



**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT (IDEA)  
PART B SPECIAL CONDITIONS  
PROGRESS REPORT # 1  
REPORTING PERIOD: APRIL 1, 2013 – SEPTEMBER 30, 2013

SUBMITTED: NOVEMBER 22, 2013

REVISED: FEBRUARY 3, 2014

## **I. Reporting Requirements**

The Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) is pleased to submit this first progress report as required by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) pursuant to the special conditions imposed by the USDE on OSSE's FFY 2013 IDEA Part B grant award.

As outlined in Enclosure E of OSEP's FFY 2013 grant award notice to OSSE, OSSE is required to submit specific data and information related to:

- Demonstrated compliance with the requirement to conduct timely initial evaluations and reevaluations
- Demonstrated compliance with the requirement to implement Hearing officer Determinations (HODs) in a timely manner
- Evidence that it has a general supervision system that is reasonably designed to effectively correct noncompliance in a timely manner
- Demonstrated compliance with secondary transition requirements, and
- Demonstrated compliance with early childhood transition requirements

OSEP has also required the District to reduce the backlog of overdue initial evaluations and re-evaluations each reporting period. Specifically, for this reporting period, OSEP has required the District to reduce the percentage of students remaining in the backlog at the end of the August 6, 2013 progress report by 50%.

OSEP has similarly required the District to improve its overall rate of compliance with secondary transition requirements. Specifically, for this reporting period, OSEP has required the state to demonstrate that of the student records reviewed, 75% of youth aged 16 and above had IEPs that included the required secondary transition content.

OSEP requires that OSSE report on the use of its FFY 2013 IDEA Part B DUF funds to support the reduction in the backlog of overdue initial evaluations and reevaluations and the improvement of secondary transition requirements. These reporting elements continue to be addressed via OSSE's FFY 2013 Corrective Action Plan (CAP) Progress Report, submitted for the same reporting period.

OSSE submits this first progress report to satisfy the above reporting requirements. OSSE is pleased to note that this report represents progress across several performance indicators. The rate of timeliness for initial evaluations, reevaluations and early childhood transition continues to be above 90% and the rate of timeliness related to Hearing Officer Determinations (HODs) is also above 90% this reporting period. At the same time, the District did not meet OSEP's target related to evaluation backlog reduction or compliance with secondary transition requirements. Through implementation of the activities outlined in OSSE's FFY 2013 Corrective Action Plan (CAP), OSSE expects to see continued improvement in outcomes over subsequent reporting

periods. OSSE looks forward to continuing to report on its accomplishments and improved outcomes throughout FFY 2013.

## 1. Compliance with the Requirement to Conduct Initial Evaluations

Summary of Data for this Reporting Element:

Initial Evaluations		7/1/2013 – 9/30/2013
<b>A</b>	<b>The number of children who, as of the end of the previous reporting period, had been referred for, but not provided, a timely initial evaluation:</b>	<b>31</b>
	1. Previous Report Untimely <sup>1</sup>	<b>52</b>
	2. Late Data Entry Adjustment	<b>-21</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>The number of children referred for initial evaluation whose initial evaluation became overdue during the reporting period</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>The number of children from (A) and (B) above, who were provided initial evaluations during the reporting period</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>The number of children who had not been provided a timely initial evaluation at the conclusion of the reporting period</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>The percent by which the State reduced the number of children with overdue initial evaluations reported in the State’s previous progress report. [(a) - (d)] / (a) x 100</b>	<b>-26%</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>The percent of initial evaluations provided to children whose initial evaluation deadlines fell within the reporting period that were conducted in a timely manner. The state must also report actual numbers for the following:</b>	
	1. The number of children whose initial evaluation deadlines fell within the reporting period	<b>696</b>
	2. The number of those children who were provided a timely initial evaluation	<b>644</b>
	3. The number of children, if any, for whom the exceptions in 34 CFR Section 300.301 (d) applied	<b>4</b>
	<b>To calculate the percent of initial evaluations provided in a timely manner use the data reported in #2 divided by [1 minus 3] times 100</b>	<b>93%</b>
<b>G</b>	<b>The average number of days the initial evaluations that had not been provided in a timely manner were overdue</b>	<b>29</b>

<sup>1</sup> Prior to FFY 2012, OSEP required OSSE to report on timeliness rates related to initial evaluations and placements. Beginning in FFY 2012, OSEP requires OSSE to report on timeliness rates related to initial evaluations. Therefore, the “Previous Report Untimely” rate was calculated utilizing the new metrics required by OSEP.

