for cohorts by 9%. For the current reporting year, local districts reported that 32% of the indicators for family engagement were "in place", while 41% are "in process".
- 2) Offering facilitated synchronous and asynchronous training within previous SSIP implementation cycles (FFY21-22), including WAPM, LEAP Replication, Building Blocks for Belonging (BB4B), and other associated training has resulted in increased knowledge of inclusion, inclusionary practices, trauma informed care, and race and equity frameworks. As a result of the findings captured by the LDPIISA, RLS began to develop additional training modules to meet their regional needs, utilizing a shared drive, to ensure consistent delivery of training content beyond that shared above. During this reporting cycle (FFY23), SSIP state and regional partners hosted over 60 synchronous training opportunities to local districts, families, child care providers, and CPs. This captures roughly 250 hours of training led statewide with modified training schedules based upon the content, audience, and frequency of contacts RLS had with their participants. Additionally, at the request of the SSIP RLS, OSPI contracted with Swan Innovations to create a training tract to address the implicit and cultural biases of individuals working with young children and families. Understanding Deep Culture, created and facilitated by Dr. Martina Whelshula, and Cree Whelshula, is designed to help participants gain a comprehensive understanding of deep culture, which encompasses the intangible aspects of culture that profoundly shape our perceptions, values, behaviors, and worldviews. Participants will explore how culture influences brain development, the impact of cultural sensitivity periods, and practical steps to engage with and appreciate deep cultural elements. Offered in a three-part series (offered 2x over 5

months), Swan Innovations facilitated the learning of more the 231 participants.

- 3) Focused coaching activities, including the utilization of EBPs to support increased knowledge of fidelity criteria and systems infrastructure relating to trauma-informed practices, race and equity practices, and the increase of family and community provider engagement within local EL programs have continued. At this time, all 9 Educational Service Districts (ESDs) across WA state have a certified RL who have completed or are near completion of the certification process led to increased training occurring statewide. To guarantee that all local district teams were able to access the 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.

In partnership with US, SSIP SLs hosted monthly coaching calls for RLs and local district coaches offering ongoing technical assistance to promote fidelity in implementation and best practice for coaches supporting the 34 participating programs sites. Steps were taken within the 2023 SSIP cycle to WA state Coaching Practice Guide created to memorialize the training and coaching model outlined to support the implementation of each EBP. Within this document, RLs will learn how to align fidelity metrics (ex: TPOT, BIR, etc.), with methods of training and coaching (in person vs. virtual) based upon the various stages of implementation their Inclusion Champions might be within. By providing data findings ground in aligned training and coaching practices, the SSIP SDT have become better equipped to provide both programmatic, fiscal, and governance recommendations to support future implementation. The SSIP RLs remain dedicated to project work and embrace the benefits of actively engaging practitioners and leaders, including family partnerships and community partners.

- 4) Sustainability and scale-up plans were drafted by the SSIP SDT in the early stages of the SSIP Implementation project. This was facilitated in part by the NCMPI TA team, that supported WA state in the initial rollout of WAPM within local schools, beginning in the 2019-2020 school year. With the support of this collaboration, the SSIP SLs were able to include documentation of the collaboration strategies identified by either state or federal statute, proposed legislation, Governor directives, and federal grant activities. 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 practices across sites.

Employing implementation science to guide practice resulted in 34 participating programs creating alignment to the stages of implementation science (an increase of 8), with 44 local districts engaging in initial and/or full implementation practices. Of these 14 local districts are engaging in scale up and sustainability practices (BB4B, IP Demo Sites, LEAP). 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 collection. The implementation of this improvement strategy is imperative in supporting the changes to systems needed to achieve the SiMR target. Systems changes will also lead to the establishment and promotion of shared accountability and monitoring program practices. With these measures in place, the SSIP SLs expect to continue to see the performance rates in social-emotional development among students with disabilities increase (+8.9% from FFY22), as well as that of other domain areas, including mathematics and literacy, beyond the SSIP implementation sites. Initial reports captured by multiple project sites have indicated that when the infrastructure improvement strategies are implemented with fidelity, student outcomes across domains have increased significantly, and have sustained across grade bands.

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 2023 SSIP infrastructure improvement strategies will continue to focus on:

- 1) Family and CP engagement strategies will continue to be deployed to increase knowledge of regional and local early learning systems, promote participation within local district program wide leadership teams, and systematize cross sector programs that would streamline the coordinated recruitment and enrollment (CRE) of young children with disabilities. Intermediate outcomes outlined in the SSIP Evaluation Plan support both sustainability of improvement efforts and scale-up through strategic 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. This theory has been held by an increasing number of districts engaging families and CPs engaging in shared training. In addition to this 6 of the 9 ESDs statewide have recruited implementation sites to participate on the Community Inclusion Team pilot with their CPs. All district teams are currently participating within the SSIP project work, have an established PWLT, and coaching protocol in place. Each project site has been paired with a SSIP RL, an ECTA TA lead, and has been participating in statewide shared PD and TA over the course of the FFY23 cycle and have been provided with an external expert offering collaboration as how best to engage with their local Tribal Nations.
- 2) The continued utilization of both asynchronous and synchronous training within the current school year related to the training topics mentioned previously in this report have been sustained and expanded. Current data reported by the EC PW BoQ indicated that 42% of SSIP Implementation sites that engage in WAPM frameworks, had 48% of the critical elements in place, while an additional 40% 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. Since FFY21, the SSIP RLs have taken the steps necessary to become certified in the methods of Pyramid Model. To further their impact as systems leaders, each RL has worked to deepen their knowledge base on the concepts of IDEA, Part B, universal design for learning, inclusionary practices, and the broader concepts of MTSS frameworks in an effort to bring the necessary technical assistance and professional learning to

their ECSE Inclusion Champions. Regardless of location, or access to resources, the SSIP RLs have become primed and ready to support any learning gap that presents itself within the system analysis process.

For FFY23, all ESD regions have certified trainers and instructional and systems level coaches. This cohort of trainers have led over 60 training courses regionally and statewide. Training content to provide to their local districts, CPs (ECEAP and Head Start), families, Part C partners, and child care providers included WAPM Modules 1-2, PWLT Strategic Planning, B6 LRE Coding, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), Equity and Diversity training, as well as Creative Curriculum, Developmentally Appropriate Practices, ECSE Myths and Facts, and Unpacking the Pyramid Model. It was reported that over 250 hours were spent with partners in the training capacity with early learning professionals from across the state's mixed delivery 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 UD, will continue to engage in a review of the RLs current training and coaching structures, further enhancing the drafted WA state Coaching Practice Guide. The purpose of this systems review is 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 includes organized support for WA Coaching & Training Network to support a scaffolded support system for Regional ESD ECSE Implementation Specialists. Differentiated guidance by in-person and virtual coaching will be offered depended on the stage of implementation of the district site with special considerations offered to integrated programs (TK, ECEAP w/ Special education), Tribal programs, and local districts located within rural/remote settings. Additionally, UD will facilitate the WA Coaching of Coaches Community of Practice meeting to: create a network of support for using high quality inclusion, problem-solve barriers to inclusion at the program and classroom level, share and build on successes, build capacity to decide how to select instruction/intervention and to use data to drive instruction and intervention, and to build on capacity to use UDL, focusing on ECEE inclusion indicators and positive behavior support.
- 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. Executing the contract with Pyramid Model Consortium (PMC), to access licenses to the Pyramid Model Implementation Database (PIDS). The acquisition of this license ensures 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 (44), 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 (now BB4B) project to include the 2 TK in addition to the 7 PreK program mentored since FFY21.

