

DC Part B

FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

57

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

LEA Structure in the District of Columbia

The Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) serves as the State educational agency (SEA) for the District of Columbia. OSSE ensures compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 20 U.S.C. § 1400 *et seq.* (IDEA) for children with disabilities who receive special education and related services from local educational agencies (LEAs) and other public agencies in the District of Columbia.

In FFY 2016, the District of Columbia's student population included 12,811 children with disabilities. (Data Source: OSSE FFY 2016 Child Count) In FFY 2016, children in the District of Columbia were served by 66 LEAs, including the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) and 65 public charter school LEAs. In the District of Columbia, public charter school LEAs historically have been able to elect to have DCPS serve as the LEA for the purposes of IDEA, in which case DCPS becomes responsible for ensuring compliance. In FFY 2016, 9 public charter school LEAs made this election. Therefore, 57 LEAs are referenced when examining IDEA-related compliance and results indicators.

The option of electing DCPS to serve as the LEA for purposes of IDEA has been eliminated. Under current law, no newly approved public charter school can make this election. (D.C. Official Code § 38-1802.10(c-1).) By August 1, 2017, all public charter schools that had elected DCPS to serve as the LEA were required to operate as their own LEA for IDEA purposes. OSSE has been providing technical assistance to public charter schools to facilitate this transition.

OSSE's System of General Supervision

OSSE's system of general supervision under IDEA continues to be designed to monitor the implementation of the IDEA and improve educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities in the District of Columbia. OSSE's general supervision system consists of eight general supervisory components identified by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP):

1. State Performance Plan (SPP)
2. Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation
3. Integrated Monitoring Activities
4. Fiscal Management
5. Data
6. Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions
7. Effective Dispute Resolution
8. Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development

The District of Columbia's SPP

The District of Columbia's FFY 2013-2018 SPP established rigorous and measurable performance goals for the 17 IDEA Part B Indicators identified by the U.S. Department of Education. A broad cross-section of stakeholders, including the State's Advisory Panel, LEA personnel, parents of DC students, and representatives of agencies that are interested in the education of children with disabilities in the District of Columbia provided advice and support to the State as SPP targets were set for the years FFY 2013-2018. D.C.'s SPP serves to keep the State publicly accountable for improving results for children with disabilities and also acts as a roadmap for D.C.'s continuous efforts to effect improved educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities.

The District of Columbia's progress against targets set in the SPP is measured and reported annually in the Annual Performance Report (APR), which is published on OSSE's website.

Below is a link to the District of Columbia APRs:
7/16/2018

Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation

The District of Columbia's special education policies and procedures align with and support implementation of the IDEA, and are enforceable under Title 38 Chapters 25, 25A, 25B, and 25C of the District of Columbia Official Code and Titles 5A Chapters 28 & 29 and 5E Chapter 30 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations. LEA implementation of policies, procedures and programs that are consistent with the IDEA and State policies and procedures is assured annually through the LEA IDEA grant application process.

To help ensure effective implementation of the IDEA and related state policies, OSSE has published a range of policy guidance documents which include FAQ documents, and information on compliant implementation of requirements described in various State policies. Link to District of Columbia Special Education Policies and Guidance:

<http://osse.dc.gov/service/specialized-education-policies-and-regulations>

In addition to publishing policies and guidance, OSSE maintains policy staff and monitoring and compliance staff who are available to provide guidance to LEAs and other interested stakeholders on compliant implementation of IDEA requirements. OSSE's training and technical assistance unit also sponsors ongoing educational opportunities for District educators aimed at both best practice and compliant implementation of IDEA.

OSSE also maintains several interagency agreements designed to ensure that children with disabilities continue to receive special education and related services in cases where multiple agencies are involved in the provision of services to a child. For example, OSSE has a memorandum of agreement (MOA) with the District of Columbia's Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services and the District of Columbia Public Schools which is designed to improve educational outcomes for children committed to the youth corrections system by minimizing disruption during times of transition and facilitating coordination of services between the agencies. OSSE also has an MOA with the District of Columbia's Child and Family Services Agency and the District of Columbia Public Schools which clarifies and coordinates the provision of educational services and monitoring of those services for foster children from the District of Columbia. OSSE has additional interagency agreements that focus on secondary transition aged students, very young children with disabilities, and other special populations of children within the District of Columbia.

Integrated Monitoring Activities

The goal of OSSE's monitoring and compliance system is to ensure that LEAs and public agencies are meeting the requirements of both federal and local regulations.

OSSE employs a number of monitoring activities which are integrated across the general supervision system to ensure compliance with federal and local law and regulations and improve educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities.

OSSE works collaboratively with LEAs/public agencies and engages in shared accountability practices to maximize success for all children with disabilities. OSSE uses multiple data sources to monitor LEAs/public agencies including: database reviews, on-site compliance monitoring (interviews, observations, record reviews), focused monitoring, review of dispute resolution activities, self-assessments, oversight of nonpublic special education schools, Phase I and Phase II grant applications, and reviews of audit findings. The diversity of OSSE's monitoring system ensures that OSSE is able to identify noncompliance from a variety of sources and support continuous improvement. Data from monitoring activities are reviewed on an ongoing basis by OSSE teams to inform strategic priorities and target resources.

OSSE's integrated monitoring system is designed to ensure timely correction of noncompliance in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02. Findings of noncompliance are issued in writing through the District of Columbia's Corrective Action Tracking System (DC-CATS). The system allows OSSE and LEAs to track each finding of noncompliance, the required corrective action(s), documentation and evidence of correction, and timelines for correction, electronically.

Another key feature of OSSE's monitoring and compliance system is the direct linkage between monitoring activities and technical assistance. In FFY 2016, the Division of Elementary, Secondary, and Specialized Education's monitoring and training teams worked to identify specific compliance areas that warranted general and targeted technical assistance. OSSE continues to offer a multitude of training opportunities for LEAs to increase their knowledge of, and compliance with, IDEA Part B requirements and to discover methods to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Fiscal Management

OSSE's system of general supervision includes fiscal management and monitoring mechanisms which provide oversight in the distribution and use of IDEA funds in accordance with federal law and regulations. The fiscal team provides training and technical assistance to LEAs on the proper use and reporting associated with federal IDEA funds and monitors for compliance with federal law and regulations. The fiscal team supports overall compliance with the IDEA through the IDEA grant application assurance process, which requires LEAs to explicitly assure OSSE that they are implementing several IDEA regulatory requirements, as well as implementing compliant policies and procedures.

OSSE's fiscal team also oversees the annual fiscal audit process. In FFY 2016 LEAs that spent \$750,000 or more in federal funds were required to receive an A-133 single audit and submit a copy of the management letter to OSSE within 30 days of receipt or nine months after the end of the audit period, whichever date comes first. Additionally, the District of Columbia Public Charter School Board (PCSB) requires all public charter schools in the District to receive an annual audit regardless of the level of expenditures. Any noncompliance identified through audits must be corrected in accordance with the audit

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

report. Audit findings are considered in making annual LEA determinations.

Data on Processes and Results

OSSE's general supervision system is driven by ongoing, systemic data review processes in which data from a variety of sources, including monitoring, dispute resolution, Section 618 data submissions, review of LEA data by Indicator, and other regularly scheduled data reviews.

OSSE has several major data systems which are key to accomplishing the systemic reviews described above. First, the Statewide Longitudinal Education Data System (SLED) houses student-level enrollment, attendance, graduation, and other data for all children in the District of Columbia. Second, the Special Education Data System (SEDS) houses Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and Part B special education related documentation for the District of Columbia. In addition, OSSE uses the District of Columbia Corrective Action Tracking System (DC-CATS) to issue findings of noncompliance and track correction of findings. LEA data submissions to these systems are used to prepare several of the Indicators for the annual APR. To ensure that LEAs/public agencies are submitting accurate data, OSSE regularly reviews data submissions and produces and monitors data error reports from each agency. OSSE has also created a web-based support tool which is available to data administrators at the agency and allows for efficient tracking and management of data questions and answers provided by OSSE. In addition, all agency users are required to participate in training for each system, and OSSE provides regular technical assistance updates to ensure the effective use of these systems. OSSE also encourages LEAs/public agencies to glean data on various aspects of their own performance from these systems and use it to plan and implement meaningful improvement for their students.

OSSE continues to maintain a website called "Learn DC" which houses a wide variety of general and special education data on the State as a whole, and for each LEA. OSSE has committed to creating and sustaining a community-friendly, easily understandable site with deep data available on every LEA, because OSSE believes that transparency and information sharing are crucial to the goals of accountability and continuous improvement under both the IDEA and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Learn DC site creates accountability for both OSSE and the District of Columbia's LEAs because it puts important data in the hands of parents and the public.

Learn DC is available at: <http://www.learnDC.org/>

Annual IDEA LEA Performance Determinations

The State uses data from multiple sources to produce annual LEA determinations in accordance with the Part B regulations at 34 CFR §§300.600 and 300.603. Annual determinations are based upon the performance of each LEA as indicated by information provided in the SPP/APR, information obtained through monitoring visits, and any other public information made available. In making such determinations, OSSE annually assigns LEAs one of the following determination levels:

1. Meets Requirements
2. Needs Assistance
3. Needs Intervention
4. Needs Substantial Intervention

OSSE's determination is based on the totality of the LEA's data and information, including the LEA's:

1. History, nature and length of time of any reported noncompliance; specifically, the LEA's performance on Indicators 4b, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 as outlined in the State Performance Plan (SPP) and FFY 2016 Annual Performance Report (APR);
2. Information regarding timely, valid and reliable data;
3. Desktop reviews, on-site compliance monitoring, focused monitoring and dispute resolution findings;
4. Sub-recipient audit findings;
5. Other data available to OSSE regarding the LEA's compliance with the IDEA, including, but not limited to, relevant financial data and compliance with the Funding for Public Schools and Public Charter School Amendment Act of 2011 (D.C. Law 19-21, § 4002, as codified at D.C. Official Code § 38-1804.01(c) through (i));
6. Performance on selected SPP results indicators; and
7. Evidence of correction of findings of noncompliance, including progress toward full compliance.

Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions

In FFY 2015, OSSE's Division of Elementary, Secondary, and Specialized Education implemented a new coordinated risk-based monitoring approach across key K-12 grants. In the new model, the SEA is deliberate in providing differentiated levels of oversight to LEAs based on a review of fiscal and programmatic data across indicators. This approach reduces unnecessary LEA burden and rewards best practice by allowing high performing LEAs additional flexibility while providing more intensive support to LEAs that are struggling.

As noted above, OSSE monitors and enforces the IDEA in accordance with 34 CFR sections 300.600-300.609. OSSE requires all instances of noncompliance to be corrected, and upon issuance of a finding of noncompliance, requires correction of each instance of noncompliance and subsequent verification of proper systemic implementation in accordance with OSEP Memo 09-02. OSSE uses a variety of tools to support LEA correction of noncompliance. For example, OSSE created DC-CATS to provide LEAs with a simple way to track findings of noncompliance, track timelines for correction of each finding of noncompliance, and submit evidence of correction for each finding of noncompliance. OSSE also utilizes corrective action plans (CAPs) and continuous improvement plans (CIPs) with LEAs who have extensive, systemic, or reoccurring areas of noncompliance. These plans emphasize high-leverage corrective or improvement activities which are aimed to create measurable improvement such as professional development,

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

creation or amendment of policies and/or procedures, and targeted technical assistance.

OSSE also employs a range of corrections and sanctions during the annual LEA determinations process. As required by section 34 CFR sections 300.600(a) and 300.604 OSSE will apply the following enforcement actions to programs based on the program's Determination Level:

Determination Level	Enforcement Actions
Meets Requirements	None
Needs Assistance	<p>State shall take one or more of the following actions if the LEA receives this determination for 2 or more consecutive years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Advise the LEA of available sources of technical assistance and require the LEA to work with appropriate entities• Direct the use of funds• Impose special conditions <p>In addition, the State must prohibit the LEA from reducing the LEA's maintenance of effort under 34 CFR §300.203 and 34 CFR §300.205(c) for any fiscal year.</p> <p>If the LEA receives this determination for 3 or more consecutive years, the State may take any of the actions described above, and shall take one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Require a corrective action plan or improvement plan if the State determines that the LEA should be able to correct the problem within one year• Require the LEA to enter into a compliance agreement if the State has reason to believe that the LEA cannot correct the problem within one year• Recover funds• Withhold further payments
Needs Intervention	
Needs Substantial Intervention	<p>At any time that the State determines that the LEA needs substantial intervention, the State shall take any of the actions described above, and require one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recover funds• Withhold further payments

NOTE: Any withholding of funds will comport with 34 CFR §300.605 which provides for reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing.