### Discussion of Reported Data:

*Timeliness:* **93%** of initial evaluations provided to children with disabilities whose initial evaluation deadlines fell within the reporting period were conducted in a timely manner. The calculation used to derive that percentage is  $644/(696-4)*100$ . This rate of timeliness represents progress compared to the **92%** rate of timeliness reported in the fourth FFY 2012 progress report submitted to OSEP on August 6, 2013.

*Progress Related to the Reduction of the Backlog:* In order to reduce the backlog by **50%**, 16 evaluations in the backlog would need to be completed in this reporting period, which would leave 15 in the backlog. Based on the above calculation, the total number of students currently in the backlog is 39.

It is noteworthy that this report period crosses school years. DC is unique in the fact that it houses 60 LEAs within the same geographic area, 59 of which allow families to participate in an annual application and admissions process. Based on a review of the data, OSSE believes that a portion of the current backlog is due to high levels of mobility, both between LEAs and returns to LEAs from out of state or private settings. Specifically, 7 students whose initial evaluations became due had transferred from a previous LEA during the reporting period, and 8 students in the backlog had exited the District over a year prior.

*Reasons for Delays in Conducting Initial Evaluations in a Timely Manner:* The reasons for delay for Initial evaluations not held in a timely manner fell into two categories: LEA delay (92%) and parental delay (8%).

The primary reasons for LEA delay included: delayed action taken related to initial referral, delayed action related to accessing records from the previous LEA, and delays in scheduling meetings. In instances of parental delay, the LEA made reasonable efforts to complete the evaluation process in accordance with OSSE's Initial Evaluation and Reevaluation Policy dated March 22, 2010 and the exceptions in 34 CFR Section 300.301 (d) applied.

*Actions the State is taking to Address Noncompliance:* OSSE has continued with its three-tiered targeted technical assistance initiative. Technical assistance related to the first and second tiers of intervention were completed in May and June, where LEAs were required to attend webinars on data quality and onsite consultation sessions. During these sessions, LEAs were introduced to a root cause analyses framework and were tasked with completing a special education improvement plan. OSSE is currently following up with LEAs with regard to the completed plans, which were submitted by LEAs in August and September. Student-level backlog data for every Tier III classified LEA has also been reviewed and OSSE continues to work with the respective LEAs to address the identified cases.

OSSE is also continuously working on streamlining and enhancing its data systems for LEA usage. An online reporting portal has been developed that provides users with key reports related to special education data. These web-based reports were developed based on LEA and

central office requests and feedback through an extensive requirements gathering process. This special education data portal will be housed within the OSSE's Statewide Longitudinal Educational Data System (SLED), and will allow school and LEA staff to more proactively manage student information, identify overdue events, track deadlines, and rectify data errors. The tool is currently being piloted with a small group of LEAs so that OSSE can better refine the tool, and the full rollout of the tool will occur during winter 2013.

The Division of Specialized Education (DSE) has also created an OSSE Support Tool, a web-based dashboard that serves to allow OSSE with a mechanism to quickly and efficiently respond to LEA inquiries. To date, over 1,500 inquiries have been received and addressed in the Tool. DSE is also working with OSSE's Office of Data Management (ODM) to create LEA Inquiry teams, which are cross-functional teams assigned to groups of LEAs to better serve and respond to the needs LEAs. DSE has also categorized the types of inquiries that may be logged into the tool and identified resolution paths for each type of inquiry. By having a database that will log inquiries and needs from LEAs, OSSE is looking to take a proactive approach in better serving the needs of LEAs.