- 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. Funding and staffing provisions will be provided via the PDG grant and facilitated by DCYF leadership.
- e. The intentional alignment of the SSIP Implementation project, and the Inclusionary Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN), to solidify systemic supports for local schools, PreK to age 22. The IPTN is designed to provide high-quality guidance, technical assistance (TA), and professional development resources to districts to disrupt segregated systems of disproportionality and reduce exclusionary practices in Washington schools. This will result in improved student outcomes, with an additional focus on the outcomes and the inclusion of students with disabilities having Intellectual or Developmental Disabilities (IDD) and for Black students with disabilities.

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 (UD) to implement LEAP PreK Models across Washington state and is currently being implemented in 6/9 ESD regions from FFY19-23. In the upcoming SSIP cycle, UD will no longer be offering training and certification of the LEAP Replication PreK model. With 6 sites trained, this will remain an essential framework, as will the fidelity metric known as the Quality Program Inventory (QPI). To better align with the efforts of integration of inclusionary practices across the PreK-22 systems, UD will expand their training and coaching supports from instructional and educational environments to include program infrastructure assessments and systems diagnostics.

- a. Building Blocks for Belonging (BB4B) is a professional development initiative by the University of Denver and the PELE Center to partner with programs to identify and reach their community's inclusion and belonging goals. Professional learning (training, coaching, communities of practices and program support) is based on the ECTA Indicators for Inclusion, the Dimensions of Belonging, and utilizes Implementation Science. DU consultants support leaders and leadership teams to consider the systems level support needed for inclusion, using the ECTA program inclusion indicators. Teaching teams reflect on inclusive practices that lead children to experience belonging, inclusive engagement, and joyful learning by presuming competence, supporting autonomy, and creating caring communities. Training, coaching and communities of practice offer opportunities to reflect on universally designed environments, teaming and collaboration practices, and considerations to plan for individual children's strengths, priorities, preferences, and support needs. OSPI has contracted with UD to implement BB4B across Washington state, currently supporting 6 of 9 ESD RLs regions within the FFY23 SSIP cycle, expanding support to 8 of 9 ESD statewide since the initiation of this contracted support in 2019.
- 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 sustained over time. 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/BB4B) 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 (LDPISA), 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 the continuous implementation of EBPs, paired with overlay of inclusionary practices, race/equity considerations, and other crucial frameworks. The utilization of data-based decision-making and comprehensive training and coaching are the heart of SSIP implementation project. The OSPI ECSE continues to host 'office hours' (first started in FFY22). This has created a bridge to the SSIP leads and the ECSE Inclusion Champions. As shared previously, the SSIP SLs with UD, also host a Community of Practice for Program and Practitioner Coaches, along with CPs participating in the statewide deployment of WAPM, LEAP Replication/BB4B, and/or those who might be engaging in the initial stages of systems redesign. This forum offers all partners 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. Findings were submitted within the PIDS

platform and reported by evaluation tools such as the TPOT and LDPISA. The SSIP SLs 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. Initial priority areas identified by the SSIP SDT include policy and guidance, family partnership, and cross sector leadership teaming.

The SSIP SLs continue to strengthen the WAPM Training and Coaching Network. 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 (\$530,000 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 (\$890,00 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, 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/BB4B, 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 practices 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/BB4B, and Implementation Science frameworks throughout the SSIP Implementation project have provided the SSIP SLs the opportunity to assess progress towards long-term goals captured in the SSIP Logic Model with a variety of data metrics, including anecdotal reporting. As each fiscal year ends, 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 their 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. Program changes have resulted in improved program structures, more effective

delivery of specially designed instruction, increased student outcomes (with readiness on the WaKIDS fall assessment rising from 12% to 77%), and a greater availability of regular early childhood programs.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Data collected from the SSIP implementation sites has enabled the SSIP SDT to craft a compelling narrative showing how the intentional use of data can positively transform educational systems and provide children farthest from opportunity with access to high-quality learning environments. The state evaluated the outcomes of each improvement strategy through various data collection instruments.

According to the Annual Federal Child Count and Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) data, for the 2023 school year, it was reported that 12,426 children placed in PreK programs were found eligible for IDEA, Part B. This is an increase of 1,604 children enrolled in preschool placements from FFY 2022. Additionally, 937 (from 179) of 5520 (from 2091) children with disabilities, ages 4 and 5 years who have been placed in Transition to Kindergarten (TK), a general education placement option, are no longer included in the B6 PreK Environments data findings. This represents 17% of the total population of children within the TK program, increasing access to this placement by 6%.

In the winter of 2021, Special Education SDT proposed that the B6 baseline and corresponding targets for 6A and 6B would increase annually within the implementation cycle by 1.5%. It was 2023 APR that the 6A data improved from 31.09% to 33.17% (+2.08%) and 6B data decreased from 43.28% to 40.95% (-2.33%). 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 the implementation of IDEA amongst programs statewide, regardless of participation in the SSIP project. Of those districts that were in the 2023 SSIP cohort, their data was as follows: 6A 47.2%, 6B 32.9%. For 2023 Annual Performance Report (APR), it was reported that though the target for 7A1 was not met and there was no slippage (83.72% to 86.40%). This was also the case for 7A2, which yielded an outcome of 37.93% in 2023, an increase of 0.33%.

The SSIP cohorts I, II, III, and IV completed the Local District Preschool Inclusion Self-Assessment (LDPISA) twice annually, revealing key positive trends and areas for growth. Cohort I reported a 9% increase in indicators "in place," reaching 52%, while Cohort IV showed a 15% increase to 37%. However, there was a general decrease in the percentage of indicators "in place" across cohorts, coupled with an upward trend in indicators "in process but not in place," indicating better understanding of these distinctions over time. Cohort I notably outperformed Cohort IV with 11% more indicators "in place" and significantly fewer "not in place" (1% vs. 10%).

The Teaching Pyramid Observation Tool (TPOT) yielded a 35% response rate, in which 89 (+4) cumulative TPOT observations were completed. An analysis of the data indicates 76% (-3%) 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. 76 (-13) 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-eight percent (48%), +6% higher, of indicators were reported to be "in place," 40%, -2% less, were "emerging and/or needed improvement," and 12% were "not in place." This improvement reflects a 3% 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 1.42, >.08 (all 1.83). Children who identify as Asian have a 2.13, >.7 (all 1.22) risk ratio, and children who identify as American Indian have a 1.22, >5.63(all 1.76) risk ratio. Children who identify as Latino or Hispanic have a 0.67, >.23 (all .51) risk ratio, and children who identify as White have a 0.58, >.14 (all .63) risk ratio. These findings show a decrease for children identified as Black (-.08), a decrease for children identified as Native American (-5.83) from the previous reporting year. Of the children reported to have an IEP (37%), 9 (>8) were reported to have received school suspension (ISS). Children identified as having an IEP are 1.51 (<.23) 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 36.4% (<11.2) and 63.6% 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 32.4% (<3.1) of children with a BIR identify as female, 0% identify as Gender Nonconforming/Transgender, 67.6% identify as male, 0% identify as non-binary, and 0% identify as Other.