Effective Dispute Resolution

In the District of Columbia there are several dispute resolution options available to the community, including due process hearings, mediation, and administrative state complaints. OSSE's Office of Dispute Resolution (ODR) oversees the District of Columbia's independent hearing office, which handles the state's due process and mediation programs. In FFY 2016 OSSE continued to administer the state complaint process within the Division of Elementary, Secondary, and Specialized Education.

Close oversight of timelines by OSSE and the ODR ensures the timely resolution of due process complaints, mediations, and state complaints. OSSE reviews dispute resolution data gleaned from complaints, hearing officer determinations, letters of decision, and settlement agreements to determine whether there are District-wide or LEA level issues that can be addressed through the OSSE's monitoring system or technical assistance systems. For example, in the District of Columbia, new LEAs typically open each year. If the monitoring unit notices that a new LEA has an unusually high level of dispute resolution activity, OSSE reviews the complaints to look for common themes, and makes an informal technical assistance visit to ensure that LEA staff understand their obligations under the IDEA, and to ensure that the LEA has access to and is using all available state data systems. OSSE staff also reviews basic compliance requirements as necessary to ensure that LEA staff understand process timelines.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

To ensure that parents understand their rights and the various dispute resolution options, OSSE monitors LEAs and public agencies to ensure that procedural safeguards are provided in accordance with 34 CFR §300.504(a). In addition, OSSE has a parent and community outreach team that provides education and information to parents seeking information about the various dispute resolution options available to them under the IDEA.

Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development

See Technical Assistance System and Professional Development System, discussed below.

Indicator 8- Parent Involvement Survey Revisions

In FFY 2015, OSSE made revisions to the parent survey in response to feedback from the State Advisory Board suggesting a need to simplify the survey. During these revisions, the survey item that collected information about the respondent's LEA and school was removed. The same survey was used in FFY 2016 and respondent's LEA and school information was not collected in FFY 2016 due to the same oversight. In preparation for the FFY 2017 survey administration, OSSE will conduct a comprehensive review of the survey to ensure that all required elements are included.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
sy 2015-2016 parent survey.pdf	Megan Williams	4/24/2018 9:33 PM	
sy 2016-2017 parent survey.pdf	Megan Williams	4/24/2018 9:34 PM	

Technical Assistance System:

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

The SEA utilizes a range of mechanisms to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence based technical assessment and support to LEAs. As noted above, data collected from monitoring activities, dispute resolution, state and federal data submissions, grant applications and assurances and fiscal audits are used to determine state-, LEA-, and school-level needs for technical assistance, which is customized to address particular practice challenges or implementation questions that arise. In addition, OSSE publishes resource documents on regulations, policies and best practices in special education and provides webinar training modules on all state-level special education policies.

In order to ensure that LEA/public agency staff are proficient in the use of state data systems, OSSE offers regular trainings on the use of the various State data systems, including SEDS and DC-CATS. A calendar of training and technical assistance opportunities provided is maintained on OSSE's website.

In addition to the traditional technical assistance described above to specifically support compliance and improve academic outcomes for students with disabilities, during the 2016-2017 school year OSSE convened a State-wide LEA conference three times and provided training and ongoing support to all LEAs/schools in the District of Columbia based on identified needs and continuous improvement planning efforts. Institute sessions featured didactic and interactive sessions.

Below is an overview of the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance related to the results for which the State received a score of zero on the Part B Results Driven Accountability Matrix- 2016:

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition:

In FFY 2016, OSSE consulted with the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) to receive recommendations on how to strengthen the work in secondary transition. Based in part on the feedback from NTACT, OSSE determined that its monitoring approach could be refined to better support systemic improvement. OSSE submitted a proposal to revise its secondary transition methodology to OSEP. The revised methodology was approved with some adjustments, and as of FFY 2017, OSSE implements the new methodology.

OSSE has continued to take advantage of opportunities to think deeply about secondary transition planning and graduation outcomes as a component of the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), becoming a member of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) Graduation and Post-School Outcomes State Learning Collaborative which first met in October of 2015. In June 2017 and November 2017, OSSE staff members attended the Results Based Accountability (RBA) Cross State Learning Collaborative (CSLC) face to face conference hosted by the NCSI. The conference provided tools states can utilize to dive deeper into the connection between compliance and results for secondary transition. OSSE collaborated with several other states and learned effective strategies related to reviewing secondary transition plans for compliance.

4th and 8th grade National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results (reading/math):

OSSE continues to take advantage of technical assistance opportunities as members of the NCSI Results-Based Accountability Cross-State Learning Collaborative. OSSE has additionally joined the Results-Based Accountability Collaborative to help think through ways in which monitoring activities can further support LEAs with improving academic outcomes while they maintain compliance with IDEA regulations. In November 2017, OSSE attended the Results Based Accountability (RBA) Cross State Learning Collaborative (CSLC) conference hosted by the NCSI. OSSE collaborated with other states to learn and develop effective strategies to shift its focus from compliance driven to results driven, specifically focusing on the better use of data to support root cause analysis and drive technical assistance. OSSE will continue to seek support and resources from technical assistance centers to ensure the improvements in desired outcomes for students with disabilities.

Longstanding Noncompliance:

OSSE has primarily worked with OSEP to address challenges related to closing out longstanding noncompliance in a manner that is appropriate and meets

Below is an overview of the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance:

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition:

As noted above, as a result of the technical assistance received from NTACT, OSSE proposed a new monitoring approach that provides LEAs with targeted technical assistance prior to the period for which their files are sampled. This approach has allowed OSSE to focus and provide meaningful engagement with LEAs in regards to secondary transition. OSSE has also seen an increase in compliance with secondary transition requirements.

OSSE continues to conduct monthly internal interdisciplinary secondary transition status sessions to review secondary transition data and discuss ways to improve the secondary transition review process.

4th and 8th grade NAEP results (reading/math):

OSSE continues to refine its monitoring approach with an eye toward making important shifts that support improved academic outcomes. In 2016-2017, OSSE utilized the root cause analysis process as a component of its State intervention model for struggling schools. This analysis included a focus on students with disabilities. Through this model, OSSE worked with identified LEAs to develop a targeted, evidence-based support plan to enhance instructional and behavioral practices. This plan is designed to accelerate outcomes for children with disabilities.

Longstanding Noncompliance:

OSSE continues to work directly with LEAs to provide clear, consistent, and timely technical assistance related to closing out longstanding noncompliance in a manner that is appropriate and meets requirements pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 09-02. OSSE's LEA monitoring team has implemented effective strategies to ensure that LEAs are correcting findings of noncompliance as soon as possible.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

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 students with disabilities.

OSSE's system of general supervision includes the utilization of a training and technical assistance team that is devoted to increasing knowledge and competence for all professionals who provide services to children with disabilities in the District of Columbia. This team is comprised of subject matter experts in the areas of secondary transition, universal design for learning (UDL), positive behavioral supports, response to intervention, content-specific instructional best practice anchored in the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and requirements related to special education law and regulation. The training and technical assistance team oversees the special education professional development opportunities offered to professionals in the District of Columbia.

The State provides multiple professional development opportunities to service providers in the District of Columbia. Professional development is geared toward ensuring that District of Columbia teachers and service providers are able to implement evidence-based strategies for improving student outcomes. The State provides both introductory-level professional development opportunities and advanced skill building opportunities to encourage growth regardless of the individual practitioner's current skill level. OSSE provides extensive training opportunities in the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) & UDL as a means for children with disabilities to access and make progress in the general education curriculum. OSSE's technical assistance team also worked closely with its assessment team to ensure alignment and coherence between instruction and assessment as the District launched the shift to next generation assessments, and this close collaboration continues.

OSSE believes that sustained engagement with materials and concepts is most likely to result in lasting and systemic gains in professional understanding. To this end, the OSSE has established multiple communities of practices in which LEAs learn strategies proven effective to assist children with disabilities being successful while educated in the least restrictive environment.

In addition to the provision of ongoing professional development opportunities, OSSE also supports the continued skill-building of service providers in partnership with other child-serving agencies, such as the Child and Family Services Administration (CFSA), the Department of Behavioral Health (DBH), and the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (DYRS). Examples of such partnerships are OSSE's effort to launch training related to non-violent crisis intervention with partner agencies, as well as its partnership with DYRS, DBH, and CFSA to provide educators with training on trauma-informed intervention and support schools with family to family peer support.

Last, OSSE works closely with the Public Charter School Board to ensure that charter schools receive timely information and that issues are addressed in as coherent a manner as possible. An example of such an effort is the joint special education training offered each spring to opening charter schools as well as coordinated support to LEAs which are becoming independent LEAs for the purposes of IDEA in accordance with local law.

OSSE uses data collected from participant surveys, focus groups, and other SEA activities to determine the need for additional areas of training, and to

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

determine whether professional development offerings are effective in building professional knowledge and skill.

A calendar of training and technical assistance opportunities, including professional development opportunities, is available at:

<https://osse.dc.gov/publication/2016-17-school-year-k-12-program-calendar>

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The State solicits broad stakeholder input for setting and revising SPP targets using the following process:

1. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts then proposed targets for each indicator, and a rationale for the proposed targets.
3. OSSE created a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator and the proposed targets for each indicator. A survey was created in both paper and web-format to capture stakeholder feedback.
4. OSSE advertised the SPP target setting process and desire for community feedback to various stakeholder groups including parents, LEA personnel, and other local agencies.
5. OSSE held multiple live and web-based presentations, and invited audience members to provide feedback on the proposed targets.
6. The presentation and survey were sent to additional parent stakeholder groups and feedback was invited.
7. All participants were offered the opportunity to have private phone or in-person consultations with OSSE staff if they wished to clarify information on the target- setting process before submitting feedback.
8. OSSE collected feedback by collecting surveys at the end of each in-person presentation and through the online survey process. OSSE also collected all questions and comments posed during web-based or in-person presentations.
9. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments, and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2015 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 2015 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, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

As required by 34 CFR Section 300.602(b)(1)(i)(A), the State reports to the public annually on each LEAs performance on the State's SPP/APR targets. To ensure compliance with Section 300.602(b)(1)(i)(A), OSSE posts the annual public reporting document to the State website no later than 120 days following the State's submission of the APR.

The District of Columbia's public reporting documents are available at:

<http://osse.dc.gov/service/specialized-education-data-and-reports>

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

OSEP Response

The Department has imposed Special Conditions on the State's IDEA Part B grant award each year from FFY 2001 through FFY 2017.

While the State has publicly reported on the FFY 2015 (July 1, 2015-June 30, 2016) performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA, those reports do not contain the required information. Specifically, the State did not report on the performance of each LEA on the targets for Indicator 8.

The State provided an explanation of the reason it was unable to provide data for each LEA for Indicator 8 in its report to the public and described the steps it has taken to ensure it will be able to provide the required information in future reports.

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Two of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 2, 2018. The State provided the required information.

In the FFY 2017 APR, the State must report FFY data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SIMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 2, 2018); and (3) a summary of the infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SIMR.

Required Actions

The State must report with its FFY 2017 SPP/APR, how and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2016 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Graduation**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			42.50%	66.23%	66.23%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	44.00%	45.80%
Data		42.00%	39.00%	53.20%	68.19%	94.23%	26.29%	39.00%	44.00%	40.95%	40.88%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	49.80%
Data	46.28%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	54.80%	60.00%	60.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 targets were set in DC's FFY 2013 SPP and have not changed.

As described in the FFY 2013 SPP submission, the Indicator 1 target for DC was 85% from FFY 2009 through FFY 2012. That target was not reached for DC students with IEPs during that time period nor was it reached for DC students overall. Indeed, 85% was and still is higher than the overall graduation rate for public high school students nationally. The Indicator 1 four-year targets DC proposed in the FFY 2013 submission were adjusted downward to align with national averages and the overall graduation targets set by DC in the ESEA Flexibility Waiver that was submitted on May 12, 2012 and approved by the Department on September 5, 2014. The Indicator 1 targets were set by using DC's ESEA Waiver targets and adjusting them downward based on the average gap between the overall graduation national graduation rate and the overall national graduation rate for students with disabilities. In the final two years (FFY 2017 and FFY 2018), the targets were set to be the national average graduation rate for students with disabilities. Although these targets are lower than the targets set in DC's previous SPP, stakeholders repeatedly commented that they are still too high, given historical growth and the current overall graduation rate for all students in DC.