Last, OSSE and the Public Charter School Board (PCSB) have recently created a data-driven "tiger team" that meets regularly to review and address challenges that LEAs are experiencing with student records, including record transfers. OSSE believes that this combination of approaches will support improved compliance and reduce the backlog of overdue events for students.

## 2. Compliance with the Requirement to Conduct Reevaluations

Summary of Data for this Reporting Element:

Reevaluations		7/1/2013-9/30/2013
<b>A</b>	<b>The number of children who, as of the end of the previous reporting period, had been referred for, but not provided, a timely triennial evaluation:</b>	<b>116</b>
	1. Previous Report Untimely	<b>69</b>
	2. Late Data Entry Adjustment	<b>47</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>The number of children whose triennial reevaluation became overdue during the reporting period</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>The number of children from (A) and (B) who were provided triennial reevaluations during the reporting period</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>The number of children who had not been provided a timely triennial reevaluation at the conclusion of the reporting period</b>	<b>131</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>The percent by which the State reduced the number of children with overdue triennial reevaluations reported in the State's previous progress report [(a)-(d)]/(a) *100</b>	<b>-13%</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>The percent of triennial reevaluations provided to children whose triennial reevaluation deadlines fell within the reporting period that were conducted in a timely manner. The state must report actual numbers for the following:</b>	
	1. The number of children whose triennial reevaluation deadlines fell within the reporting period	<b>532</b>
	2. The number of children who were provided a timely triennial reevaluation	<b>479</b>
	<b>To calculate the percent of triennial reevaluations provided in a timely manner use the data reported in #2 divided by #1 times 100</b>	<b>90%</b>
<b>G</b>	<b>The average number of days the triennial evaluations that had not been provided in a timely manner were overdue</b>	<b>104</b>

Discussion of Reported Data:

*Timeliness:* **90%** of reevaluations provided to children with disabilities whose reevaluation deadlines fell within the reporting period were conducted in a timely manner. The calculation used to derive this percentage is  $(479/532)*100$ . This rate of timeliness represents slippage compared to the **92%** rate of timeliness reported in the fourth FFY 2012 progress report submitted to OSEP on August 06, 2013.

*Progress Related to the Reduction of the Backlog:* In order to reduce the backlog by **50%**, 58 reevaluations in the backlog would need to be completed in this reporting period, which would

leave 58 in the backlog. Based on the above calculation, the total number of students in the backlog is 131.

*Reasons for Delays in Conducting Reevaluations in a Timely Manner:* The reevaluations were not held in a timely manner due to LEA delay. The primary reasons for LEA delay in completing reevaluations included: delayed action related to accessing records from the previous LEA and delays in scheduling meetings.

As noted above, DC's unique status (60 LEAs within the same geographic area) leads to a higher incidence of student mobility, particularly between school years.

Based on a review of the data, OSSE believes that a portion of the current reevaluation backlog is due to these high levels of mobility, both between LEAs and returns to LEAs from out of state or private settings. Specifically, at least 60 students whose reevaluations were due in the previous period exited the school system more than a year ago, 7 students whose reevaluations were due in the current period had exited the school system more than a year ago, and 3 students whose reevaluations were due in the current period have had an LEA to LEA transfer that impacted timeline compliance.

*Actions the State is taking to Address Noncompliance:* As noted above, OSSE has continued with its three-tiered targeted technical assistance initiative. Technical assistance related to the first and second tiers of intervention were completed in May and June, where LEAs were required to attend webinars on data quality and onsite consultation sessions. During these sessions, LEAs were introduced to a root cause analyses framework and were tasked with completing a special education improvement plan. OSSE is currently following up with LEAs with regard to the completed plans, which were submitted by LEAs in August and September. Student-level backlog data for every Tier III classified LEA has also been reviewed and OSSE continues to work with the respective LEAs to address the identified cases.