The Parent Survey Instrument: The School Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale results indicate that 45% of the parent respondents believe that schools have facilitated their involvement in their child's education (+7.3% from FFY23). This report yielded a 15.7% response rate (230/1465). The total sample of parents surveyed included parents of students identified as Hispanic (11%), American Indian/Alaska Native (11%), Asian (14%), Black (12%), Pacific Islander (8%), Two or More Races (20%), and White (19%).

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 continue the drafting of a Memo of Understanding (MOU) to support the implementation of IDEA across Washington's mixed delivery system, the SSIP SLs have considered collecting supplementary WaKIDS data, Head Start performance indicator (PIR), school aged IDEA performance indicator, do elevate the value of shared data collection and aligned program policies

and procedures . Examples of this data include:

- 1) Federal and State preschool data management annual reports pinpoint 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 115 children identified as American Indian/Alaskan Native had an IEP. Of the children enrolled in this program, 152 were referred for a special education referral, with 112 receiving an evaluation for IDEA, and 40 not receiving an evaluation. Of the 40 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 (39 children were referred, 37 children did not receive an evaluation).
- 2) The number of kindergarteners with IEPs on the November 2023 child count was 9,090, with 80.2% of students with IEPs taking the WaKIDS assessment. Based upon the state summary, 26.4% of children with disabilities met criteria for all six domains in the WaKIDS assessment. Of that percentage, only 25.6% of children with disabilities demonstrated skills of a kindergarten aged child for SEL.
- 3) Social Emotional Learning performance rate of entering TK students with disabilities (based on WaKIDS fall assessment data) Currently 937 (from 179) of 5520 (from 2091) children with disabilities, ages 4 and 5 years who have been placed in Transition to Kindergarten (TK), a general education placement option that is no longer included in the B6 PreK Environments data findings. This represents 17% of the total population of children within the TK program, increasing access to this placement by 6%. Initial data collected on this population shows performance rates of 45.2% in 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. Initial data findings are indicating that children enrolled in inclusive TK programs are not only retaining their skills in math, literacy, and SEL, throughout their time in TK, but are outperforming peers without TK experience when entering Kindergarten, in some instances by as much as 30% (literacy: TK: 98.3% vs no TK: 68.3%).
- 4) Other essential data metrics targets that will be considered for review for the 2023 SSIP cycle include:
 - B4 Suspension and Expulsion
 - B5 Educational Environment
 - B11 Child Find
 - B12 Early Childhood Transition
 - C8 Early childhood Transitions data

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. Efforts relating to coordinated recruitment and enrollment (CRE) have also been prioritized to streamline policies and procedures for children with disabilities, as well as to seek alignment in practices for existing programs facilitated across agencies, including Help Me Grow, Within Reach, and Strong Start.

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 finalize 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 from PreK through age 21, OSPI Executive Leadership has taken significant action steps to refine and strengthen Washington's educational system. Currently, we are in the middle of a feasibility study on a statewide Individualized Education Program (IEP) system, funded through the Legislature. This study explores the potential for a consistent, integrated IEP system designed to benefit students with disabilities, their families, educators, and schools. The system under consideration would incorporate compliance mechanisms, emphasize results-driven interactions, and transform the IEP into a tool for instructional planning and improved outcomes. We also continue our leadership in the Inclusionary Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN) that blends state and federal funds

to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The IPTN represents a coordinated and comprehensive network that is continuously expanding its scope and partnerships to address persistent inequities with a focus on students most excluded from choice and opportunity across Washington schools. This broad network operates collaboratively to build statewide capacity, working to eliminate barriers that exclude students and shift to a focus on high quality instruction that leads to meaningful inclusionary outcomes.

The IPTN recognizes that inclusionary outcomes can only occur within a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) and intentional efforts are made to build systems that break down silos and allow for special educators, general educators and educational leaders to engage in root cause analysis and data-based decision-making to address issues of disproportionality.

Key elements include:

- 1) **Family-Centered Practices:** Integrating family voices into local practices and leadership teams to ensure parent engagement is central to educational planning.
- 2) **Professional Learning and Technical Assistance:** Supporting districts and educators with the tools and knowledge to reduce exclusionary practices and improve outcomes for students with disabilities, particularly students with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD) and Black students with disabilities.
- 3) **Collaboration Across Systems:** Aligning efforts across general and special education to create inclusive, equitable environments within the MTSS framework, which supports early intervention, integrated instruction, and a reduction in overidentification for special education.

The IPTN continues its commitment to disrupting ableist and exclusionary systems while fostering transformational shifts in Washington’s educational landscape, starting with our youngest learners. By focusing on those students most excluded from choice and opportunity, this work not only supports students with disabilities but also contributes to school improvement for all students statewide. As OSPI continues to refine its strategies, the integration of state and federal funds ensures these efforts remain sustainable and impactful, building a foundation for equity and inclusion in Washington’s schools.

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:

"The success of our itinerant model in community placements has prompted us to expand our resources for students. We have increased the Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) for our itinerant preschool teacher from 0.5, which previously provided 2.5 days of service each week, to 1.0. This change allows for five full days of service and a caseload of 20 students. By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, the district will proudly serve over 30 students through these itinerant services. In response to the positive outcomes from our initial two co-taught inclusive classrooms, we are excited to announce the opening of an additional co-taught classroom, demonstrating our commitment to inclusive education."

"Since the 2018-2019 school year, we created six ITK classrooms, with 20 pre-k children each. We did not have any of these community placements before this project. In 23/24, we added one class and then this year, we added another (24/25) for a total of six. This is additive in that we still have all of our community MOU placements with Head Start and YMCA. For our special education students, this means we are now able to offer a full continuum of services in a way we did not before. Also, for our LEAP ITK classroom, trained through this grant, our staff are significantly more capable in co-planning and delivery as well as embedded services and this year (24/25) we plan to continue sharing this training and including with our other ITK classes."

"Our students with disabilities improve in all areas at a much higher rate when paired with their typically developing peers, then when isolated with only disabled children. It is even difficult to "pick them out" by just walking in the room. By having extra support in the room, these children are able to mirror and blend in with their peers."

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. The PIDS platform has supported the increase in statewide data submission and created 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 with SSIP RLs then taking the lead to train and supporting their local districts. FFY23, data submission was required within the PIDS system. This shift of expectation yielded an 88% usage rate by the SSIP local districts which was an increase from the previous submission periods. As a collective, 84% of the ECSE Inclusion Champions were able to successfully submit and interact with the data platform within the assessment window.