Overall, during the development of the FFY 2013 SPP, the State solicited broad stakeholder input for setting and revising SPP targets using the following process:

1. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts then proposed targets for each indicator, and a rationale for the proposed targets.
3. OSSE created a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator and the proposed targets for each indicator. A survey was created in both paper and web-format to capture stakeholder feedback.
4. OSSE advertised the SPP target setting process and desire for community feedback to various stakeholder groups including parents, LEA personnel, and other local agencies.
5. OSSE held multiple live and web-based presentations, and invited audience members to provide feedback on the proposed targets.
6. The presentation and survey were sent to additional parent stakeholder groups and feedback was invited.
7. All participants were offered the opportunity to have private phone or in-person consultations with OSSE staff if they wished to clarify information on the target- setting process before submitting feedback.
8. OSSE collected feedback by collecting surveys at the end of each in-person presentation and through the online survey process. OSSE also collected all questions and comments posed during web-based or in-person presentations.
9. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments, and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	509	
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	1,028	null
SY 2015-16 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/12/2017	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	49.51%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2015 Data	FFY 2016 Target	FFY 2016 Data
509	1,028	46.28%	54.80%	49.51%

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: 4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

The minimum conditions youth, including youth with IEPs, must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma during the relevant time period, are specified in Title 5-A of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations. The current relevant regulatory sections are as follows:

TITLE 5-A, OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION

CHAPTER 22, GRADUATION

2203 ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS

2203.1 The course work set forth in Subsections 2203.3 shall be required of students who enrolled in ninth (9th) grade in school year 2007-2008 and thereafter in order to be certified as eligible to receive a high school diploma.

2203.2 At the beginning of the ninth (9th) grade, students shall develop a graduation plan pacing the courses they will take to complete high school. This shall be done with the assistance of the school counselor or other school official designated by the local education agency (LEA).

2203.3 (a) A total of twenty-four (24) Carnegie Units in corresponding subjects and required volunteer community service hours shall have been satisfactorily completed for graduation.

(b) The following Carnegie Units in the following subjects shall be required:

COURSES UNIT(S)

English 4.0

Mathematics; must include Algebra 1, Geometry, and Algebra II at a minimum 4.0

Science; must include three (3) lab sciences 4.0

Social Studies; must include World History 1 and 2, United States History; United 4.0

States Government, and District of Columbia History

World Language 2.0

Art 0.5

Physical Education/Health 1.5

Electives 3.5

TOTAL 24.0

(c) At least two (2) of the twenty four (24) Carnegie Units for graduation must include a College Level of Career Preparatory (CLCP) course approved by the LEA and successfully completed by the student. The course may fulfill subject matter or elective unit requirements as deemed appropriate by the LEA. CLCP courses approved by the LEA may include courses at other institutions.

(d) All students must enroll in Algebra I no later than tenth (10th) grade commencing with the 2016-2017 school year, unless the school is approved for a waiver pursuant to Subsection 2203.7.

(e) For all students entering the ninth (9th) grade beginning school year 2009-2010, one (1) of the three (3) lab science units, required by paragraph (a) of this subsection, shall be a course in Biology.

(f) In addition to the twenty-four (24) Carnegie Units, one hundred (100) hours of volunteer community service shall be satisfactorily completed. The specific volunteer community service projects shall be established by the LEA.

(g) One and one half (1.5) Carnegie Units in health and physical education shall not be required for the evening program high school diploma.

2203.4 An LEA may establish specialized or career-focused programs or courses of study, which lead to the high school diploma in accordance with Subsection 2203.3. These courses of study can include academic, performing arts, science and mathematics, and career or vocational education focuses or other areas of concentration. The programs or courses of study may require additional coursework.

2203.5 Electives taken to fulfill the requirements of Subsection 2203.4 shall be required to be taken in courses established by the LEA for each area of concentration in order to receive certification in the area of concentration.

2203.6 Each student who completes the requirements for specialized or career focused courses of study established under Subsection 2203.4 shall receive appropriate recognition on the student's diploma.

2203.7 Beginning with School Year 2016-2017:

(a) The District of Columbia Public Schools ("DCPS") or the Public Charter School Board ("PCSB") may waive the Carnegie Unit requirement set forth in Subsection 2203.3 for a school seeking to award competency-based unit(s), as defined in this chapter, accordingly:

(1) A school that seeks a waiver from the Carnegie Unit requirement to award competency-based unit(s) shall submit an application to either the DCPS or PCSB. If a charter school is part of an LEA, the application must be submitted to the PCSB through the LEA;

(2) Applications for a waiver to award competency-based unit(s) shall be in the format established by the Office of the State Superintendent of Education ("OSSE") and contain the information required by OSSE; and

(3) The DCPS or PCSB, respectively, shall review the school's application in accordance with the standards and requirements established by OSSE. If the school's application meets the standards and requirements established by OSSE, the DCPS or PCSB, respectively shall approve the school's application for a waiver to award competency-based unit(s);

(b) [RESERVED]

(c) OSSE shall make publicly available aggregated evidence of annual implementation of Subsections 2203.7(a) in a summative report no later than three years after initial implementation, and annually thereafter, to share best practices and lessons learned from implementation.

All other requirements are administrative in nature, e.g. a requirement to enroll and regularly attend for a minimum of eight (8) consecutive months prior to graduation unless certain transfer requirements are met.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

As explained in DC's FFY 2014 submission, DC's criteria for accurately recording and documenting when and why a student is no longer attending school have not been historically well defined. DC began using more stringent exit code criteria in school year 2011-12. The graduating class of SY 2015-16, reported here for FFY 2016, is only the second set of graduates to which four full years of this more stringent policy have been applied. For that reason, FFY 2016 data is the first set of Indicator 1 data that is comparable year-over-year to the SY 2014-15 (FFY 2015) data and it shows a 3.23 point improvement from 46.28% to 49.51%.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

The State reported that its "FFY 2016 data is the first set of Indicator 1 data that is comparable year-over-year to the SY 2014-15 (FFY 2015) data." The State compared its FFY 2016 data to the FFY 2015 data and concluded that the State's FFY 2016 data reflect progress of 3.23%. OSEP recommends that the State consider revising its baseline data to reflect the FFY 2015 data of 46.28%, rather than the current baseline data of 39% that was established in FFY 2011.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Drop Out**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			7.00%	6.80%	6.60%	6.40%	6.20%	6.00%	5.80%	5.80%	5.60%
Data		7.20%	9.40%	2.90%	5.03%	2.32%	3.82%	39.00%	6.00%	16.74%	8.08%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	5.30%
Data	23.79%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	5.10%	4.80%	4.60%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 targets were set in DC's 2013 SPP and have not changed.

Overall, during the development of the FFY 2013 SPP, the State solicited broad stakeholder input for setting and revising SPP targets using the following process:

1. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts then proposed targets for each indicator, and a rationale for the proposed targets.
3. OSSE created a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator and the proposed targets for each indicator. A survey was created in both paper and web-format to capture stakeholder feedback.
4. OSSE advertised the SPP target setting process and desire for community feedback to various stakeholder groups including parents, LEA personnel, and other local agencies.
5. OSSE held multiple live and web-based presentations, and invited audience members to provide feedback on the proposed targets.
6. The presentation and survey were sent to additional parent stakeholder groups and feedback was invited.
7. All participants were offered the opportunity to have private phone or in-person consultations with OSSE staff if they wished to clarify information on the target- setting process before submitting feedback.
8. OSSE collected feedback by collecting surveys at the end of each in-person presentation and through the online survey process. OSSE also collected all questions and comments posed during web-based or in-person presentations.
9. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments, and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
 Option 2

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2 when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? Yes

Please include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

OSSE changed its reporting methodology in DC's FFY 2012 APR submission to begin using an adjusted cohort dropout rate calculation. Since that submission OSSE has calculated the rate as follows:

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

(# of students in cohort with IEP who dropped out) / (# of students in cohort with IEP)

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the SY 2015-2016 adjusted cohort who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of high school students with IEPs in the SY 2015-2016 adjusted cohort	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
204	1,028	23.79%	5.10%	19.84%

Use a different calculation methodology

- Change numerator description in data table
- Change denominator description in data table

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

OSSE calculated the status dropout rate for FFY 2016 using the Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate Cohort as the student universe for Indicator 2. The official calculation is (# of students in cohort with IEP who dropped out)/(# of students in cohort with IEP), where students are identified as having an IEP if they had an active IEP at any point during or since their verified first ninth grade year. For this report, OSSE calculated the metric using the cohort whose First Ninth Grade Year was school year 2012-13, hence were due to be four-year graduates in 2015-16. Dropouts are considered any members of the Adjusted Cohort who were non-graduates as of August 31, 2016 and who did not enroll during the 2016-17 school year. Additionally, students who received a GED or IEP certificate by August 31, 2016 were not considered drop-outs.

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

Dropouts are considered any members of the Adjusted Cohort who were non-graduates as of August 31, 2016 and who did not enroll during the 2016-17 school year. Students who received a GED or IEP certificate by August 31, 2016 were not considered drop-outs.

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

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			92.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		89.50%	88.31%	95.60%	93.39%	92.79%	93.69%	95.00%	99.00%	97.89%	87.59%
Math	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			92.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		88.70%	88.31%	95.60%	93.06%	92.42%	93.57%	95.00%	99.00%	98.48%	86.12%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	90.95%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	95.00%
		Data	91.51%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad stakeholder input for setting and revising SPP targets using the following process:

- OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
- Subject matter experts then proposed targets for each indicator, and a rationale for the proposed targets.
- OSSE created a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator and the proposed targets for each indicator. A survey was created in both paper and web-format to capture stakeholder feedback.
- OSSE advertised the SPP target setting process and desire for community feedback to various stakeholder groups including parents, LEA personnel, and other local agencies.
- OSSE held multiple live and web-based presentations, and invited audience members to provide feedback on the proposed targets.
- The presentation and survey were sent to additional parent stakeholder groups and feedback was invited.
- All participants were offered the opportunity to have private phone or in-person consultations with OSSE staff if they wished to clarify information on the target- setting process before submitting feedback.
- OSSE collected feedback by collecting surveys at the end of each in-person presentation and through the online survey process. OSSE also collected all questions and comments posed during web-based or in-person presentations.
- Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments, and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
------------	------------------------------	--	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	6,936	6,344	90.95%	95.00%	91.46%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	6,943	6,317	91.51%	95.00%	90.98%

Public Reporting Information

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

OSSE's public report related to State-wide assessments can be found at: <http://results.osse.dc.gov/>, <http://learndc.org/>, and <https://osse.dc.gov/page/2016-17-results-and-resources> (information on this page has also been provided as an attachment below.)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The prepopulated data for 3a, 3b and 3c includes students who had a disability at the start of testing for a given school year consistent with the Federal definition for students with disabilities. Please note that the data provided in response to 3a, 3b and 3c will differ from what is publicly reported by OSSE on <http://results.osse.dc.gov/> and <http://learndc.org/>.

Public reporting of assessment results in the District of Columbia includes students with disabilities in the following subgroups: 1) students who were receiving special education services at the start of the assessment testing window; and 2) students who received special education services at any point within the two years prior to start of the assessment testing window, but who are no longer receiving services. The inclusion of students who exited special education status within the two years prior to testing is a local definition for students with disabilities and is used for assessment reporting only. Starting with 2017-18 assessment reporting and under ESSA, OSSE will no longer include students who exited special education status within the previous two years in the students with disabilities subgroup for purposes of assessment reporting.

Additionally, OSSE has been made aware that the number of students who participated on the PARCC assessment with accommodations is not available on OSSE's public reporting sites as required. OSSE has developed a plan to ensure that this information will become publicly available on or before June 15, 2018.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.

Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2018 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2016, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2017.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2014	Target ≥											27.00%
			Data											
Math	A Overall	2014	Target ≥											30.00%
			Data											

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	27.00%
		Data	4.52%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	30.00%
		Data	5.63%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	34.00%	42.00%	52.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	37.00%	48.00%	60.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad stakeholder input for setting and revising SPP targets using the following process:

1. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts then proposed targets for each indicator, and a rationale for the proposed targets.
3. OSSE created a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator and the proposed targets for each indicator. A survey was created in both paper and web-format to capture stakeholder feedback.
4. OSSE advertised the SPP target setting process and desire for community feedback to various stakeholder groups including parents, LEA personnel, and other local agencies.
5. OSSE held multiple live and web-based presentations, and invited audience members to provide feedback on the proposed targets.
6. The presentation and survey were sent to additional parent stakeholder groups and feedback was invited.
7. All participants were offered the opportunity to have private phone or in-person consultations with OSSE staff if they wished to clarify information on the target- setting process before submitting feedback.
8. OSSE collected feedback by collecting surveys at the end of each in-person presentation and through the online survey process. OSSE also collected all questions and comments posed during web-based or in-person presentations.
9. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments, and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
------------	------------------------	---	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned				
A Overall	6,344	447	4.52%	34.00%	7.05%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	6,317	510	5.63%	37.00%	8.07%

Public Reporting Information

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

OSSE's public report related to State-wide assessments can be found at: <http://results.osse.dc.gov/>, <http://learndc.org/>, and <https://osse.dc.gov/page/2016-17-results-and-resources> (information on this page has also been provided as an attachment below: "Detailed 2017 PARCC and MSAA Performance".)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The prepopulated data for 3a, 3b and 3c includes students who had a disability at the start of testing for a given school year consistent with the Federal definition for students with disabilities. Please note that the data provided in response to 3b and 3c will differ from what is publicly reported by OSSE on <http://results.osse.dc.gov/> and <http://learndc.org/>.