OSSE is also continuously working on streamlining and enhancing its data systems for LEA usage. An online reporting portal has been developed that provides users with key reports related to special education data. These web-based reports were developed based on LEA and central office requests and feedback through an extensive requirements gathering process. This special education data portal will be housed within the OSSE's Statewide Longitudinal Educational Data System (SLED), and will allow school and LEA staff to more proactively manage student information, identify overdue events, track deadlines, and rectify data errors. The tool is currently being piloted with a small group of LEAs so that OSSE can better refine the tool, and the full rollout of the tool will occur during winter 2013.

The Division of Specialized Education (DSE) has also created an OSSE Support Tool, a web-based dashboard that serves to allow OSSE with a mechanism to quickly and efficiently respond to LEA inquiries. To date, over 1,500 inquiries have been received and addressed in the Tool. DSE is also working with OSSE's Office of Data Management (ODM) to create LEA Inquiry teams, which are cross-functional teams assigned to groups of LEAs to better serve and respond to the needs



LEAs. DSE has also categorized the types of inquiries that may be logged into the tool and identified resolution paths for each type of inquiry. By having a database that will log inquiries and needs from LEAs, OSSE is looking to take a proactive approach in better serving the needs of LEAs.

Last, OSSE and the Public Charter School Board (PCSB) recently created a data-driven “tiger team” that meets regularly to review and address challenges that LEAs are experiencing with student records, including record transfers. OSSE believes that this combination of approaches will support improved compliance and reduce the backlog of overdue events for students.

### 3. Compliance with the Requirement to Implement Hearing Officer Determinations (HODs) in a Timely Manner

Hearing Officer Determinations		4/1/2013-9/30/2013
A	The number of children whose hearing officer determinations, as of the end of the previous reporting period, had not been implemented within the time frame established by the hearing officer or by the State	10 <sup>2</sup>
B	The number of children whose hearing officer determinations had not been implemented within the time frame established by the hearing officer or by the State (became overdue) during the reporting period	4
C	The number of children from (a) and (b) above whose hearing officer determinations were implemented during the reporting period	10
D	The number of children whose hearing officer determinations had not been implemented in a timely manner at the conclusion of the reporting period	4
E	The percent by which the State reduced the number of children whose hearing officer determinations had not been implemented in a timely manner reported in the State's previous progress report $(a - d) / (a) * 100$	60%
F	The percent of hearing officer determinations that were implemented in a timely manner during the reporting period	93%

#### Discussion of Reported Data:

In accordance with OSEP requirements for this benchmark, the data above reflects HODs and does not include settlement agreements. The benchmark is also calculated on a per child basis, not per HOD, in cases where the same child has more than one HOD. A student with multiple HODs within the reporting period is only counted once. If the student has both timely and untimely/overdue HODs, he or she is only counted once as having been overdue.

*Timeliness of HODs:* **93%** of HODs were implemented in a timely manner during the reporting period. This indicates an increase from the **80%** rate of timeliness reported in the progress report submitted to OSEP on May 1, 2013 (revised May 28, 2013). The calculation used to derive this percentage is  $(79/85) * 100$ .

<sup>2</sup> The number of students reported as overdue at the conclusion of the previous period (12) differs from the number reported at the beginning of the current period (10). This is due to the fact that documentation evidencing HOD timeliness was submitted after the due date for certain HODs. This changed the status of 2 students from untimely to timely between reporting periods.

*Implementation of Backlog of HODs:* **60%** of children (a) who, as of the end of the previous reporting period had HODs that had not been implemented within the required time frame (10), and children (d) whose HODs had not been implemented within the required time frame during the reporting period (4), had HODs implemented during the reporting period. The calculation used to derive the percentage is  $[(10-4)/10] * 100$ . This percentage represents progress from the **57%** reported in the progress report submitted to OSEP on May 1, 2013 (revised May 28, 2013).

*Reasons for Delays:* The reasons for the delays in implementing HODs in a timely manner were found to be LEA delay and parental consent.

*Actions the State is taking to Address Noncompliance:* OSSE's compliance team continued to take multiple steps to achieve improved results during this reporting period. First, as noted in the previous report, OSSE continued to take measures acceptable to the Court to close cases in a way which ensured compliance with the Jones consent decree while also ensuring that students that remain within the District receive the relief awarded them.

