

Special Education Performance Report (SEPR) Measurement Definitions

Measurement	Definition	Measurement	Definition & Measurement Source	Data Source
LEA Compliance				
Valid and Reliable Data	Percent of data submitted for inclusion in OSSE's data submissions in Annual Performance Report (APR) are submitted on time and are accurate.	The number of instances where the local education agency (LEA) is required to submit data to OSSE for inclusion in the District's Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) APR to the US Department of Education, divided by the number of instances of timely data submission multiplied by 100.	OSSE LEA Determinations	IDEA program and grant monitoring
Initial Evaluation	Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days.	The number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days divided by number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received, multiplied by 100.	IDEA Annual Performance Report (APR)	OSSE Special Education Data System (SEDS)
Secondary Transition	Percent of youth age 16 and older with an individualized education program (IEP) that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.	The number of youth with disabilities age 16 and older with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals; divided by the number of youth with an IEP age 16 and older, multiplied by 100.	IDEA APR and IDEA Specific Conditions	IDEA program monitoring
Significant Discrepancy in Suspension/Expulsion	<p>A. Percent of 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 IEPs.</p> <p>B. Percent of LEAs that have: (1) 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 (2) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and support.</p>	<p>A. Divide the number of LEAs, by the number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, multiplied by 100.</p> <p>B. Divide the number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy for one or more racial/ethnic groups due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices; by the number of total number LEAs in the state, multiplied by 100.</p> <p>The District of Columbia defines significant discrepancy as a suspension/expulsion rate of greater than 1.5 times the equivalent rate for nondisabled peers for three consecutive years. In order to be included in this calculation, LEAs must meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have at least 40 students with IEPs at the LEA (n-size) • Have at least five students with disabilities suspended and/or expelled more than 10 cumulative days in a school year (cell size) 	IDEA APR	LEA self-reporting & Child Count

LEA Compliance				
Disproportionate Representation (race/ethnic group in special education)	Percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Risk ratio is a calculation: Divide the risk of a particular outcome (special education identification) for children in one racial or ethnic group within the LEA, by the risk for children in all other racial and ethnic groups within the LEA. LEAs with risk ratios in excess of 5.0 for three consecutive years that also demonstrate inappropriate identification practices are considered to have a disproportionate representation.	IDEA APR	Child Count
Disproportionate representation (race/ethnic group & disability category)	Percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. Conducted for each of the following disability categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intellectual disability; • Specific learning disability; • Emotional disability; • Speech or language impairment; • Other health impairments; and • Autism. 	Risk ratio calculation: Divide the risk of a particular outcome (special education identification in a specific disability category) for children in one racial or ethnic group within the LEA, by the risk for children in all other racial and ethnic groups within the LEA. LEAs with risk ratios in excess of 7.0 for three consecutive years that also demonstrate inappropriate identification practices are considered to have a disproportionate representation.	IDEA APR	Child Count
Longstanding Noncompliance	Percent of findings of noncompliance corrected no later than one year (356 days) after OSSE notice to the LEA of identification noncompliance.	Divide the number of findings of noncompliance not corrected within 356 days of OSSE issuance to the LEA, by the number of LEA findings of noncompliance identified through OSSE monitoring of IDEA requirements.	OSSE LEA Determinations	IDEA program monitoring
Part C to B Transition	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.	$\text{Percent} = [(c) \text{ divided by } (a - b - d)] \text{ times } 100.$ <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination. b. Number of children referred determined to be not eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays. c. Number of children found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. d. Number of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services. Account for children included in a but not included in b, c or d. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.	IDEA APR	OSSE Special Education Data System (SEDS)