Additional testimony from the SSIP RLs and coaches about the SSIP Implementation project were:

"Our rural districts have historically struggled to provide a mixed-delivery system due to resources. With the implementation of TK, several rural districts have an additional placement option for families and IEP teams to consider. Some of the more urban districts are leaning into itinerant services and have been providing SDI at local child care centers or Head Start/ECAP programs. What we have seen in our region is an increase of more than 7% in our LRE data. We hope with more intentional support; the number will increase."

"This past year, PSESD continued to support district monthly leadership team meetings in partner districts. Through collaboration and pre-meetings with district leaders, we supported our new districts in exploration as well as building sustainable practices for our returning districts. We continue to emphasize the importance of diversity of voice in district leadership meetings through inviting and engaging families and community partners. Supports we have provided include, strengthening our partnership with our PSESD early learning department, increasing our efforts to connect with community partners and exploration of structures and systems for on-going district and childcare staff and PD collaboration."

"The NCESD Early Learning team provided coaching, professional development and systems level support to districts engaged in the Preschool Inclusion Champions, State systemic Improvement Plan and LEAP initiatives. Accomplishments include an additional LEAP certified classroom, a district subcontracted with the local ECEAP Program to increase opportunities for children and families, increased focus on the alignment of the Pyramid Model Framework with GLAD strategies and focus on Creative Curriculum. More districts have asked for training in the WAPM Modules 1 and 2 which has resulted in conversations about the Inclusion Champions initiatives. The NCESD coaches collaborated with GLAD trainers and regional content coordinators which resulted in more cohesive and wrap-around support to many of our districts."

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 (full) and 4 of implementation science, a mean baseline of 80.95% was reported on the LSDPISA, compared to their sites engaged in stages 1-3 (initial), who reported 67.94% fidelity of implementation of inclusionary practices. Of the existing SSIP sites, 76.15% (from 53%) reported fidelity of implementation of WAPM on the PW EC BoQ compared to 59.4% fidelity of partners engaged in stages 1-3 (initial), demonstrating that efforts maintained over time resulted in scale up and sustainability of infrastructure improvement strategies

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

See [Broad Stakeholder Input](#) above in the Introduction for a detailed description.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

The partners committed to the improvement of the overall quality of early childhood programming in WA state have increased significantly in the past year due to intentional alignment with internal and external cross-sector collaboration. Representatives identified within each partner group 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. 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 2023 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.

A singular effort that has an incredible impact on the expansion of the continuum of placement options for children with disabilities, has been a result of DCYF ECEAP and Head Start efforts to promote integrated programs and inclusive settings. The Saturation Study analyzes access to Washington's ECEAP and Head Start programs serving 3- and 4-year-olds. This study estimates the number of eligible children living within each school district boundary and calculates the percentage currently served. It assigns points for each district based on numbers and percentages of unserved children and child maltreatment rates. Since the release of the 2021-22 ECEAP & Head Start Saturation Study, the number of children enrolled into ECEAP and Head Start programs has increased by 4%.

Shifting the focus of priority groups to include local districts with the lowest 6A data has increased opportunities for districts to access additional funding to create integrated and inclusive early learning programs. This change in calculation has allowed districts and community ECEAP programs to work collaboratively to better serve children with disabilities across learning environments. Within this annual recruitment cycle, the 6A data improved by an additional 2.1%, increasing by 7.5% from 2021.

Additionally, in November 2023, ECTA awarded WA state with an intensive technical assistance grants to support the scale up and sustainability of inclusion across state systems. Over the course of the 2023 SSIP cycle, this grant award has opportunities for local districts and CPs to authentically co-create policies and procedures that positively support the needs of all children and families with the creation of 6 community inclusion teams, representing 6/9 ESD regions.

Other essential partners that have supported statewide efforts to increase access to inclusive early learning 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 ECSE 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 UW IPP PreK Demo Sites, and the IPTN. Each community partner plays an essential role in the SSIP implementation process and by design has impacted the scale up and sustainability of regional ESDs, local districts, community partners, and families, as they gain mastery of the MTSS frameworks, inclusionary practices, and other identified EBPs and expand their impact through a coordinated and comprehensive network.

To increase family and CP engagement at the local level, OSPI has leveraged Federal Special Education 619 activity funds to incentivize local districts to hold permanent positions for families and CPs on their Program Wide Leadership Teams (PWLTS) and to include them in all relevant training and technical assistance opportunities related to the implementation of WAPM, inclusionary practices, race/equity, and/or the impacts of trauma.

Project outcomes cited by district partners engaged in the 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 positive changes that we have seen is the desire by our PIC leadership team to move to all inclusive classrooms to create the sense of belonging and increase our LRE numbers."

"For the past two years, the LRE has changed in three of our preschool classrooms. The teachers have shared the significance of this change in a positive way for numerous reasons, including empathy and compassion for others, and increased friendship/relationship skills. Most importantly, there was a family feel and a sense of community in the learning environment that wasn't there before we had inclusive classrooms."

"The data from the Preschool Inclusion Self-Assessment indicates significant improvements in several key areas, particularly in partnering with families and enhancing professional development. These trends suggest that the early childhood education programs are increasingly successful in fostering inclusive environments and supporting families of children with disabilities. Continued focus on these areas will likely yield further positive outcomes, contributing to the overall goal of inclusive early childhood education."

The outcomes shared by the ECSE Inclusion Champions are a direct result of the efforts put forward by the WA state ECSE Coordination Team. The ECSE Coordinators 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. Additional efforts will be put forward in the coming year to create training modules to improve Child Find practices across systems, as well as to better education practitioners on the impacts of exclusionary practices in early learning settings.

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 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/BB4B 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, RLs, and families, the SSIP SLs continue to take significant steps to move the implementation of inclusion, inclusionary practices, and MTSS frameworks into early childhood programs across the complex mixed delivery systems for children, 0–5 years. Each advisory group has been actively engaged in collectively 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, attempts have been made to include offering monthly network meetings, bi-weekly OSPI ECSE updates on hot topics, editing and writing sessions for upcoming guidance, as well as increased representation within statewide advisory councils, including the Coordinated Recruitment and Enrollment (CRE), and the Early Learning Cross Agency Work Group, the Indian Policy Early Learning Meeting, the Cross State Meeting Infant and Early Childhood Mental Health Committee, the WA Pregnancy, infancy, and early childhood committee, and many more connections hosted by DCYF, the Department of Health, the Office of Financial Management, and the Health Care Authority.

Decades of rigorous research show that high-quality early learning environments that include children with and without disabilities contribute 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. An analysis of CP concerns has identified the following priority areas:

The need to further increase the understanding of inclusion and inclusionary practices, and how to meet the unique needs of children with disabilities across the early learning mixed delivery system.

- 1) Equitable considerations for Tribal children, children with disabilities, children impacted by intergenerational trauma, Black children, and the practitioners living within these communities.
- 2) Leveraging existing data sources to avoid the weaponization of data, especially when considering our most marginalized community members.
- 3) Addressing the number of children in ECEAP and Head Start referred but not evaluated for special education services, specifically children enrolled in Head Start's Tribal, and/or Season and Migrant Programs.
- 4) Assessing current Child Find practices across the mixed delivery system to address the significant disproportionality of children referred to and found eligible for IDEA, Part C and B.
- 5) Investigating the impacts of child care deserts, leading families to enroll children with IEPs into early learning programs across district boundaries resulting in families choosing to either decline or limit the provisions of IDEA services for their child.
- 6) The continued report of early learning staff experiencing significant social emotional incidents (physical aggression, running away, unsafe behaviors) of children enrolled in child care and PreK programs, which correlates with a reported increase in discipline practices put upon the children with disabilities exhibiting challenging behaviors in kindergarten.