In addition, the OSSE is continuing to make adjustments to the Blackman Jones database, which tracks HOD implementation, to improve the implementation process. OSSE believes that this combination of activities has led to the accelerated progress noted in this reporting period.

#### 4. Demonstration of General Supervision System Reasonably Designed to Correct Noncompliance

Summary of Data for this Reporting Element:

Reporting Period for Verification of Noncompliance		7/1/13-9/30/13
A	The number of the 61 remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and the number of the 1,111 findings identified in FFY 2010 that D.C. reported were not corrected under Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, for which the State verified the noncompliance was corrected more than one year after the State's identification of the noncompliance (i.e. "subsequent correction").	Total = 183 FFY 2009 = 26 FFY 2010 = 157
B	The number of findings of noncompliance DC made during FFY 2011 (July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012).	2883 <sup>3</sup>
C	The number of findings identified in FFY 2011 for which the State verified that noncompliance was corrected as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State's identification of noncompliance.	2216
D	The number of findings identified in FFY 2011 for which the State verified that noncompliance was corrected more than one year after the State's identification of the noncompliance (i.e. "subsequent correction").	380

#### Discussion of Reported Data:

As of October 29, 2013, OSSE verified that 77%, or 2216 of 2883, findings of noncompliance made during FFY 2011 (July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012) were corrected pursuant to Memo 09-02 within one year of the date of issuance of the finding. ~~370~~ 380 findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected more than one year after the State's identification of noncompliance.

#### *E. Actions Taken to Verify the Correction of Noncompliance in FFY 2009, 2010, and 2011 Consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02*

To ensure that noncompliance is corrected timely, and in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02, OSSE provides technical assistance to LEAs through the Special Education Monitoring and Compliance Manual (revised in September, 2013). The manual provides LEAs with specific details about how the State identifies noncompliance using data captured through all aspects of its general supervision system, including data received through on-site monitoring, LEA self-assessments, the statewide database, State complaints, and due process hearings. The manual

<sup>3</sup> Please note that the timeline for correction has not expired for two findings resulting from Dispute Resolution monitoring activities.

clearly establishes the responsibility each LEA has to correct all noncompliance as soon as possible, and in no case later than one year of the State's written identification of noncompliance to the LEA.

After reviewing Prong I and Prong II data using the DC CATS system, OSSE determined that not all LEAs understood that both Prong I and Prong II of the correction needed to be completed within one year of issuance of the finding. In response to this discovery, the Special Education Monitoring and Compliance manual was updated for the 2013-2014 to include a flow chart explaining the two-pronged approach to correction of noncompliance. In addition clarifications were made to the text throughout the manual to emphasize that Prong I corrections are necessary, but not sufficient to timely close a finding of noncompliance, and that both Prong I and Prong II corrections must be completed as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date a finding is issued.

The manual outlines the process for identification and correction of noncompliance in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the process ensures that when the State finds information indicative of noncompliance, the State will: (1) make a finding of noncompliance; or (2) confirm whether the data demonstrate noncompliance and issue a finding if the State concludes that noncompliance is demonstrated; or (3) verify that the LEA has corrected the noncompliance, using Prong 1 and Prong 2 of OSEP Memo 09-02 before determining that the LEA has corrected both student level and LEA level noncompliance.

OSSE verifies correction of noncompliance to ensure that each LEA is: (1) has corrected each student level case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02; and (2) correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e. achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data collected from subsequent on-site visits or from additional/updated review of data collected in the State database system. Procedures for verifying that an LEA is correctly implementing a particular regulatory requirement vary based on the type of monitoring activity through which noncompliance was identified.

#### *Correction of Findings Identified through On-site Monitoring*

To verify correction of student level findings identified through on-site monitoring, OSSE re-examines each of the original student files reviewed to verify that a required correction has been completed. To verify subsequent correct implementation of the regulatory requirement by the LEA, OSSE selects a sample of student files that were not included in the original review or generates a report from the District's Special Education Data System to verify that the LEA is complying with regulatory requirements. Correction of noncompliance is complete when the LEA demonstrates that all corrections are made and that 100% of files reviewed in a subsequent sample are compliant with the regulatory requirement(s) in question.