Public reporting of assessment results in the District of Columbia includes in the students with disabilities subgroup the following: 1) students who were receiving special education services at the start of the assessment testing window; and 2) students who received special education services at any point within the two years prior to start of the assessment testing window, but who are no longer receiving services. The inclusion of students who exited special education status within the two years prior to testing is a local definition for students with disabilities and is used for assessment reporting only. Starting with 2017-18 assessment reporting and under ESSA, OSSE will no longer include students who exited special education status within the previous two years in the students with disabilities subgroup for purposes of assessment reporting.

Additionally, OSSE was asked by OSEP to review its approach for publicly reporting proficiency on assessments, specifically related to reporting LEA proficiency on the alternate assessment. Currently, this data is only reported for one LEA. The data that the District makes publicly available on the OSSE website is consistent with State reporting and privacy policies (please see attachment below: "DC Rules for 2017 Assessment Participation and Performance Calculations"). OSSE only reports proficiency rates for LEAs with 25 or more students in all subgroups, as additional reporting could potentially compromise the privacy of students within the subgroup.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, 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 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤					0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data					42.80%	42.86%	50.00%	43.00%	28.00%	38.10%	2.17%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	0%
Data	12.24%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State elected to maintain the 4a targets as previously set with stakeholder input in 2009. The State solicited broad stakeholder input for setting and revising SPP targets using the following process:

1. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts then proposed targets for each indicator, and a rationale for the proposed targets.
3. OSSE created a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator and the proposed targets for each indicator. A survey was created in both paper and web-format to capture stakeholder feedback.
4. OSSE advertised the SPP target setting process and desire for community feedback to various stakeholder groups including parents, LEA personnel, and other local agencies.
5. OSSE held multiple live and web-based presentations, and invited audience members to provide feedback on the proposed targets.
6. The presentation and survey were sent to additional parent stakeholder groups and feedback was invited.
7. All participants were offered the opportunity to have private phone or in-person consultations with OSSE staff if they wished to clarify information on the target- setting process before submitting feedback.
8. OSSE collected feedback by collecting surveys at the end of each in-person presentation and through the online survey process. OSSE also collected all questions and comments posed during web-based or in-person presentations.
9. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments, and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 20

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
5	31	12.24%	0%	16.13%

Reasons for Slippage

The FFY 2016 data of 16.13% represents slippage as compared to FFY 2015 data of 12.24%. The State did not meet its target of 0%. OSSE attributes the 7/16/2018

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

slippage to the State's use of a new denominator, as required by the Office of Special Education Programs, which only includes LEAs that met the "n" size of 40. This new requirement reduces the number of LEAs in the denominator, which increases the percentage of identified LEAs. The State would like to point out that while the percentage increased for this indicator, the raw number of LEAs who were identified as having a significant discrepancy decreased from 6 (six) in FFY 2015 to 5 (five) in FFY 2016.

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

- 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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The State defines "significant discrepancy" as the suspension and expulsion of any child with a disability for more than 10 days cumulatively in a school year by an LEA with a qualifying subgroup at a rate that is greater than 1.5 times the equivalent rate for nondisabled peers.

OSSE investigates significant discrepancy for LEAs that have suspended and/or expelled at least five students with disabilities. OSSE uses only LEAs that meet the "n" size of 40 as the denominator. In its analysis, the State compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA, with a qualifying subgroup, compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 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.

For the five (5) LEAs 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 2016 (using 2015-2016 data), the State required the completion of self-study activities and reviewed the LEAs policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to determine if the policies, procedures and practices complied with the IDEA.

The LEAs submitted their completed self-studies as well as copies of their policies and procedures to OSSE.

OSSE reviewed the results of the self-studies, in addition to the LEA policies, procedures and practices. As a result of this review, OSSE determined that zero (0) of the five (5) LEAs that were flagged for this review had noncompliant policies, procedures and practices.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OSSE did not issue individual student-level findings for this indicator. OSSE did review LEA policies, procedures, and practices, and conducted a subsequent review of LEA discipline data in order to verify that the noncompliance had been corrected and that the LEA was demonstrating that it is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement for all students with IEPs. OSSE reviewed 2015-16 data for the two (2) LEAs who received findings of noncompliance based on 2014-2015 data. OSSE found that both LEA's had compliant policies, procedures, and practices based on a review of those policies and the results of a subsequent review of LEA discipline data.

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

The State did not issue individual findings of noncompliance in association with the Indicator 4A significant discrepancy.

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, 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 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						28.60%	33.33%	14.00%	8.00%	7.14%	2.17%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	4.08%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

The State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement. 17

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
5	0	34	4.08%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The State defines "significant discrepancy" as the suspension and expulsion of any child with a disability for more than 10 days cumulatively in a school year by an LEA with a qualifying subgroup at a rate that is greater than 1.5 times the equivalent rate for nondisabled peers.

OSSE investigates significant discrepancy for LEAs that have suspended, and/or expelled at least three students with disabilities in a particular racial and ethnic group. OSSE uses only LEAs that meet the "n" size of 40 as the denominator. In its analysis, the State compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA, with a qualifying subgroup, compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA. OSSE did not issue individual student-level findings of noncompliance for indicator 4B in FFY 2016.

During the 2015-2016 school year, the District of Columbia had 51 LEAs. After excluding all LEAs that did not meet the "n" size of 40 children with IEPs, the denominator for this indicator is 34 LEAs. Twenty-seven (27) LEAs suspended or expelled less than three children with IEPs in specific racial and ethnic groups for greater than 10 cumulative school days and were excluded from the calculation. Of the seven (7) LEAs that suspended and/or expelled three or more children with IEPs in specific racial and ethnic groups for greater than 10 cumulative schools days, five (5) had a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity. Zero (0) LEAs were found to have policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and did not comply with requirements.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 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.

For the five (5) LEAs that the State identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in FFY 2016 (using 2015-2016 data), the State required completion of self-study activities and reviewed the LEAs policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

As part of this self-study, the LEAs were required to review a number of student records and provide existing policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to OSSE for comparison with regulatory requirements under the IDEA.

OSSE reviewed the results of the self-studies submitted by the LEAs, in addition to the policies, procedures and practices. OSSE determined that zero (0) LEAs' policies, procedures, and practice contributed to their identified significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity.

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

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OSSE did not issue individual student-level findings for this indicator. OSSE did review LEA policies, procedures, and practices, and conducted a subsequent review of LEA discipline data in order to verify that the noncompliance had been corrected and that the LEA was demonstrating that it is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement for all students with IEPs. OSSE reviewed 2015-16 data for the two (2) LEAs who received findings of noncompliance based on 2014-2015 data. OSSE found that the LEA had compliant policies, procedures, and practices based on a review of those policies and the results of a subsequent review of LEA discipline data.

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

The State did not issue individual findings of noncompliance in association with the Indicator 4A significant discrepancy.

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State's data reported in the table for this indicator reflects that it verified that two LEAs corrected noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices within one year of identification. However, the State's narrative indicates that the State "found that the LEA" had compliant policies, procedures, and practices. As a result, OSEP concludes that the State did not demonstrate that the two LEAs corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that both LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 are 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. Therefore, when reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2017 APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 (and add other years, as needed) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

OSEP notes that the State references "Indicator 4A" in its description of how the State verified noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 was corrected.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			12.50%	12.50%	13.50%	14.50%	15.50%	16.50%	17.50%	50.00%	53.00%
		Data		22.91%	14.40%	17.34%	17.90%	35.52%	42.40%	46.00%	50.00%	53.51%	54.59%
B	2005	Target ≤			14.85%	14.00%	13.50%	13.00%	12.50%	13.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%
		Data		18.60%	27.20%	19.49%	28.20%	11.86%	10.31%	13.00%	12.00%	15.64%	15.24%
C	2005	Target ≤			29.00%	28.00%	27.00%	26.00%	25.00%	20.00%	15.00%	15.00%	14.00%
		Data		24.40%	21.70%	12.15%	22.80%	28.97%	28.05%	20.00%	19.00%	12.40%	11.53%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	56.00%
	Data	55.61%
B	Target ≤	15.00%
	Data	17.38%
C	Target ≤	13.00%
	Data	10.04%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	59.00%	61.00%	64.00%
Target B ≤	15.00%	15.00%	14.00%
Target C ≤	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad stakeholder input for setting and revising SPP targets using the following process:

1. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts then proposed targets for each indicator, and a rationale for the proposed targets.
3. OSSE created a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator and the proposed targets for each indicator. A survey was created in both paper and web-format to capture stakeholder feedback.
4. OSSE advertised the SPP target setting process and desire for community feedback to various stakeholder groups including parents, LEA personnel, and other local agencies.
5. OSSE held multiple live and web-based presentations, and invited audience members to provide feedback on the proposed targets.
6. The presentation and survey were sent to additional parent stakeholder groups and feedback was invited.
7. All participants were offered the opportunity to have private phone or in-person consultations with OSSE staff if they wished to clarify information on the target- setting process before submitting feedback.
8. OSSE collected feedback by collecting surveys at the end of each in-person presentation and through the online survey process. OSSE also collected all questions and comments posed during web-based or in-person presentations.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

9. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments, and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	11,136	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	6,288	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	1,696	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	987	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	47	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	14	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	6,288	11,136	55.61%	59.00%	56.47%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	1,696	11,136	17.38%	15.00%	15.23%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,048	11,136	10.04%	12.00%	9.41%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For indicator 5A, 6,288 students were served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day. While the state did not meet its target (by 3%), the increase in students served in this category is indicative of the natural progression for students moving from the most restrictive setting into lesser restrictive settings.

For indicator 5B, 1,696 students were served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day. For this indicator, OSSE used generally accepted rules of rounding to the nearest whole number and therefore met the designated target.

For indicator 5C, 1,048 students were served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. Of the 1,048 students in this category, only 61 students accounted for placements in residential facilities or homebound/hospital settings. The majority of students in this category are students who were placed in separate schools (or nonpublic schools). The state is pleased to continue to report a decrease in the number of students served in the most restrictive settings.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									63.00%	55.00%	56.00%
		Data								53.00%	56.00%	49.34%	48.99%
B	2011	Target ≤									15.00%	16.00%	16.00%
		Data								18.00%	16.00%	19.92%	4.34%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	57.00%
	Data	43.17%
B	Target ≤	14.00%
	Data	7.75%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	58.00%	59.00%	60.00%
Target B ≤	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad stakeholder input for setting and revising SPP targets using the following process:

1. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts then proposed targets for each indicator, and a rationale for the proposed targets.
3. OSSE created a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator and the proposed targets for each indicator. A survey was created in both paper and web-format to capture stakeholder feedback.
4. OSSE advertised the SPP target setting process and desire for community feedback to various stakeholder groups including parents, LEA personnel, and other local agencies.
5. OSSE held multiple live and web-based presentations, and invited audience members to provide feedback on the proposed targets.
6. The presentation and survey were sent to additional parent stakeholder groups and feedback was invited.
7. All participants were offered the opportunity to have private phone or in-person consultations with OSSE staff if they wished to clarify information on the target- setting process before submitting feedback.
8. OSSE collected feedback by collecting surveys at the end of each in-person presentation and through the online survey process. OSSE also collected all questions and comments posed during web-based or in-person presentations.
9. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments, and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	1,675	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	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	760	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	260	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b2. Number of children attending separate school	17	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	760	1,675	43.17%	58.00%	45.37%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	279	1,675	7.75%	12.00%	16.66%