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). Referrals for special education are a result of well-intended adult's response to student needs, but there are risks that those adult decisions can result in harm. 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 their actions do not address the root causes of student need and are not culturally affirming. Equally essential is the need for local district staff

to have a strong understanding of the communities they serve, and the impacts of intergenerational trauma on Black, Indigenous, and other persons of color. To better serve the SSIP Implementation districts, the SLs have continued efforts to collaborate with experts in the field who are successfully making positive changes for children and families farthest from opportunity. Within this reporting cycle, the SSIP SDT and SLs have worked to address these critical concerns with the following actions:

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 ECSE". 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), and 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. This document was finalized and released for the start of the 24-25 school year and paired with the Extended Myths & Facts about Inclusionary Practices in WA State guidance.

OSPI contracted with Swan Innovations to expand the work initiated in FFY21 with Dr. Martina Whelshula and Cree Whelshula. The contract scope of work addresses key recommendations from Swan Innovation's to adapt professional development materials to support both Native American educators and non-Native educators. Within this contract, Swan Innovations will develop synchronous and asynchronous 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. They will also be compensated for their time as collaborative partners and Tribal experts within OSPI's existing state advisory groups, and will become members of the SSIP SDT, to support the 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 Team project.

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 and has resulted in a memo that is influencing the OSPI Special Education Division's Strategic Plan. Its data yielded from the memo resulting 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.

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 SDT, Washington State will be positioned to increase cross agency policy and procedures to expand access to students with disabilities across early learning programs, a vision reflected within 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 CPs, families, and local districts. As the work to expand WAPM, MTSS, and the implementation of inclusionary practices continues, it is paramount that districts and CPs take intentional efforts to understand the implications of personal biases of staff and the lived experiences of the children and families they serve.

As shared earlier in this report, OSPI in partnership with UD, will engage in a review of the WA state ECSE 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. This tool is currently in draft and will continue to be refined through the current SSIP cycle to ensure the following needs are met by the RLs:

1. Differentiate guidance by in-person and virtual coaching.
2. Address special considerations for integrated early learning programs, Tribal programs, and rural/remote settings.
3. Establish criteria for Stages of Implementation when facilitating WAPM, LEAP, BB4B, and/or community inclusion teams (CITs).

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. Utilizing the ECTA grant team, the agencies are continuing to work on the groundwork to create a MOU that outlines the roles and responsibilities of OSPI, DCYF, and Child Care Aware of WA. The state agencies are also working together to create a shared definition of quality so that there is a clear and unified understanding about the programmatic experiences that will be required to 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 third 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 with the local districts and community-based programs.

Per the directives found within HB 1550, OSPI engaged in permanent rulemaking activities and finalized WA Administrative Codes (WACs) to clarify the requirements for school districts implementing TK (effective July 29, 2024). Additional guidance was offered relating to the implementation of TK including the: Transition to Kindergarten: Minimum Standards and Requirements, CRE Planning Worksheet, TK Readiness Considerations, and Funding Early Learning Activities in WA state with Title I, Part A.

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.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

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. 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, families, and local districts have varied as the SSIP SLs attempt to be responsive to the needs at the state, regional, and local levels. Engagement activities have included the offering monthly network meetings (ECSE Inclusion Champions Network), bi-weekly OSPI ECSE Check Ins with the WA state ECSE Coordination Team meetings, monthly state advisories committees (Part C, Early Learning Advisory Council), as well as the offering of Office Hours for LEA Special Education Directors and ECSE Inclusion Champions.

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, incidents of reported discipline in PreK and K, and timely evaluations. These efforts directly correspond to the SSIP Theory of Action which works to strengthen the implementation of education innovations, increase knowledge of fidelity criteria and systems infrastructure, and increase family and community provider knowledge of regional and local EL systems directly impacting the SiMR.

To meet the 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, to target the SSIP RLs and local districts, to support the implementation of community inclusion teams, with the intent of guiding local districts to inventory processes and policies that support inclusion across agencies and environments (specifically state guidance and LEA/community guidance working to align with the HQIs) This has been offered to local district teams currently within the stages 3-Implementation and 4-Scale up, of implementation science, and is intended to create a sustainable method of delivering inclusionary practices across community programs. Currently, the SSIP RLs and local districts are engaging in monthly convenings with ECTA leadership to support communities in the co-creation of a shared vision of inclusion within 6 ESD regions. Additionally, the SSIP RLs participated in separate monthly calls with the grant leads to specifically address their roles as external coaches facilitating the development of this community team.

SSIP Implementation project sites also engage in monthly connections with their assigned RLs. Further, they have opportunities to engage in state and national professional learning opportunities including the 2nd Annual Northwest Early Learning and Pyramid Model Summit, in collaboration with the Idaho, Alaska, Washington, and Oregon Department of Educations. Local district teams are also provided access to 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 free 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 resulting in 2 RLs becoming Certified TPOT statewide trainers. To further support the SSIP SLs commitment to better serve the Tribal children living within the SSIP Implementation project sites, Swan Innovations, as part of their contract, has been invited to attend the CIT Coaching meetings, SSIP SDT and SL convenings, and in some cases have been invited to become members of the CIT for their SSIP region .

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, contractors will offer OSPI mid-year and end of year reports within the lifespan of the grant, and local and RLs will submit grant applications annually sharing their action plans using the LDPIISA as their baseline metric at the start of each year, and will submit an end of year report, offering OSPI a reflection of their journey, suggestions for improvement, data metrics used to drive systems change, and their engagement activities that included families and CPs. The SSIP SLs will continue assess the effectiveness of their efforts across the early learning landscape to support the outcomes predicted within the SSIP Logic Model, Evaluation Plan, and Theory of Action, utilizing the Indicators of High-Quality Inclusion (State,

Program, Community, and Early Childhood Education Environment). Paired with the program level (PIDS) and state data entries into the student information systems hosted by our state agencies, we are streamlining the data sources that are offering us the more direct outcomes for this SSIP project work at all levels of implementation.

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 tied 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 3–22 system is needed to ensure scale up and sustainability of EBPs systemwide,
3. The distribution of funding to support the alignment for early childhood programs must occur equitably 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. A bill was passed in December 2023 affirming and expanding upon OSPI's existing responsibility to ensure that NPAs are authorized to provide services to students who are eligible to receive special education services. The bill established minimum contract requirements for school district placements at an NPA and set minimum standards for OSPI to annually authorize and reauthorize entities as NPAs. The bill also directed OSPI to create a complaint process for any individual to report noncompliance with local, state, or federal laws or violations of student rights by NPAs. Supported by agency leadership, OSPI continues to work with the legislature towards fully funding special education, including providing adequate funds for early childhood special education.