OSSE has established a minimum number of files to review to verify Prong 2 correction. For LEAs with 150 or more students with IEPs, the State reviews at least 5 student files to verify Prong 2 correction. For LEAs with fewer than 150 students with IEPs, the State reviews at least

2 student files to verify correction for Prong 2. OSSE may choose to review additional files at its discretion.

#### *Correction of Findings Identified through Database Monitoring*

To verify the correction of findings made through monitoring of the State database system (i.e. evaluations and secondary transition findings) OSSE reviews the database to ensure each student level finding is corrected and requires the LEA to demonstrate that it is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement by achieving 100% compliance on a subsequent quarterly review.

To verify correction of LEA level findings, OSSE reviews LEA evidence of correction and, where applicable, selects a sample of student files that were not originally reviewed to verify correction. OSSE works with LEAs to determine, on a case-by-case basis, whether an LEA's policies and procedures lead to noncompliance. If policies and procedures are found to lead to noncompliance, the LEA must review and change those policies and practices to ensure compliance. OSSE also reviews all corrective actions associated with LEA level findings, and may assign additional corrective actions if necessary to fully correct noncompliance.

To verify dispute resolution findings are corrected, OSSE reviews all corrective actions performed by the LEA and determines, on a case-by-case basis whether additional data are required to verify correction.

#### *F. Actions Taken to Address Findings of Noncompliance in FFY 2009, 2010, and 2011 that were not Corrected within One Year*

During the first quarter of FFY 2013 OSSE prepared a count of all outstanding findings of noncompliance that are more than one year old. Compliance monitors are currently working with LEAs and nonpublic schools to support closure of these findings by re-identifying them for LEA and school personnel, and identifying activities that will close each finding. The compliance unit has also begun a review and refinement of internal practices to ensure that monitors are actively engaged with both making findings and supporting LEAs toward closure of findings.

To address findings of noncompliance that are not corrected by the LEA within one year of the State's identification of noncompliance, OSSE's Quality Assurance and Monitoring team assesses each LEA's need for training and technical assistance, and arranges for the provision of comprehensive training as necessary. OSSE also provides technical assistance to LEAs attempting to correct noncompliance identified through dispute resolution activities by providing LEAs with a monthly round-up and discussion of corrective actions associated with State complaints, and by providing technical assistance with the implementation of Hearing Officer Determinations. Finally, OSSE uses the annual LEA Determinations process to levy sanctions as appropriate. OSSE considers information collected for or during APR reporting, other US Department of Education reporting, on-site monitoring, record and database review, audits, dispute resolution processes, and rates of timely correction when making LEA determinations.

## 5. Compliance with Secondary Transition Requirements

### Summary of Data Reported for this Element:

<b>Secondary Transition Compliance Item</b>	<b>7/1/12 - 9/30/12</b>	<b>10/1/12 - 12/31/12</b>	<b>1/1/13 - 3/31/13</b>	<b>4/1/13- 6/30/13</b>	<b>7/1/13- 9/30/13</b>
Total Number of Files with All Items Compliant	38	45	34	43	47
Percent of Files with All Items Compliant	38%	45%	34%	43%	47%
Total Number of LEAs Reviewed	11	11	11	9	11
Number of LEAs in Compliance	2	1	4	1	4

### Discussion of Reported Data:

OSSE reviewed a sample of 100 IEPs to determine whether all secondary transition requirements were met. The review was completed on October 15, 2013. OSSE will notify LEAs of the findings by January 15, 2014.

Four (4) of 11 LEAs had files that were fully compliant with all secondary transition requirements, which is an increase in the number of LEAs whose files were in total compliance when compared to the prior review period of April 1, 2013 – June 30, 2013, when 1 LEA was fully compliant.