Use a different calculation methodology

Reasons for B Slippage

Based on preliminary analysis, OSSE believes that the majority slippage in indicator 6 is attributable to one LEA. OSSE is further examining disaggregated data and will be reviewing it with the LEA to determine potential root causes for this slippage.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with 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 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2010	Target ≥								60.00%	70.00%	75.00%	76.00%
		Data							50.00%	64.00%	76.00%	82.05%	75.33%
A2	2010	Target ≥								50.00%	60.00%	63.00%	64.00%
		Data							29.20%	29.00%	67.00%	69.16%	65.70%
B1	2010	Target ≥								85.00%	90.00%	82.00%	83.00%
		Data							78.30%	70.00%	81.00%	80.12%	77.57%
B2	2010	Target ≥								50.00%	60.00%	63.00%	64.00%
		Data							16.70%	42.00%	67.00%	67.40%	61.88%
C1	2010	Target ≥								50.00%	60.00%	79.00%	80.00%
		Data							0%	67.00%	79.00%	79.37%	77.37%
C2	2010	Target ≥								70.00%	80.00%	75.00%	76.00%
		Data							62.50%	62.00%	70.00%	75.33%	73.99%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	76.00%
	Data	85.71%
A2	Target ≥	64.00%
	Data	73.62%
B1	Target ≥	83.00%
	Data	87.42%
B2	Target ≥	64.00%
	Data	74.77%
C1	Target ≥	80.00%
	Data	86.15%
C2	Target ≥	76.00%
	Data	82.11%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	77.00%	78.00%	80.00%
Target A2 ≥	65.00%	66.00%	68.00%
Target B1 ≥	84.00%	85.00%	87.00%
Target B2 ≥	65.00%	66.00%	68.00%
Target C1 ≥	81.00%	82.00%	84.00%
Target C2 ≥	77.00%	78.00%	80.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

OSSE reviewed the FFY 2012 Indicator 7 analysis written by the TA&D network and compared national patterns to the District's FFY 2012 reported data. OSSE also reviewed the Data Quality Report generated for the District of Columbia by the ECTA center. Based on this analysis, OSSE created targets that were aggressive, yet aligned with current performance.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

In addition, the State solicited broad stakeholder input for setting and revising SPP targets using the following process:

1. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts then proposed targets for each indicator, and a rationale for the proposed targets.
3. OSSE created a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator and the proposed targets for each indicator. A survey was created in both paper and web-format to capture stakeholder feedback.
4. OSSE advertised the SPP target setting process and desire for community feedback to various stakeholder groups including parents, LEA personnel, and other local agencies.
5. OSSE held multiple live and web-based presentations, and invited audience members to provide feedback on the proposed targets.
6. The presentation and survey were sent to additional parent stakeholder groups and feedback was invited.
7. All participants were offered the opportunity to have private phone or in-person consultations with OSSE staff if they wished to clarify information on the target- setting process before submitting feedback.
8. OSSE collected feedback by collecting surveys at the end of each in-person presentation and through the online survey process. OSSE also collected all questions and comments posed during web-based or in-person presentations.
9. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments, and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	477.00
--	--------

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	11.00	2.31%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	21.00	4.40%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	95.00	19.92%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	214.00	44.86%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	136.00	28.51%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	309.00	341.00	85.71%	77.00%	90.62%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	350.00	477.00	73.62%	65.00%	73.38%

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	13.00	2.73%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	20.00	4.19%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	81.00	16.98%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	229.00	48.01%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	134.00	28.09%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool	310.00	343.00	87.42%	84.00%	90.38%

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)					
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	363.00	477.00	74.77%	65.00%	76.10%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	11.00	2.31%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	13.00	2.73%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	49.00	10.27%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	175.00	36.69%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	229.00	48.01%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	224.00	248.00	86.15%	81.00%	90.32%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	404.00	477.00	82.11%	77.00%	84.70%

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

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? Yes

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

Child Outcomes Summary data were collected by LEAs entering information related to COS into the D.C. Corrective Action Tracking System (DCCATS). The numbers indicated in this report are from the B7 indicator report generated by the DCCATS.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8: Parent involvement**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the 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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			68.50%	69.20%	70.00%	71.00%	72.20%	73.00%	75.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Data		68.20%	78.00%		78.60%	82.90%	79.30%	68.00%	93.00%	81.76%	84.47%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	80.00%
Data	83.60%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad stakeholder input for setting and revising SPP targets using the following process:

1. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts then proposed targets for each indicator, and a rationale for the proposed targets.
3. OSSE created a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator and the proposed targets for each indicator. A survey was created in both paper and web-format to capture stakeholder feedback.
4. OSSE advertised the SPP target setting process and desire for community feedback to various stakeholder groups including parents, LEA personnel, and other local agencies.
5. OSSE held multiple live and web-based presentations, and invited audience members to provide feedback on the proposed targets.
6. The presentation and survey were sent to additional parent stakeholder groups and feedback was invited.
7. All participants were offered the opportunity to have private phone or in-person consultations with OSSE staff if they wished to clarify information on the target- setting process before submitting feedback.
8. OSSE collected feedback by collecting surveys at the end of each in-person presentation and through the online survey process. OSSE also collected all questions and comments posed during web-based or in-person presentations.
9. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments, and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
491.00	568.00	83.60%	85.00%	86.44%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	4.44%	12782.00
---	-------	----------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

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.

In the District of Columbia, a single survey is disseminated to parents of both pre-school and school aged students with IEPs. All questions are applicable to both groups. All data were collected using the same survey and survey methodology as in previous reporting years.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Yes

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Distribution of the IDEA parent survey occurred in September 2017 and remained open until January 2018. Each parent of a student who has an IEP was mailed a hard copy in the English language. OSSE mailed out the survey in Spanish to increase the number of Latino respondents. The mailing included self-addressed business reply envelopes along with instructions regarding the option to fill the survey out online. In addition, distribution occurred at family-focused events throughout various wards within the District of Columbia. At each outreach activity, families with students who have IEPs were given the opportunity to fill out a hard copy of the survey or provide verbal responses collected by an OSSE staff member. In some instances parents opted to take a hard copy and mail back responses in a self-addressed stamped envelope. Parents appeared to appreciate the general presence of OSSE at these events, as it served as a reminder for them to simply complete the survey which they also received via US postal mail. OSSE staff members distributed surveys at the following events: Annual Parent Summit, Secondary Transition Community of Practice Annual Retreat, EdFest DC, State Advisory Panel on Special Education monthly meetings, and quarterly DC Supporting Families Community of Practice meetings. At each opportunity OSSE staff gleaned survey responses which contributed to the overall response rate.

To arrive at the percent of parents who report that the school facilitated their involvement, a "percent of maximum" scoring procedure was used. Each survey respondent received a percent of maximum score based on their responses to 8 of the items. Respondents who rated their experiences with the school a "1" (Very Strongly Agree) on each of the 8 items received a 100% score; respondents who rated their experiences with the school a "6" (Very Strongly Disagree) on each of the 8 items received a 0% score. Respondents who rated their experiences with the school a "3" (Agree) on each of the 8 items received a 60% score. (Note: a respondent who on average rated their experiences a "3" (e.g. a respondent who rated 2 items a "3," 3 items a "2" and 3 items a "4,") would also receive a percent of maximum score of 60%). A parent who has a percent of maximum score of 60% or above was identified as one who reported that the school facilitated his/her involvement. A 60% cut-score is representative of a parent who, on average, agrees with each item; as such, the family member is agreeing that the school facilitated his/her involvement.

Sixty-nine percent of respondents reported having a child who is Black/African American, 14 percent reported having a child who is White/Caucasian, 11 percent reported having a child who is Hispanic or Latino and 2 percent reported having a child who is Asian or Pacific Islander. The number of parents who reported having children who are American Indian/Alaskan Native was less than 10 in this category. All parents provided this demographic information. In FFY 2016, no respondents indicated that they had a child who was multiracial. Overall, the demographic breakdown of survey respondents is reflective of the demographic breakdown of the FFY 2016 student population of District of Columbia public schools and public charter schools: Black/African American made up 79 percent of students with disabilities; Hispanic or Latino made up 14 percent of students with disabilities; White/Caucasians made up 5 percent of students with disabilities; Asian or Pacific Islander made up less than 1 percent of students with disabilities; American Indian/Alaskan Natives made up less than 1 percent of students with disabilities; and less than 1 percent of students with disabilities identified as multiracial. One exception is that while White/Caucasian students represent 5 percent of students with disabilities, parents of White/Caucasian students with disabilities provided the second largest number of responses to the survey.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? Yes

Submitted survey: [SY 2016-2017 Parent Survey](#)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The survey was revised in FFY 2015 but OSSE did not provide a copy of the revised survey in its FFY 2015 APR submission. The attached survey is the revised survey from FFY 2015 used in both FFY 2015 and FFY 2016.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data					0%	5.88%	0%	5.00%	12.50%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

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 totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 23

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and 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-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
4	0	34	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

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).

Data Source:

OSSE used its FFY 2016 Enrollment and Child Count data for the calculation to determine disproportionate representation. All LEAs included in the denominator met the “n” size of 40 children with IEPs and at least 5 students in one race/ethnicity.

Definition of “Disproportionate Representation” and Methodology

OSSE has adopted a weighted risk ratio of 2.5 for over-representation for determining if LEAs have disproportionate representation for Indicator 9. The weighted risk ratio compares the chance, or risk, of children of a particular racial/ethnic group being identified for special education with the chance of children of all other racial/ethnic groups being identified for special education, taking into account the racial/ethnic composition of the student population in the District of Columbia. The weighted risk ratio negates any effect on risk caused by a large or small percent of students being of a particular racial/ethnic group.

The District of Columbia’s weighted risk ratio limits of 2.5 means that the OSSE will investigate cases in which a particular racial/ethnic group is more than two and one half times as likely as all other racial/ethnic groups to be identified for special education, based on each racial/ethnic group’s proportion of all students in the District of Columbia.

As required by OSEP, OSSE reviewed data related to the following required racial/ethnic groups:

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, or two or more races.

Minimum Group Size for Inclusion:

An LEA must have at least 40 students with IEPs to be included in this indicator. In addition, within LEAs of 40 or more students with IEPs, at least five students of a single race/ethnicity are required for weighted risk ratio analysis for that particular race/ethnicity. In FFY 2016, 34 LEAs in the District of Columbia had 40 or more students with IEPs and at least five students in one race/ethnicity. (Twenty-three (23) agencies were excluded due to “n” size).

Step One: Identifying the Number of Districts Identified with Disproportionate Representation

Using the criteria established above, OSSE determined that four (4) LEAs were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation. Three (3) LEAs were identified as having disproportionate representation of African-American (Black) students in special education and one (1) LEA was identified as having disproportionate representation of Hispanic students in special education.

Step Two: Determining if Disproportionate Representation is the Result of Inappropriate Identification

For each of the four (4) LEAs that the State identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education or related services, the State required completion of a self-study to determine if the disproportionate representation was a result of inappropriate identification. As part of this self-study, LEAs were required to review a number of student records (depending on the overall number of students with IEPs at the LEA); and provide existing policies, procedures and practice documentation to OSSE for comparison with child find, evaluation and eligibility requirements.

All four (4) LEAs submitted their completed self-studies. OSSE reviewed the results of the self-studies including reviewing each LEA's child find, evaluation, and eligibility policies and practices and found that zero (0) LEAs had disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification.

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.

All LEAs flagged as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education were required to submit copies of their policies and procedures and complete a self-study. The self-study requires the LEAs to conduct student file reviews and submit the results of the review to OSSE upon completion. OSSE reviews all documents submitted by the LEAs to determine if the LEA is inappropriately identifying students of racial and ethnic groups in special education.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Required Actions

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2016

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data					0%	11.76%	10.00%	10.00%	16.70%	3.85%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	3.33%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

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 totally excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size. 23

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
18	2	34	3.33%	0%	5.88%

Reasons for Slippage

The FFY 2016 data of 5.88% represents slippage as compared to FFY 2015 data of 3.33%. The State did not meet its target of 0%. OSSE attributes the slippage to the following factor:

- Two (2) LEAs' failure to have in effect written policies and procedures that are compliant with the IDEA requirements relating to the initial evaluation process and use of measures for determining eligibility for special education and related services.

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

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

All LEAs flagged as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories were required to submit copies of their policies and procedures and complete a self-study. The self-study requires the LEAs to conduct student file reviews and submit the results of the review to OSSE upon completion. OSSE reviews all documents submitted by the LEAs to determine if the LEA is inappropriately identifying students of racial and ethnic groups as students within specific disability categories.

After carefully reviewing the identified LEAs' policies, procedures and practices, OSSE determined that two (2) of the 18 LEAs had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inadequate policies, procedures and practices.

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).

OSSE used its FFY 2016 Enrollment and Child Count data for the Indicator 10 FFY 2016 SPP/APR submission.
7/16/2018

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Definition of “Disproportionate Representation” and Methodology:**

OSSE has adopted a weighted risk ratio of 2.5 for over-representation for determining if LEAs have disproportionate representation for Indicator 10. The weighted risk ratio compares the chance, or risk, of children of a particular racial/ethnic group being identified with a specific disability with the chance of children of all other racial/ethnic groups being identified with that same specific disability, taking into account the racial/ethnic composition of the student population in the District of Columbia. That is, the weighted risk ratio negates any effect on risk caused by a large or small percent of students being of a particular racial/ethnic group. The District of Columbia’s weighted risk ratio limits of 2.5 means that the OSSE will investigate cases in which a particular racial/ethnic group is more than two and one half times as likely as all other racial/ethnic groups to be identified with a specific disability, based on each racial/ethnic group’s proportion of all students in the District of Columbia.