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 fulltime 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.

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. Moreover, OSPI with the support of ECTA will continue its efforts to 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

To further align PreK through age 22 system supports, OSPI used IDEA data (Indicators 4,5,6, 9,10,

Significant Disproportionality) to identify local districts across WA state, building upon the initial efforts of the IPTN.

The Inclusionary Practices (IP) and Reducing Restraint and Eliminating Isolation (RREI) Demonstration Sites are a key component of the Inclusionary Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN), funded by OSPI. These sites serve as learning hubs where educators and school leaders can observe and implement effective inclusionary practices tailored to different districts and school contexts across Washington State.

The IP Demonstration Sites showcase best practices in inclusive education at various school levels, from preschool to high school. The goal is to provide an action-oriented, transformational learning experience for visitors so they can bring inclusive practices back to their own schools and districts. The IP Demo Sites emphasize strengthening inclusive practices to improve student outcomes, reducing reliance on exclusionary practices, and improving equitable social and academic opportunities for all students. ¶The RREI Demonstration Sites focus on strategies to minimize the use of restraint and eliminate isolation practices in schools. These districts and schools' model proactive, supportive approaches that prioritize student well-being, social-emotional learning, and positive behavior supports.

Both IP and RREI Demonstration Sites are designed to provide real-world examples of how schools can implement effective inclusionary practices, improve student outcomes, and create safe, supportive learning environments. Through these demonstration sites, Washington State is making significant progress toward ensuring all students, particularly those with disabilities, receive equitable and high-quality education in inclusive settings.

To further support local districts across WA state, not yet engaged in the ECSE Inclusion Champions Network, the University of Denver (UD) has been selected to participate in the Inclusionary Practices Technical Assistance Network (IPTN) Through a series of ten 90-minute professional development sessions with ECHO-DU, they will use the Comprehensive Inclusive Education in Washington: Connecting General Education and Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) to develop early childhood guidance for collaborative service delivery in inclusive, general education settings where children and families: 1. describe belonging as members of their communities and 2. children are inclusively engaged and joyfully learning in their communities. Employing this training and technical assistance opportunities have bolstered accountability and monitoring of practice, as recorded through ongoing bi-monthly ECSE check-ins and the creation of multiple technical assistance modules.

It is the continued belief of the SSIP SDT that statewide trainings, aligned across the early learning landscape, paired with intensive data analyses will result in an increase to inclusive settings, improved academic student outcomes, and a decrease in reported suspensions and expulsion rates of children as they enter the larger K-12 system.

17—Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17—Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Response

17—Required Actions

INDICATOR 18: GENERAL SUPERVISION

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority

General Supervision

Compliance indicator

This SPP/APR indicator focuses on the State's exercise of its general supervision responsibility to monitor its local educational agencies (LEAs) for requirements under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) through the State's reporting on timely correction of noncompliance (20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(11) and 1416(a); and 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.149, 300.600). In reporting on findings under this indicator, the State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State.

Data Source

The State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Include all findings of noncompliance regardless of the specific type and extent of noncompliance.

Measurement

This SPP/APR indicator requires the reporting on the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance issued the prior Federal fiscal year (FFY) (e.g., for the FFY 2023 submission, use FFY 2022, July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023)
- b. # of findings of noncompliance the State verified were corrected no later than one year after the State's written notification of findings of noncompliance.

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

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data expressed as a percentage. OSEP assumes that the State's FFY 2023 data for this indicator is the State's baseline data unless the State provides an explanation for using other baseline data.

Targets must be 100%.

Report in Column A the total number of findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2022 (July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023) and report in Column B the number of those findings which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State’s written notification of noncompliance.

Starting with the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, States will be required to report on the correction of noncompliance related to compliance indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 based on findings issued in FFY 2022. Under each compliance indicator, States report on the correction of noncompliance for that specific indicator. However, in this general supervision Indicator 18, States report on both those findings as well as any additional findings that the State issued related to that compliance indicator.

In the last row of this General Supervision Data Table, States may also provide additional information related to other findings of noncompliance that are not specific to the compliance indicators. This row would include reporting on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported by the State under the compliance indicators listed below (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.). In future years (e.g., with the FFY 2026 SPP/APR), States may be required to further disaggregate findings by results indicators (1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17), fiscal and other areas.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA’s enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

18--Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2023	100%

Targets

FFY	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%

Indicator 4B. 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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	0	0	0	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 4B due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:
Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Indicator 9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	0	0	0	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 9 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Indicator 10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups

in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
0	0	0	0	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 10 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

Indicator 11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
68	0	68	0	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 11 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

As described under Indicator B-11 of this APR, OSPI issued a written notification of non-compliance in September 2023 to 68 LEAs that were determined to not meet the IDEA implementation requirements for Indicator B-11 (i.e., all LEAs that were not at 100% for this indicator) for the 2022-23 school year per the Indicator B-11 report submitted by LEAs on July 15, 2023.

In order to verify that the LEAs were correctly implementing the identified regulatory requirements related to C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1), verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the LEA's regional Educational Service District (ESD), under the direction of 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 included a review of documentation, including updated data reports, student records and information from the LEA's student information system for the 2023-24 school year showing evidence of timely initial evaluations. Specifically, the updated data reports and information were reviewed to ensure that the LEA was currently, correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., the LEA achieved 100 percent compliance with 34 C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1)).

The LEA and ESD provided a detailed summary and assurances of the actions taken to correct the identified non-compliance and the activities completed to verify the correction of the non-compliance, including verifying the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements. These were submitted by LEA and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from LEAs as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2024, and from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 3, 2024). OSPI special education program supervisors reviewed the LEA and ESD summaries to ensure:

- 1) all identified areas of non-compliance within each individual student record had been corrected;
- 2) the dates of correction and verification were included, were in alignment with each other, and were for the current school year (i.e., after the finding was issued);
- 3) the LEA described the identified root cause(s) for any system-level non-compliance, and the actions taken to correct the system directly correlated to the identified root cause(s);
- 4) the sampling of updated documentation/data reports verified the LEA's 100 percent compliance with IDEA requirements (34 C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1));
- 5) the ESD verified all actions taken by the LEA; and
- 6) the LEA and ESD administrator provided assurances that the information contained in the summaries was valid and accurate.

If any information was missing or concerns were noted, the OSPI program supervisor contacted the ESD director to let them know what was needed. The ESD director then worked with the LEA to address the OSPI reviewer's concerns.

The results of these verification and validation activities showed 100% compliance; all 68 LEAs were

correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1).

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance* was corrected:

As described under Indicator B-11 of this APR, the identified LEAs corrected and accounted for each individual, child-specific instance of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings.