LEA Compliance				
On-site Monitoring	Percentage of identified noncompliance from OSSE on-site compliance monitoring and/or focused monitoring. Includes student and LEA-level review of compliance.	Number of student file reviews through OSSE monitoring that resulted in findings of noncompliance divided by the number of student files reviewed.	OSSE LEA Determinations	OSSE on-site monitoring tool data
Reevaluation	Rate of timely reevaluation.	Divide the number of children who were provided a determination of eligibility by the triennial evaluation deadline within the period, by the number of children whose triennial reevaluation deadlines fell within the period.	IDEA Specific Conditions	OSSE Special Education Data System (SEDS)
Student Progress				
Parent Engagement	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.	Divide the number of responding parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, by the total number of responsive parents of children with disabilities, multiplied by 100.	IDEA APR	Annual IDEA Parent Survey results
Graduation	Percent of all youth with IEPs ages 14-21 who exited school with a regular diploma compared to all youth with IEPs ages 14-21 who left school.	Divide the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular diploma I, by all youth with IEPs who left school (ages 14-21), multiplied by 100.	IDEA APR	OSSE Special Education Data System (SEDS); LEA self-reporting of graduates
Dropout	Percent of all youth with IEPs ages 14-21 who exited school from dropping out compared to all youth with IEPs ages 14-21 who left school.	Divide the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out, by all youth with IEPs who left school (ages 14-21).	IDEA APR	OSSE Special Education Data System (SEDS)
Least Restrictive Environment	Rate of LEA placement of students into settings outside of the LEA. Excludes instances where OSSE recommends such placement.	Divide the number of students placed into more restrictive environments outside of the LEA, minus the number of more restrictive environments outside of the LEA recommended by OSSE; by the number of Justifications of Removal Statements (JRS) submitted by the LEA to OSSE.	n/a	OSSE Special Education Data System (SEDS) (SEA) placement oversight data
Grant Resources	Rate of timely LEA submission of Phase I and Phase II applications and reimbursement for a minimum of 45 percent of its IDEA, Section 611 funds within the first 15 months of the grants cycle. Maintenance of Effort (MOE): LEAs must spend the same amount of state and/or local money on the education of children with IEPs from year to year.	Timely submission of Phase I and Phase II applications; and evidence that LEA sought valid reimbursement for a minimum of 45 percent of its IDEA, Section 611 funds within the first 15 months of the grant cycle Evidence that LEA is in compliance with the IDEA MOE requirement; and timely submission of the IDEA MOE spreadsheet for the fiscal year.	OSSE LEA Determinations	IDEA Grant monitoring

Student Progress				
<p>Dispute Resolution</p>	<p>Rate of resolution of due process and state complaints prior to formal dispute resolution.</p> <p>Formal dispute resolution is defined as a due process hearing in the instance of a due process complaint, or issuance of a Letter of Decision (LOD) in the instance of a state complaint.</p>	<p>Divide the number of the number of due process and state complaints resolved prior to due process hearing or issuance of a Letter of Decision, by the number due process and state complaints received by the LEA during the period.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>SEA mediation, due process, and OSSE Special Education Data System (SEDS)</p>
<p>Child Find + Enrollment (ages 3-5)</p>	<p>Percent of children ages 3-5 who are enrolled in special education and related services under Part B or extended Part C services.</p> <p>A child is considered “enrolled” by the US District Court on the date the child began receiving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All special education and related services identified in the child’s IEP, or • All services identified in the child’s extended Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP), including the required educational component. 	<p>The District’s enrollment percentage shall be calculated by dividing the number of preschool children enrolled, by the number of preschool children in the District.</p> <p>Students enrolled in the District is based on the most recent annual census estimate prepared by the US Census Bureau’s Population Estimates Program, except in the years for which the decennial census results are issued, in which case the enrollment percentage should be calculated by the number of preschool children enrolled by the decennial census results.</p>	<p>DL v. DC</p> <p>Subclass I: Child Find</p>	<p>OSSE Special Education Data System (SEDS)and DC Annual Performance Report to the US District Court</p>
<p>Initial Evaluation (ages 3-5)</p>	<p>Percent of children ages 3-5 referred for Part B services who receive a timely eligibility determination.</p> <p>An eligibility determination is considered timely if it is completed 60 days from the date the student’s parent or guardian provides consent for the evaluation or assessment.</p>	<p>Divide the number of students, younger than age 6 at the time of referral, who received an initial special education referral and whose initial eligibility determination deadlines fell within the reporting year; by the number of children younger than 6-years-old at the time of referral, whose initial eligibility determination deadline fell within the reporting year, who were provided an eligibility determination within 60 days from the date the student’s parent or guardian provided consent for the evaluation or assessment.</p>	<p>DL v. DC</p> <p>Subclass III: Timely Eligibility Determination for Part B Services</p>	<p>OSSE Special Education Data System (SEDS)and DC Annual Performance Report to the US District Court</p>