As required by OSEP, OSSE reviewed data related to the following required racial/ethnic groups: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic /Latino, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, or two or more races, and the following disabilities categories: autism, specific learning disability (SLD), emotional disturbance (ED), multiple disabilities (MD), other health impaired (OHI), intellectual disability (ID), speech or language impairment (SLI), deaf/blind, visually impaired (VI), deafness, hearing impairment, orthopedic impairment (OI), and traumatic brain injury (TBI).

Minimum group size for inclusion:

OSSE determined that an LEA must have at least 40 students with IEPs in order for an LEA to be included in this indicator. In addition, within LEAs of 40 or more students with IEPs, at least five students of a single race/ethnicity are required for weighted risk ratio analysis for that particular race/ethnicity. In FFY 2016, thirty-four (34) LEAs in the District of Columbia served students aged 6-21 and had 40 or more students with IEPs and at least five students of a single race/ethnicity for a particular race/ethnicity (Twenty-three (23) LEAs were excluded due to “n” size).

Step One:

Using the criteria established above, OSSE determined that eighteen (18) LEAs were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation.

Step Two: Determining if Disproportionate Representation is the Result of Inappropriate Identification

Eighteen (18) LEAs that the State identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, the State required completion of a self-study to determine if the disproportionate representation was a result of inappropriate identification. As part of this self-study, LEAs were required to review a number of student records (depending on the overall number of students with IEPs at the LEA), and submit documentation of existing policies, procedures and practices related to child find, evaluation and eligibility requirements to OSSE for comparison with regulatory requirements.

Eighteen (18) of the eighteen (18) LEAs submitted their completed self-studies. OSSE reviewed the results of the self-studies including reviewing each LEA’s child find, evaluation, and eligibility policies and practices and found that two (2) LEAs had disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification.

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.

All LEAs flagged as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories were required to submit copies of their policies and procedures and complete a self-study. The self-study requires the LEAs to conduct student file reviews and submit the results of the review to OSSE upon completion. OSSE reviews all documents submitted by the LEAs to determine if the LEA is inappropriately identifying students of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
--------------------------------------	---	--	--

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OSSE did not issue individual student-level findings for this indicator. OSSE did review LEA policies, procedures and self studies in order to verify that the noncompliance had been corrected and that the LEA was demonstrating that it is correctly identifying students of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories appropriately. OSSE reviewed 2015-16 data for the one (1) LEA who received findings of noncompliance based on 2014-2015 data. OSSE found that the LEA had compliant policies, procedures, and practices based on a review of those policies and the results of a subsequent review of LEA childfind data.

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

The State did not issue individual findings of noncompliance in association with the Indicator 10 disproportionate representation.

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2016, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that the two districts identified in FFY 2016 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 11: Child Find**

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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		22.30%	42.08%	45.30%	66.56%	75.43%	71.60%	89.00%	93.00%	89.42%	90.72%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	92.51%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
2,687	2,447	92.51%	100%	91.07%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	240
---	-----

Reasons for Slippage

While OSSE is pleased to note that the rate of compliance for this indicator remains above 90%, and does not consider this slippage to be significant, OSSE continues to set an expectation of 100% compliance for LEAs, conducts regular monitoring, and provides ongoing training and technical assistance to LEAs to support improvement.

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.

The range of days beyond the 120 day timeline is one (1) to 213 days. 74 cases were due to parental delay. 30 cases were due to students who withdrew and reentered within 120 days of referral. 136 cases were due to other LEA delays, including delayed action taken related to initial referral and delays in scheduling meetings.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

OSSE uses its statewide Special Education Data Systems (SEDS) to collect data for this indicator. Data were collected for the entire reporting year (July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017) on all children referred for initial evaluation.

Each quarter, OSSE reviews data in SEDS to report to OSEP on compliance with initial evaluation (and reevaluation) timeline requirements. Data are reviewed from all LEAs. Following the review of data, OSSE issues written findings of noncompliance to each LEA that did not achieve 100% compliance for evaluation timelines.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
18	14	4	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OSSE has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e. achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Below are the steps OSSE used to verify correction of noncompliance related to untimely initial evaluations:

- 1) Each LEA provided evidence of correction of each finding of student-level noncompliance unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Student-level correction was demonstrated when OSSE verified that the student had received the evaluation, although late.
- 2) In order to ensure that the LEA demonstrated compliant implementation of the regulatory requirement to conduct initial evaluations in a timely manner, OSSE conducted a subsequent review of the timeliness of initial evaluations for each LEA.

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

The state verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance by verifying the documentation provided by the LEA that an evaluation had been provided for each student unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. After the state verified that every individual instance of noncompliance was properly corrected, the state pulled subsequent data to whether the LEA was properly implementing the regulatory requirement to provide a timely evaluation. After correcting each instance of student-level noncompliance, if the LEA demonstrated 100% compliance on the subsequent data pull, the state closed the findings of noncompliance.

OSEP Response

The State was required to provide updated data on its compliance with the requirement to conduct timely reevaluations consistent with the Special Conditions imposed on the State's FFY 2017 IDEA Part B grant award. The State submitted the Special Conditions progress reports as required. OSEP responded to the State's submissions in separate correspondence.

In its September 1, 2017 submission the State provided a report of the State's timely reevaluations compliance data for the FFY 2016 period, disaggregated by LEA, along with the State's analysis of these data, including suspected or known reasons for any noncompliance. The State reported on the steps it would take to address the suspected or known reasons for the noncompliance, which included review of school-level data to further identify trends and root causes of the noncompliance; professional development activities; and targeted assistance to LEAs that have placed children in nonpublic schools for the provision of a free appropriate public education.

The State submitted a progress report on November 1, 2017, revised November 29, 2017. The State reported that, for the April 1, 2017 through September 30, 2017 reporting period, 88.8% of children were provided a timely reevaluation. In its May 1, 2018 progress report, revised May 24, 2018, the State reported that for the period October 1, 2017 through March 31, 2018, 87.1% of children were provided a timely reevaluation.

OSEP notes that for the April 1, 2017 through March 31, 2018 period, 87.8% of children were provided a timely reevaluation.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for Indicator 11. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

7/16/2018

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		37.00%	40.62%	62.00%		30.30%	62.40%	89.00%	96.00%	98.71%	96.77%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	98.44%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	453
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	71
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	94
d. Number of children for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	86
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	6
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 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	190

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	94	100	98.44%	100%	94.00%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	6
--	---

Reasons for Slippage

The FFY 2016 data of 94% represents slippage as compared to FFY 2015 data of 98.44%. The State did not meet its target of 100%. After a careful analysis of data, OSSE believes the slippage is attributable to the following circumstances which add complexity to the transition process:

- Challenges with transitions that take place during the summer
- Challenges with transition related to implementation of the extended Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) option for children ages 3 to 4 years old. This option allows parents to opt out of receiving Part C services at any point during the service period

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.

Account for children included in a, but not in b, c, d, or e:

Six (6) children who were served in Part C and referred to Part B for a Part B eligibility determination did not have an IEP developed and implemented by the child's third birthday.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicate the range of days beyond the child's third birthday and any reasons for delay:

The number of days beyond the child's third birthday was 9 to 231, and reasons for delay included delayed action taken related to initial referral, and delays in scheduling meetings.

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

- State monitoring
- 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.

The State implemented a two phase plan to collect and report data for this indicator. The first phase included collecting data from Part C systems and completing a direct pull from existing Part B data systems. This check is completed on a monthly basis. The second phase included a record review for the each of the students who did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays, in order to determine the reason for delay.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2014, OSSE identified two (2) instances of noncompliance related to timely IEP completion. Upon subsequent review of the student records, the IEPs were determined to be completed, though late. However, findings of noncompliance were issued subsequent to the APR submission. OSSE appreciates the opportunity to clarify the status of these findings.

In FFY 2015, OSSE reported one (1) instance of noncompliance related to timely IEP completion. Upon review of the student record, the IEP was determined to be completed, though late. A finding of noncompliance was issued subsequent to the APR submission. OSSE appreciates the opportunity to clarify the status of this finding.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	0	0	1

FFY 2015 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

In FFY 2015, OSSE reported one (1) instance of noncompliance related to timely IEP completion. Upon review of the student record, the IEP was determined to be completed, though late. A finding of noncompliance was issued subsequent to the APR submission. OSSE appreciates the opportunity to clarify the status of this finding.

In all instances in which OSSE noncompliance, OSSE verifies that the LEA: (1) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with the Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008; and (2) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through the data system or an additional review of student files.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that the one remaining finding based on FFY 2015 data and the two remaining findings based on FFY 2014 data, were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance based on FFY 2015 and FFY 2014 data: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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 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 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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						3.00%	6.75%	28.00%	40.00%	50.00%	69.67%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	63.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
213	300	63.00%	100%	71.00%

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

- State monitoring
- 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.

As a result of a determination by the U. S. Department of Education that the District of Columbia "needs intervention", based in part on the District's noncompliance in the area of secondary transition, OSSE was required to complete a random sampling of at least 100 IEPs from all LEAs of youth aged 16 and above to be reviewed for secondary transition content. (OSSE randomly selected the IEPs equitably among LEAs based on the percentage of students with IEPs in this age range served by each LEA, relative to the total number of students with IEPs in the age range in the District of Columbia, during the quarter under review.)

OSSE monitored the FFY 2016 secondary transition data, in accordance with the procedure outlined above, 3 times and reported in the FFY 2016 special conditions reports due to OSEP. Below are the results:

FFY 2016 Review Period	Overall Percent Compliant
July 1, 2015 to September 30, 2015	55%
October 1, 2015 to March 31, 2016	73%
April 1, 2017 to June 30, 2016	85%
FFY 2016 Compliance Rate	71%

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

- Yes
- No

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
109	94	15	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

There are no (0) FFY 2015 findings of noncompliance remaining open.

The State has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015: (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 a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

OSSE requires submission of documentation showing the correction of noncompliance as soon as possible and in no case longer than one year from notification. OSSE issues findings of noncompliance using the District of Columbia Corrective Action Tracking System (DC CATS). DC CATS allows SEA and LEA staff members to view findings issued, as well as deadlines for correction. LEA staff submit evidence of correction of noncompliance to the DC CATS system. If noncompliance is not properly corrected by the LEA's first submission, OSSE compliance monitors follow-up with the LEA to

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

provide additional technical assistance on the requirements for correction.

After OSSE verifies that the LEA has properly corrected every instance of noncompliance associated with a specific regulatory requirement, OSSE reviews subsequent data from the LEA. OSSE closes the finding(s) of noncompliance when each instance of noncompliance has been corrected and the LEA is 100% compliant in a subsequent data review.

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

For correction of individual student-level noncompliance, OSSE ensured that the LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, by ensuring each LEA had completed the required action (e.g. develop appropriate measurable post-secondary goal that addresses education or training). After OSSE verified that each individual student-level finding of noncompliance for a specific regulatory requirement had been properly corrected, OSSE reviewed subsequent LEA data. OSSE closed the individual findings of noncompliance when all individual student-level findings of noncompliance had been corrected and the LEA demonstrated that it is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement for all students with IEPs. Specifically, OSSE verified correction of the findings of noncompliance when the LEA demonstrated, in a subsequent record sample, that it had achieved 100% compliance for the regulatory requirement.

OSEP Response

The State was required to provide updated data on its compliance with the secondary transition requirements consistent with the Special Conditions imposed on the State's FFY 2017 IDEA Part B grant award. The State submitted the Special Conditions progress reports as required. OSEP responded to the State's submissions in separate correspondence.

In addition, since the State had not used the full amount of the directed FFY 2015 and FFY 2016 IDEA Part B funds to address noncompliance with secondary transition requirements, as required in OSEP's June 30, 2015 and June 28, 2016 determination letters, the State was required to continue to report on the use of the remaining directed FFY 2015 and FFY 2016 IDEA Part B funds during FFY 2017. The State submitted reports on its use of the remaining directed funds as required. OSEP responded to the State's submissions in separate correspondence.

In correspondence dated September 27, 2017, OSEP notified the State that it had fulfilled the requirement to use the full amount of directed FFY 2015 IDEA Part B funds to improve compliance with secondary transition requirements.

The State provided documentation with its May 1, 2018 submission, revised May 24, 2018, that demonstrates that it has used the full amount of the directed FFY 2016 IDEA Part B funds to improve compliance with secondary transition requirements.