LEAs identified with non-compliance under Indicator B-11 conducted a root cause analysis to identify the cause(s) for each individual instance of non-compliance, which included a review of policies, procedures, and/or practices that contributed to the noncompliance. Actions were taken by each LEA 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 (due from LEAs as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2024). Actions taken by LEAs were specific to the identified root cause(s) and included activities such as:

- a. providing professional development to LEA 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 LEA's procedures manual/standard operating procedures;
- d. implementing a new LEA practice or form to timely document an agreement to extend the evaluation timeline;
- 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 LEAs corrected the identified non-compliance, verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the LEA's regional Educational Service District (ESD), under the direction of OSPI. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings; staff interviews; data reviews; student record reviews; observations; guidance documents provided to staff; professional development materials and attendee rosters; updated/revised policies, procedures, and practices manuals; staff meeting agendas; and more. The documents reviewed as part of the verification depended on what actions the LEA took to correct. For example, if the LEA conducted a staff training, the ESD verifier reviewed the participant roster, along with the PowerPoint, agenda, and/or other training materials, to confirm that the training took place as described in the LEA's correction summary (including date).

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 LEAs and ESDs administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 3, 2024). OSPI special education program supervisors reviewed the LEA and ESD summaries to ensure:

- 1) all identified areas of non-compliance within each individual student record had been corrected;
- 2) the dates of correction and verification were included, were in alignment with each other, and were for the current school year (i.e., after the finding was issued);
- 3) the LEA described the identified root cause(s) for any system-level non-compliance, and the actions taken to correct the system directly correlated to the identified root cause(s);
- 4) the sampling of documentation/data reports verified the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements;
- 5) the ESD verified all actions taken by the LEA; and

- 6) the LEA and ESD administrator provided assurances that the information contained in the summaries was valid and accurate, and that all identified student evaluations had been completed, although late, unless the child was no longer under the LEA’s jurisdiction.

In addition, OSPI’s Special Education Data Team confirmed each individual student’s status within the CEDARS system to ensure that each evaluation had been completed, although late.

If any information was missing or concerns were noted in the LEA’s summary of correction or the ESD’s verification, the OSPI program supervisor contacted the ESD director to let them know what was needed. The ESD director then worked with the LEA to address the OSPI reviewer’s concerns.

The outcomes of these verifications demonstrated that all 68 LEAs 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 LEA’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.

Based on the review of updated data and information, the 68 LEAs were at 100 percent compliance for the specific regulatory requirements under (34 C.F.R. §300.301(c)(1)). In addition, all of the individual instances of non-compliance were corrected and all of the identified students under the LEA’s jurisdiction have a completed evaluation. Therefore, OSPI reports that all identified noncompliance from FFY 2022 for Indicator B-11 was corrected within one year of identification.

Indicator 12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))
Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
48	0	48	0	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 12 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:

As described under Indicator B-12 of this APR, OSPI issued a written notification of non-compliance in September 2023 to 48 LEAs that were determined to not meet the IDEA implementation requirements for Indicator B-12 (i.e., all LEAs that were not at 100% for this indicator) for the 2022-23 school year per the Indicator B-12 report submitted by LEAs on July 15, 2023.

In order to verify that the LEAs were correctly implementing the identified regulatory requirements related to C.F.R. §300.124(b), verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the LEA's regional Educational Service District (ESD), under the direction of OSPI. Verification activities included, but were not limited to, on-site visits and/or virtual meetings, staff interviews, data reviews, student record reviews, observations. The verification included a review of documentation, including updated data reports, student records, and information from the LEA's student information system for the 2023-24 school year showing evidence of timely Part C to Part B transitions. Specifically, the updated data reports and information were reviewed to ensure that the LEA was currently, correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., the LEA achieved 100 percent compliance with 34 C.F.R. §300.124(b)).

The LEA and ESD provided a detailed summary and assurances of the actions taken to correct the identified non-compliance and the activities completed to verify the correction of the non-compliance, including verifying the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements. These were submitted by LEA and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from LEAs as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2024, and from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 3, 2024). OSPI special education program supervisors reviewed the LEA and ESD summaries to ensure:

- 1) all identified areas of non-compliance within each individual student record had been corrected;
- 2) the dates of correction and verification were included, were in alignment with each other, and were for the current school year (i.e., after the finding was issued);
- 3) the LEA described the identified root cause(s) for any system-level non-compliance, and the actions taken to correct the system directly correlated to the identified root cause(s);
- 4) the sampling of updated documentation/data reports verified the LEA's 100 percent compliance with IDEA requirements (34 C.F.R. §300.124(b));
- 5) the ESD verified all actions taken by the LEA; and
- 6) the LEA and ESD administrator provided assurances that the information contained in the summaries was valid and accurate.

If any information was missing or concerns were noted, the OSPI program supervisor contacted the ESD director to let them know what was needed. The ESD director then worked with the LEA to address the OSPI reviewer's concerns.

The results of these validations showed 100% compliance; all 48 LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.124(b).

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance* was corrected:

As described under Indicator B-12 of this APR, the identified LEAs corrected and accounted for each individual, child-specific instance of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings.

LEAs 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 LEA 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 (due from LEAs as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2024). Actions taken by LEAs 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 LEA 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 LEA's procedures manual/standard operating procedures;
- e. implementing a new LEA 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 LEAs corrected the identified non-compliance, verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the LEA's regional Educational Service District (ESD), under the direction of OSPI. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings; staff interviews; data reviews; student record reviews; observations; guidance documents provided to staff; professional development materials and attendee rosters; updated/revise policies, procedures, and practices manuals; staff meeting agendas; and more. The documents reviewed as part of the verification depended on what actions the LEA took to correct. For example, if the LEA conducted a staff training, the ESD verifier reviewed the participant roster, along with the PowerPoint, agenda, and/or other training materials, to confirm that the training took place as described in the LEA's correction summary (including date).

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 LEAs and ESDs administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 3, 2024). OSPI special education program supervisors reviewed the LEA and ESD summaries to ensure:

- 1) all identified areas of non-compliance within each individual student record had been corrected;
- 2) the dates of correction and verification were included, were in alignment with each other, and were for the current school year (i.e., after the finding was issued);
- 3) the LEA described the identified root cause(s) for any system-level non-compliance, and the actions taken to correct the system directly correlated to the identified root cause(s);
- 4) the sampling of documentation/data reports verified the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements;
- 5) the ESD verified all actions taken by the LEA; and
- 6) the LEA and ESD administrator provided assurances that the information contained in the

summaries was valid and accurate, and that the C to B transition process was complete for all of the identified students, although late, unless the child was no longer under the LEA's jurisdiction.

In addition, OSPI's Special Education Data Team confirmed each individual student's status within the CEDARS system to ensure that the C to B transition process had been completed, although late.

If any information was missing or concerns were noted in the LEA's summary of correction or the ESD's verification, the OSPI program supervisor contacted the ESD director to let them know what was needed. The ESD director then worked with the LEA to address the OSPI reviewer's concerns.

The outcomes of these verifications demonstrated that all 48 LEAs 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 LEA'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.

Based on the review of updated data and information, the 48 LEAs were at 100 percent compliance for the specific regulatory requirements under 34 C.F.R. §300.124(b). In addition, all of the individual instances of non-compliance were corrected and all of the identified students under the LEA's jurisdiction have transitioned from Part C to Part B. Therefore, OSPI reports that all identified noncompliance from FFY 2022 for Indicator B-12 was corrected within one year of identification.