Student Progress

<p align="center">Part C to B Transition + Start of Service</p>	<p>The rate of smooth and effective transition by the student’s third birthday for students transitioning from IDEA Part C to IDEA Part B services.</p> <p>A transition is considered “smooth and effective” if:</p> <p>(1) the transition begins no less than 90 days prior to the child’s third birthday;</p> <p>(2) the child is provided with an IEP listing the services that are to be provided and both the type of placement and a specific location for services by the child’s third birthday;</p> <p>(3) there is no disruption in services between IDEA Part C and IDEA Part B services (that is, all special education and related services in the child’s IEP must commence by the child’s third birthday); and</p> <p>(4) IDEA Part B personnel are involved in the transition process.</p>	<p>Divide the number of All students expected to transition from IDEA Part C to Part B as indicated by OSSE data systems; by the number of children, whose third birthday occurred from July 1-June 30 of the reporting year, who were considered to have made a “smooth and effective” transition from Part C to Part B.</p>	<p align="center">DL v. DC</p> <p align="center">Subclass IV: Smooth and Effective Transition from IDEA Part C to B</p>	<p align="center">OSSE Special Education Data System (SEDS) and DC Annual Performance Report to the US District Court</p>
<p align="center">Statewide Assessment Participation</p>	<p>Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade-level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>Participation grades are calculated separately for reading and math.</p>	<p>Divide the number of children with IEPs participating in an assessment, by all children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window.</p>	<p align="center">IDEA APR</p>	<p align="center">State-wide assessment data (PARCC and MSAA)</p>
<p align="center">Statewide Assessment Proficiency</p>	<p>Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade-level academic achievement standards.</p> <p>Proficiency rates are calculated separately for reading and math and disaggregated by testing grade.</p>	<p>Divide the number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards, by all children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment.</p>	<p align="center">IDEA APR</p>	<p align="center">State-wide assessment data (PARCC)</p>

Student Progress				
Statewide Assessment Proficiency (Alt)	<p>Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>Proficiency rates are calculated separately for reading and math and disaggregated by testing grade.</p>	<p>Divide the number of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards, by all children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment.</p>	<p>IDEA APR</p>	<p>State-wide assessment data (MSAA)</p>
Statewide Assessment Proficiency Gap	<p>Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.</p> <p>Gap rates are calculated separately for reading and math and disaggregated by testing grade.</p>	<p>The difference between the proficiency rate of students without IEPs and the proficiency rate of students with IEPs against grade-level academic achievement standards:</p> <p>Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade-level academic achievement standards for the school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade-level academic achievement standards for the 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.</p>	<p>IDEA APR</p>	<p>State-wide assessment data (PARCC)</p>
Preschool Skills	<p>Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p>	<p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):</p> <p>a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(number of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (number of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(number of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (number of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(number of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (number of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p> <p>d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(number of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (number of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.</p>	<p>IDEA APR</p>	<p>LEA self-reporting</p>

Student Progress

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{number of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}}{\text{number of preschool children with IEPs assessed}} \right] \times 100$. If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100 percent, explain the difference.

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

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $\left[\frac{\text{number of preschool children who did not improve functioning}}{\text{number of preschool children with IEPs assessed}} \right] \times 100$.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{number of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}}{\text{number of preschool children with IEPs assessed}} \right] \times 100$.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $\left[\frac{\text{number of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}}{\text{number of preschool children with IEPs assessed}} \right] \times 100$.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{number of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}}{\text{number of preschool children with IEPs assessed}} \right] \times 100$.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $\left[\frac{\text{number of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}}{\text{number of preschool children with IEPs assessed}} \right] \times 100$. If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100 percent, explain the difference.

Student Progress

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $\frac{[(\text{number of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\text{number of preschool children with IEPs assessed})]}{\text{times 100}}$.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $\frac{[(\text{number of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\text{number of preschool children with IEPs assessed})]}{\text{times 100}}$.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $\frac{[(\text{number of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\text{number of preschool children with IEPs assessed})]}{\text{times 100}}$.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $\frac{[(\text{number of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\text{number of preschool children with IEPs assessed})]}{\text{times 100}}$.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $\frac{[(\text{number of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\text{percent of preschool children with IEPs assessed})]}{\text{times 100}}$. If a + b + c + d + e does not equal 100 percent, explain the difference.