In its August 1, 2017 progress report, the State provided data for the period April 1, 2017 through June 30, 2017, that reflect 85% compliance with secondary transition requirements. In its November 1, 2017 progress report, revised November 29, 2017, the State reported data for the period July 1, 2017 through September 30, 2017, that reflect 92% compliance with the secondary transition requirements. In its May 1, 2018 progress report, the State reported data for the period October 1, 2017 through March 31, 2018, that reflect 96% of youth aged 16 and above had IEPs that included the required secondary transition content.

OSEP notes that for the period April 1, 2017 through March 31, 2018, 91% of youth aged 16 and above had IEPs that included the required secondary transition content. These data reflect progress from the State's reported data of 62% for the period April 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 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 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had 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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2012	Target ≥							25.00%	26.00%	27.00%	27.00%	28.00%
		Data						23.00%	32.00%	35.00%	23.00%	17.20%	17.29%
B	2012	Target ≥							47.00%	49.00%	51.00%	34.00%	39.00%
		Data						45.00%	54.00%	56.00%	25.62%	24.10%	25.94%
C	2012	Target ≥							58.00%	61.00%	64.00%	40.00%	45.00%
		Data						55.00%	63.00%	68.00%	30.81%	31.60%	36.93%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	29.00%
	Data	12.13%
B	Target ≥	44.00%
	Data	18.62%
C	Target ≥	50.00%
	Data	32.96%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%
Target B ≥	49.00%	54.00%	59.00%
Target C ≥	56.00%	63.00%	74.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 targets were set in DC's FFY 2013 SPP and have not changed. Overall, during the development of the FFY 2013 SPP, the State solicited broad stakeholder input for setting and revising SPP targets using the following process:

1. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts then proposed targets for each indicator, and a rationale for the proposed targets.
3. OSSE created a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator and the proposed targets for each indicator. A survey was created in both paper and web-format to capture stakeholder feedback.
4. OSSE advertised the SPP target setting process and desire for community feedback to various stakeholder groups including parents, LEA personnel, and other local agencies.
5. OSSE held multiple live and web-based presentations, and invited audience members to provide feedback on the proposed targets.
6. The presentation and survey were sent to additional parent stakeholder groups and feedback was invited.
7. All participants were offered the opportunity to have private phone or in-person consultations with OSSE staff if they wished to clarify information on the target- setting process before submitting feedback.
8. OSSE collected feedback by collecting surveys at the end of each in-person presentation and through the online survey process. OSSE also collected all questions and comments posed during web-based or in-person presentations.
9. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments, and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	947.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	195.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	89.00
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)	51.00
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).	7.00

	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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	195.00	947.00	12.13%	30.00%	20.59%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	284.00	947.00	18.62%	49.00%	29.99%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	342.00	947.00	32.96%	56.00%	36.11%

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.

Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, 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.

Was a survey used? No

Was sampling used? No

Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSSE does not use a survey to collect this data. The response data represents all youths who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

In its description of its FFY 2016 data, the State did not include an 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.

The State reported that it does not use a survey to collect data for this indicator.

Required Actions

OSEP requests that the State include in its FFY 2017 SPP/APR, a description of the method it uses to collect its data for this indicator.

In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2017 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, 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 youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions**

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 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004			2005			2006			2007			2008		
Target				-			5.00%	-	5.00%	7.00%	-	7.00%	9.00%	-	9.00%
Data				3.00%			9.00%						24.40%		

FFY	2009			2010			2011			2012		
Target	11.00%	-	11.00%	50.00%	-	65.00%	55.00%	-	70.00%	55.00%	-	70.00%
Data	48.60%			34.20%			26.91%			9.98%		

FFY	2013			2014			2015		
Target	20.00%	-	35.00%	22.00%	-	37.00%	25.00%	-	40.00%
Data	2.74%			14.32%			13.90%		

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016			2017			2018		
Target	27.00%	-	42.00%	29.00%	-	44.00%	31.00%	-	46.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad stakeholder input for setting and revising SPP targets using the following process:

- OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
- Subject matter experts then proposed targets for each indicator, and a rationale for the proposed targets.
- OSSE created a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator and the proposed targets for each indicator. A survey was created in both paper and web-format to capture stakeholder feedback.
- OSSE advertised the SPP target setting process and desire for community feedback to various stakeholder groups including parents, LEA personnel, and other local agencies.
- OSSE held multiple live and web-based presentations, and invited audience members to provide feedback on the proposed targets.
- The presentation and survey were sent to additional parent stakeholder groups and feedback was invited.
- All participants were offered the opportunity to have private phone or in-person consultations with OSSE staff if they wished to clarify information on the target-setting process before submitting feedback.
- OSSE collected feedback by collecting surveys at the end of each in-person presentation and through the online survey process. OSSE also collected all questions and comments posed during web-based or in-person presentations.
- Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments, and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
--------	------	-------------	------	----------------

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	42	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	239	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
42	239	13.90%	27.00% - 42.00%	17.57%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 16: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004			2005			2006			2007			2008		
Target				-			20.00%	-	20.00%	23.00%	-	23.00%	25.00%	-	25.00%
Data				23.10%			16.67%			18.18%			90.00%		

FFY	2009			2010			2011			2012		
Target	30.00%	-	30.00%	40.00%	-	55.00%	45.00%	-	60.00%	45.00%	-	60.00%
Data	60.00%			94.74%			70.00%			72.22%		

FFY	2013			2014			2015		
Target	60.00%	-	75.00%	62.00%	-	77.00%	64.00%	-	79.00%
Data	66.67%			64.71%			66.67%		

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016			2017			2018		
Target	66.00%	-	81.00%	68.00%	-	83.00%	70.00%	-	85.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State solicited broad stakeholder input for setting and revising SPP targets using the following process:

1. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts then proposed targets for each indicator, and a rationale for the proposed targets.
3. OSSE created a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator and the proposed targets for each indicator. A survey was created in both paper and web-format to capture stakeholder feedback.
4. OSSE advertised the SPP target setting process and desire for community feedback to various stakeholder groups including parents, LEA personnel, and other local agencies.
5. OSSE held multiple live and web-based presentations, and invited audience members to provide feedback on the proposed targets.
6. The presentation and survey were sent to additional parent stakeholder groups and feedback was invited.
7. All participants were offered the opportunity to have private phone or in-person consultations with OSSE staff if they wished to clarify information on the target- setting process before submitting feedback.
8. OSSE collected feedback by collecting surveys at the end of each in-person presentation and through the online survey process. OSSE also collected all questions and comments posed during web-based or in-person presentations.
9. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments, and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
--------	------	-------------	------	----------------

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	10	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1 Mediations held	19	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
3	10	19	66.67%	66.00% - 81.00%	68.42%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016
Target ≥		36.00%	38.00%	43.00%
Data	34.00%	38.60%		

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	49.00%	60.00%

Key:

Description of Measure

PART B IDEA STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN: PHASE I

In accordance with the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education ACT (IDEA), Part B, the District of Columbia's Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) submits this Phase I document as Indicator 17 of the Annual Performance Report, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

After reviewing various data sources, OSSE has selected the following State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR), which will be implemented using the infrastructure, improvement strategies, and theory of action detailed below:

The District of Columbia will increase the rate of graduation with a regular diploma for all students with disabilities with a focus on students who attend a high school that has a graduation rate of less than 50% for students with disabilities, and is in Focus or Priority school status under the ESEA Flexibility waiver accountability system.

Graduation is defined under IDEA as graduating with a regular diploma within four years of entering high school. The District of Columbia intends to report the five- and six- year graduation rates for students with disabilities in Phase II and Phase III of the SSIP, as five- and six-year graduation rates may be the most appropriate measure of graduation success for certain students with disabilities.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Overall, OSSE solicited broad stakeholder input for setting and revising SSIP targets using the following process:

OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national graduation and dropout related-data, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area. Subject matter experts then proposed improvement strategies for achieving the State Identified Measurable Result and a rationale for the proposed activities.

OSSE created a presentation including information about the SSIP process, the rationale behind OSEP's new requirement, and the proposed State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). A survey was created in both paper and web-format to capture stakeholder feedback.

OSSE advertised the SSIP development process and desire for community feedback to various stakeholder groups including parents, LEA personnel, and other local agencies. OSSE held in-person meetings and webinars with a variety of stakeholder groups where the SSIP was introduced, targets were reviewed, and timelines and SIMR selection issues were vetted. Stakeholder groups included DCPS central office staff and principals, the Public Charter School Board, a working group of the State Board of Education, members of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, the Title I Committee of Practitioners, the Secondary Transition Community of Practice, the OSSE's Post-Secondary Division, the Special Education Co-op (a professional development network for public charter schools, the District of Columbia Association for Special Education (an association of nonpublic special education schools), and parents and community stakeholders through ten community meetings that addressed the SEA's education priorities. Copies of SSIP presentations were also sent to additional stakeholder groups and feedback was invited.

OSSE collected feedback at the end of selected in-person presentations and invited additional feedback by email. OSSE also collected all questions and comments posed during in-person presentations. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments, and consulted with State leadership to revise the SSIP targets as appropriate.

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

IA&B) Identification of Data Sources, Data Analysis, and Disaggregation of Data on the District of Columbia's Graduation Rates for Students with Disabilities

The District of Columbia's Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) began preparing for the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by performing a general review of FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 State APR data in an attempt to understand the relative strengths and weaknesses in DC's programming for students with disabilities. At the same time, the SSIP conceptual framework, purpose, and core plan requirements were introduced to stakeholders including the State Advisory Panel, community members who attended public comment sessions related to proposed special education regulations and policies, and LEA stakeholders. Through these early conversations about the SSIP and the kinds of issues that DC might be able to address through the SSIP, OSSE learned that there was heightened interest and concern about graduation rates for students with disabilities and related issues such as dropout rates, truancy, meaningful post-secondary engagement with college or career, and effective secondary transition planning. This heightened interest coincided with the release of the DC Graduation Pathways Report, the launch of the DC Re-Engagement Center and renewed attention on a number of other ongoing initiatives.

Data Sources: Graduation Rates

After seeing the broad community interest in graduation and related issues, OSSE undertook a deep review of multiple sources of State data including the following:

1. Section 618 data for the school years 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14. Special emphasis was placed on the following Section 618 sub-collections:
 - Child Count Data
 - Exit Data
2. Part B SPP/APR data for FFYs 2011-2013. Special emphasis was placed on the following Indicators:
 - Indicator 1- Graduation Rates
 - Indicator 4A & B- Discipline
 - Indicator 13- Secondary Transition
3. Statewide data produced by the "Graduation Pathways" project, produced by the District of Columbia's Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education^[1] using State-level data collected by OSSE.
4. 5 year graduation rate data calculated by OSSE for District of Columbia LEAs.
5. National graduation data produced by the US Department of Education, National Center for Education Sciences for school years 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13.
6. The District of Columbia's ESEA data on Focus and Priority schools.

The data demonstrated that four-year on-time high school graduation rates for public school students in the District of Columbia are lower than the national average. Between school years 2011-12 and 2013-14, 60% of all District of Columbia Students graduated^[2] in four years compared to 80%^[3] nationally, and 34% of District of Columbia students with disabilities graduated in four years compared with 61% nationally.

Analysis of Root Causes of Failure to Graduate Timely

In 2013, the District of Columbia's Deputy Mayor for Education's office conducted a longitudinal study, known as the Graduation Pathways Project, in order to determine when and why students fall off track for timely graduation, as well as to identify programs and schools that are able to get students back on track. The Graduation Pathways Project identified the following factors as root causes or strong predictors of late graduation and dropout among District of Columbia students including the following:

1. Special education status in grade 8
2. English language learner status in grade 8
3. Average at high school entry
4. Basic or below basic performance on the grade 8 DC CAS (statewide test)
5. Suspensions before entering high school

6. Absences before high school
7. Course failures before high school

In addition, the Graduation Pathways project documented linkages between involvement with the juvenile justice or foster care systems and lack of timely or steady credit accumulation, and lack of effective credit recovery programs and untimely graduation or dropout. This link is also related, at least in part, to high mobility and school transfer rates among these students.