Indicator 13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age-appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services and 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 a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
17	0	17	0	0

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 13 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

As described under Indicator B-13 of this APR, OSPI issued a written notification of non-compliance in September 2023 to 17 LEAs that were determined to not meet the IDEA implementation requirements for Indicator B-13 (i.e., all LEAs that were not at 100% for this indicator) for the 2022-23 school year, as identified through monitoring reviews and Safety Net completed in spring/summer 2023.

In order to verify that the LEAs were correctly implementing the identified regulatory requirements related to 34 C.F.R. §300.320(b) and 300.321(b), verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the LEA's regional Educational Service District (ESD), under the direction of 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 included a review of updated documentation, including IEPs developed during the 2023-24 school year (i.e., after the original finding was issued), showing evidence that the LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements for secondary transition (i.e., the LEA achieved 100 percent compliance with 34 C.F.R. §300.320(b) and 300.321(b)).

The LEA and ESD provided a detailed summary and assurances of the actions taken to correct the identified non-compliance and the activities completed to verify the correction of the non-compliance, including verifying the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements. These were submitted by LEA and ESD administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from LEAs as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2024, and from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 3, 2024). OSPI special education program supervisors reviewed the LEA and ESD summaries to ensure:

- 1) all identified areas of non-compliance within each individual student record had been corrected;
- 2) the dates of correction and verification were included, were in alignment with each other, and were for the current school year (i.e., after the finding was issued);
- 3) the LEA described the identified root cause(s) for any system-level non-compliance, and the actions taken to correct the system directly correlated to the identified root cause(s);
- 4) the sampling of updated documentation/data reports verified the LEA's 100 percent compliance with IDEA requirements (34 C.F.R. §300.320(b) and 300.321(b));
- 5) the ESD verified all actions taken by the LEA; and
- 6) the LEA and ESD administrator provided assurances that the information contained in the summaries was valid and accurate.

If any information was missing or concerns were noted, the OSPI program supervisor contacted the ESD director to let them know what was needed. The ESD director then worked with the LEA to address the OSPI reviewer's concerns.

The results of these validations showed 100% compliance; all 17 LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements found in 34 C.F.R. §300.320(b) and 300.321(b).

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

As described under Indicator B-13 of this APR, the identified LEAs corrected and accounted for each individual, child-specific instance of noncompliance identified in the notification of findings.

The LEAs provided a summary of the actions taken to correct each individual instance of non-compliance to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from LEAs as soon as possible but no later than March 1, 2024).

In order to verify that the LEAs corrected the identified non-compliance, verification activities were conducted by special education administrators from the LEA's regional Educational Service District (ESD), under the direction of OSPI. Verification activities included on-site visits and/or virtual meetings; staff interviews; data reviews; student record reviews (including current IEPs/IEP amendments); observations; 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 specific actions taken to correct the child-specific non-compliance, and the documentation and activities completed to verify the corrections, were submitted by LEAs and ESDs administrators through the IDEA Compliance Package (due from ESDs as soon as possible but no later than June 3, 2024). OSPI special education program supervisors reviewed the LEA and ESD summaries to ensure:

- 1) all identified areas of non-compliance within each individual student record had been corrected;
- 2) the dates of correction and verification were included, were in alignment with each other, and were for the current school year (i.e., after the finding was issued);
- 3) the LEA described the identified root cause(s) for any system-level non-compliance, and the actions taken to correct the system directly correlated to the identified root cause(s);
- 4) the sampling of documentation/data reports verified the LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements;
- 5) the ESD verified all actions taken by the LEA; and
- 6) the LEA and ESD administrator provided assurances that the information contained in the summaries was valid and accurate, and that all individual instances of non-compliance had been corrected.

If any information was missing or concerns were noted in the LEA's summary of correction or the ESD's verification, the OSPI program supervisor contacted the ESD director to let them know what was needed. The ESD director then worked with the LEA to address the OSPI reviewer's concerns.

The outcomes of these verifications demonstrated that all 17 LEAs corrected each individual case of non-compliance, unless the student was no longer under the LEA'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.

Based on the review of updated data and information, the 17 LEAs were at 100 percent compliance

for the specific regulatory requirements under 34 C.F.R. §300.320(b) and 300.321(b). In addition, all of the individual instances of non-compliance were corrected and all of the identified students have IEPs that contain the required transition components (unless they are no longer under the LEA's jurisdiction). Therefore, OSPI reports that all identified noncompliance from FFY 2022 for Indicator B-13 was corrected within one year of identification.

Total for All Noncompliance Identified (Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and Optional Areas):

Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 6/30/23)	Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable	Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)	Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected
133	0	133	0	0

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

Number of findings of Noncompliance that were timely corrected (C1+C2)	Number of findings of Noncompliance that were identified FFY 2022 (A+B)	FFY 2022 Data	FFY 2023 Target	FFY 2023 Data	Status	Slippage
133	133		100%	100.00%	N/A	N/A

Percent of findings of noncompliance not corrected or not verified as corrected within one year of identification	0.00%
---	-------

Summary of Findings of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 Corrected in FFY 2023 (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified during FFY 2022 (the period from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023)	133
2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of written notification to the LEA of the finding)	133
3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year	0

Subsequent Correction: Summary of All Outstanding Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022 Not Timely Corrected in FFY 2023 (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):

4. Number of findings of noncompliance not timely corrected	0
5. Number of findings in Col. A the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline for Indicator 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 ("subsequent correction")	0
6a. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 4B	0
6b. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 9	0
6c. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 10	0
6d. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 11	0
6e. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 12	0
6f. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 13	0
6g. (optional) Number of written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - All other findings	0
7. Number of findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected	0

18 - OSEP Response

The State has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2023, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

18 - 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

2025 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination

Percentage (%)	Determination
78.18%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	14	70.00%
Compliance	22	19	86.36%

2025 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4	95%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	89%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	33%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	86%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	28%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	83%	1

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4	95%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	89%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	46%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	88%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	23%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	89%	1

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	23	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.”

2025 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022	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%	YES	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	99.31%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	94.75%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	75.00%	YES	1
Indicator 18: General Supervision	100.00%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	97.62%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	66.21%		0
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

Data Rubric

FFY 2023 APR

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
18	1	1
	Subtotal	22
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2023 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) =	27

618 Data

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 7/31/24	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 3/5/25	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 3/5/25	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 3/5/25	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/8/25	1	0	1	2
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/13/24	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 9/4/24	1	1	1	3
			Subtotal	20
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.28571429) =	25.71

Indicator Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	27
B. 618 Grand Total	25.71
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	52.71
<i>Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator</i>	0
<i>Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator</i>	0.00
Denominator	54.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator*) =	0.9762
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	97.62

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 1.28571429 points are 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 2025 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	FS002 & FS089	7/31/2024
Part B Personnel	FS070, FS099, FS112	3/5/2025
Part B Exiting	FS009	3/5/2025
Part B Discipline	FS005, FS006, FS007, FS088, FS143, FS144	3/5/2025
Part B Assessment	FS175, FS178, FS185, FS188	1/8/2025
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	11/13/2024
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	9/4/2024

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 2025 will be posted in June 2025. 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