While the District did not meet OSEP’s established target of 75% compliance with secondary transition requirements for the November 2013 reporting period, secondary transition compliance rates continue to increase in the District. Forty-seven percent (47%) of IEPs reviewed for the period of July 1, 2013- September 30, 2013 were compliant with all secondary transition requirements. This represents an increase as compared to the prior review period of April 1, 2013 –June 30, 2013, when 43% of IEPs reviewed included all required secondary transition content.

OSSE attributes the gain in secondary transition compliance rates to continuing efforts to provide robust training and technical assistance to District LEAs. OSSE has held two meetings since June of 2013 where all LEAs in the District were invited to discuss the monitoring process and learn about special conditions, including the enhanced monitoring and reporting duties the District has in the area of secondary transition. This effort was intended to ensure that all LEAs are aware of secondary transition obligations. OSSE’s compliance unit has continued to meet with District LEAs and the Public Charter School Board to develop working partnerships on

compliance issues and provide technical assistance on meeting compliance requirements including secondary transition requirements. In addition, OSSE continues to work with the State secondary transition Community of Practice (CoP) and has partnered with the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC), with whom OSSE is partnering via a successful targeted technical assistance proposal.

Of note is the District's continued efforts to engage representative sister agencies in the District, such as the Rehabilitative Services Agency (RSA) and the Office of Disability Rights (ODR) in developing a comprehensive menu of District services available to students of transition age and their families.

Through these efforts OSSE developed a cross-agency training series that was introduced via a summer institute on secondary transition. In the upcoming reporting period, LEAs will have access to a series of core trainings which will then be made available on-line for continued use in the 2013-2014 SY. In addition, OSSE has finalized a Secondary Transition Toolkit, aligned with the training modules, that is also available on-line. OSSE also continues to expand its Secondary Transition webpage to ensure that all stakeholders have access to a robust set of resources to support best practices.

OSSE is engaging in a focused monitoring pilot on the issue of secondary transition in November of 2013. OSSE used the DC CATS compliance data tracking system to identify specific schools that have had persistently high rates of noncompliance with secondary transition items. OSSE will work with LEA-level and school-level staff to review secondary transition compliance requirements, determine specific areas or items that are creating difficulty at each school, and provide training such that all secondary transition items are able to be completed with fidelity to regulatory requirements. The focused monitoring is intended to result in continuous improvement plans for LEAs and schools most in need of support in meeting secondary transition requirements.

OSSE continues to provide targeted technical assistance to LEAs regarding secondary transition content and remains committed to doing so until District LEAs are in compliance with the secondary transition requirements.



## 6. Compliance with Early Childhood Transition Requirements

	Early Childhood Transition	7/1/2012 – 6/30/2013
<b>A</b>	Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination	<b>228</b>
<b>B</b>	Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays	<b>54</b>
<b>C</b>	Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	<b>150</b>
<b>D</b>	Number of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied	<b>10</b>
<b>E</b>	Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays	<b>7</b>
	Number of children included in A but not included in B, C, D, or E.	<b>7</b>
	Range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed	<b>4-157</b>
	Percent = [(C) divided by (A-B-D-E)] x 100	<b>96%</b>

### Discussion of Reported Data:

A review of the data from this reporting period indicates an overall rate of timeliness of **96%**. OSSE is pleased to note that this rate of timeliness represents progress as compared to **89%** reported in the FFY 2011 APR.

*Actions the State is taking to Address Noncompliance:* To sustain progress, OSSE continues to facilitate meetings between the leadership of the Part C team and the Early Stages Center Leadership Team at DCPS. Staff members that support State-level activities for both Part C and Part B 619 grant obligations have also continued to engage stakeholders in updating guidance documents to clarify responsibilities in the transition process. These ongoing activities will continue to sustain the District's performance related to this compliance indicator.

### **Certification**

This report reflects OSSE's good faith efforts to report accurate and reliable data and ensure a full and comprehensive submission. The District of Columbia's Assistant Superintendent of Specialized Education, Dr. Amy Maisterra, hereby certifies that this report is complete and appropriate for submission to the Office of Special Education Programs.