Disaggregation of Relevant Data

OSSE disaggregated graduation data by sector (traditional public vs. public charter), by disability category, by disability category and gender, by disability category by sector and race, and by school. When disaggregating state level data, several issues arose in relation to the District of Columbia's population size and other demographic factors. According to OSEP's 2014 State Data Display, 19.5% of students in the District of Columbia receive special education services, which is above the national average. However, the actual number of students with disabilities, at 11,035, is relatively low in comparison to a typical statewide population. The population numbers are sliced even thinner when focus is placed only on the subset of students who comprise a single graduation cohort, which OSSE currently estimates at 1,330 students with disabilities per year. The average graduation rate for the cohort of 1,330 students with disabilities is 34%, or 452 students. Assuming the cohort size is stable, to achieve the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) target of 60% by FFY 2018, the District of Columbia would need to graduate an additional 70 students per year, or 350 students over the five years of the SSIP, for a total of 802 graduating students. OSSE disaggregated data in an effort to better understand the dynamics at work in creating the low graduation rates for students with disabilities, but also to identify possible subgroups for the SIMR intervention cohort. The very small cohort sizes made it difficult to base the intervention on any of the traditionally examined factors such as race, gender, or disability category, because the resulting subgroup sizes were generally too small to ensure a statewide difference in outcomes.

For example, the relatively small number of students per graduating cohort was related to an issue in the analysis of disability category subpopulation sizes. When looking into data from FFYs 2011, 2012, and 2013, the disability categories of autism and emotional disturbance had similar average graduation rates (22%). However, there was an average of 29 students with autism graduating per year, while there was an average of 286 students with emotional disturbance graduating per year during the three year period. Students with speech language impairment had the highest 4 year graduation rate by disability category, with 46% of students graduating timely. However in three years combined, only 71 graduating students fell into this disability category. Comparing rates of graduation by disability category for students in the District of Columbia, especially within single years, did not provide OSSE with enough information to clearly identify a group or logical combination of groups of students that would, if selected as the intervention cohort, have enough power to move results on a Statewide basis.

Comparing graduation rates by race did not lead to the narrowing of a potential SIMR cohort group. Between FFYs 2011 and 2013, African American and Hispanic students comprised 97% of graduates with disabilities in the District of Columbia, so no other race groups were disaggregated. The average graduation rate was 6% higher for Hispanic students with disabilities (39%) than for African American students with disabilities (33%). However, on average, there were more than 15 times as many African American students with disabilities per graduating cohort. OSSE encountered similar difficulties when disaggregating the data by gender and sector (traditional LEA v. Public Charter Schools). The data showed almost 50% more male students per graduating class (an average of 869 males vs 459 females), but showed a statewide graduation rate for female students with disabilities (40%) that was 9% higher than the graduation rate for male students with disabilities (31%). While the charter school graduation rate (47%) was notably higher than the traditional LEA graduation rate (31%), on average only 291 students with disabilities are part of a graduating cohort in a charter school in the District each year, while an average of 1,012 students with disabilities are part of the graduating cohort in the traditional LEA each year.

In order to ensure that decisions were based on statistically relevant population sizes, OSSE ultimately used averages derived from three school years: 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14. As a result, some of the state-level rates reported throughout the Phase I SSIP document are based, as described below, on a combination of three cohorts.

OSSE reviewed high school graduation data for students with disabilities in the cohorts scheduled to graduate in 2012, 2013, and 2014 and identified 3,984 students with disabilities who fell into the three cohorts. The average four-year graduation rate for these three cohorts is 34%. Note that the examined data was compiled using data submitted to OSEP for Section 618, particularly Child Find and Exit counts as the basis of the data set. However, this is an expanded cohort set both because it covers three years and because this data set assigns previously "ungraded" students to graduation cohorts.

After conducting traditional data disaggregation, OSSE had still not identified an intervention subgroup that covered all sectors of public schooling in the District and included enough students to make a positive statewide difference. The SSIP team decided to further disaggregate the data to the school campus level, rather than comparing rates by sector or LEA. Once the data was disaggregated by school campus and the data spread was analyzed, OSSE determined that there was a noticeable break around the 50% graduation rate for students with disabilities, with several schools' graduation rates clustered between 26% and 48%. ESEA data was introduced and compared to the per campus graduation rates, and in most cases, OSSE found that a graduation rate for students with disabilities coincided with a school being in Focus or Priority status under the ESEA Flexibility waiver accountability system. Focus and Priority schools are school communities generally in need of deep support. Therefore, OSSE proposed that that it would target the Focus and Priority schools that were graduating fewer than 50% of students with disabilities. As described below, after stakeholder input, OSSE identified this group as a cohort of high schools that would receive targeted interventions to improve graduation rates.

1C) Description of Any Data Quality Concerns and the State's Plan to Correct the Concerns

OSSE's primary data concern deals with data quality. The District has 995 students attending non-public special education schools^[4] and many of these students are in ungraded programs. When non-public students graduate, they are assigned to their LEAs for the purpose of being counted with their

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

graduating cohort group. However, non-public students who attend ungraded programs might not be assigned to a particular high school campus within their LEA until they are ready to exit the system at age 22. OSSE is currently working through student data and making cohort assignments in an effort to correct historical gaps in the data tracking for these students. OSSE has been working on this issue for several months and expects all students will be assigned to a cohort and this issue will be resolved in 2016.

For the purpose of SSIP analysis, OSSE was able to manually account for and assign to specific high schools the non-public students in ungraded programs who were previously assigned to LEAs. This ensured the non-public students were counted in the data for cohort graduation rates. As previously stated, OSSE is working on developing methods of tracking and assigning these students at the beginning of their high school careers.

ID) The State's Consideration of Compliance Data During Development of Phase I of the SSIP

OSSE has chosen to focus on Indicator 1, improving graduation rates for students with disabilities, as its one Priority improvement area. This is a results based indicator rather than a compliance based indicator. Additional compliance indicators OSSE focused on while developing the SSIP are Secondary Transition (Indicator 13) and Significant Discrepancy (Indicator 4B).

In looking at secondary transition compliance data, OSSE noted that while the compliance data revealed areas of difficulty for some LEAs and schools, OSSE does not anticipate these compliance issues, in and of themselves, to present barriers to improvement. Over the past few years, OSSE has made significant improvements in Secondary Transition compliance. This is primarily due to an increase in targeted technical assistance and focused monitoring, as well as the work of the Secondary Transition Community of Practice. OSSE expects this compliance rate to continue its upswing over the next several years until the District of Columbia reaches 100% compliance.

With respect to Significant Discrepancy, or Indicator 4, OSSE is currently undergoing a revision of its Indicator 4 methodology and monitoring process in an effort to ensure that OSSE can focus energy on those LEAs and schools that are using suspension and expulsion inappropriately or too easily with their students. DC's Graduation Pathways report noted a correlation between an increased number of suspensions prior to 9th grade and an increased likelihood of students not completing high school. This finding is confirmed by multiple published research reports and the body of work produced by R. Skiba et al at the Indiana University Equity Project, which establish firm links between suspension and failure to complete school.

Thus in reviewing compliance rates with Indicators 4 and 13, OSSE did not see any particular barriers to improving graduation rates based on work already underway. However, OSSE is optimistic that higher graduation rates will be an added benefit to improved compliance rates in these areas.

Additional Data Analysis

During the Phase I analysis, OSSE identified 11 high schools that will form the targeted SIMR intervention cohort subgroup that will receive the most intensive support. The identified subgroup of schools have graduated less than 50% of their students with disabilities, and have either a Focus or Priority designation under the ESEA Flexibility waiver accountability system. Because so many predictors related to timely graduation were evident by middle school or influenced by middle school, over the next 12 months, OSSE also intends to engage in additional analysis of the middle schools that send students to the 11 targeted SIMR intervention cohort schools.

Over the much longer term (18-24 months), OSSE also plans to look at those high schools that are successfully graduating higher percentages of their students with disabilities. OSSE will work to determine how and why these schools are successful. OSSE will disaggregate and examine the race, gender, and disability data for these schools, and look for similarities between successful schools and less successful schools, to determine which, if any, of the interventions put in place might be successfully exported and replicated. OSSE has conducted initial analysis regarding high school feeder patterns and will continue to conduct a similar analysis of the feeder middle schools, in an attempt to further understand when and in what ways groups of students with disabilities are getting off track. Initial analysis indicates that there are discernable middle school feeder patterns for students with disabilities in 6 of the 11 SIMR subgroup high schools. However, for 4 high schools, there were no significant feeder patterns identifiable in the three years of data that was analyzed. For the remaining high school, an alternative high school, there is no middle school feeder pattern because the school begins serving students at age 16.

IF) Stakeholder Involvement

Several groups of external stakeholders were involved in the collection and analysis of the data. First, as part of its longitudinal Graduation Pathways study, the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education and Raise DC, a cross-sector partnership of local public, private, philanthropic and non-profit stakeholders, consulted with DCPS and several public charter schools. In developing the Phase I SSIP plan, OSSE consulted with LEAs, including DCPS central office staff and principals, the Public Charter School Board, a working group of the State Board of Education, members of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, the Title I Committee of Practitioners, the Secondary Transition Community of Practice, OSSE's Post-Secondary Division, the Special Education Co-operative (a professional development network for public charter schools), and the District of Columbia Association for Special Education (an association of DC nonpublic special education schools). OSSE further engaged parents and community stakeholder through ten community meetings that addressed OSSE's SEA priorities.

[1] The District of Columbia Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education, (September 2014) "Graduation Pathways Project Summary. Available at: <http://dme.dc.gov/publication/graduation-pathway-report>

Note that in addition to review of the report, OSSE staff had several meetings with staff who authored the report to more deeply understand the data that were used in the production of the report, and the analytical approaches used by the DME's office.

[2] Note that throughout this report, where District of Columbia data are cited, the State is referring to the three year data analysis (SY 2010-11, SY 2011-12 and SY 2012-13) and averages derived from that analysis.

[3] Stetser, M., and Stillwell, R. (2014) *Public High School Four-Year On-Time Graduation Rates and Event Dropout Rates: School Years 2010-11 and 2011-12*. First Look (NCES 2014-391) U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics. Available at: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>

[4] OSSE (January, 2015) Nonpublic Program Report

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

2A) Analysis of Current Infrastructure Capacity

Through the course of implementing the first Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) waiver, OSSE conducted an analysis of its infrastructure and determined that: 1) the District was not on a trajectory to meet its performance targets; 2) OSSE had not fully coordinated core K-12 work, leading to some duplication of work within the agency; and some level of confusion for outside stakeholders; and 3) as an agency, we were not maximizing talent, knowledge and resources. As a result, while the District has made significant strides, progress has been incremental and we have not met performance targets outlined in the Waiver, including reading, math and graduation.

In response to this examination, OSSE began implementing a series of realignment phases to achieve the following desired outcomes: 1) increase coordination and improve resource mapping; 2) promote the smart use of data to help LEAs address challenges; 3) provide streamlined and more effective technical assistance delivery to LEAs; 4) reduce LEA burden, 5) increase peer-to-peer problem solving; 6) identify best practice identification and dissemination; and 7) improve outcomes.

As described below, the OSSE realignment is ongoing, and SSIP presents an opportunity to ensure that the improvements made related to the SEA's infrastructure help ensure that the District is best positioned to achieve desired outcomes outlined in the SSIP.

2B) Description of the State's Former, Current and Future Infrastructure

OSSE was established in 2007 as the State Education Agency in the District of Columbia. As it was being established, OSSE inherited some non-typical functions for an SEA, such as special education transportation.

In its first seven years of existence, OSSE made significant improvements in special education, adopted and began rolling out the Common Core State Standards, launched a State Longitudinal Education Database, began implementing an Enterprise Grants Management System, and sought and obtained flexibility from ESEA. However, as a new agency in a crowded and dynamic education landscape, OSSE has experienced a number of challenges.

In effort to accelerate outcomes and ensure a clear focus, OSSE was reorganized in 2014 into three programmatic divisions and four support divisions:

Programmatic Divisions:

1. Early Learning (ages 0-5),
2. Elementary, Secondary & Specialized Education (ages 5-18)
3. Post-Secondary (ages 18-24+)

Support Divisions:

1. Data, Accountability, Assessment and Research
2. Grants Management/Operations
3. Information Technology
4. Transportation

The component of the OSSE realignment effort that best positions the SEA's ability to impact the SIMR is the consolidation of the Division of Specialized Education and the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education into one, unified Division of Elementary, Secondary and Specialized Education (ESSE). This move reflects OSSE's belief that improvement in, and support for, special education and general education cannot be meaningful and have the most impact when it occurs in isolation.

2C & D) Description of Current Strengths and Areas for Improvement and Current State-Level Improvement Plans and Initiatives

In fall 2014, after receiving approval from the US Department of Education to implement the DC ESEA Waiver, OSSE launched a new State System of Support (SSOS). This model, made up of four key strands of work, is designed to fundamentally change the way in which OSSE delivers services, in order to facilitate increased collaboration among LEA and State leaders and improve student outcomes related to academic achievement and secondary transition opportunities, including post-secondary education and employment. The SSOS, as with the new ESSE Division, is not general or special education -specific and instead has been developed to support school improvement across multiple areas, for ALL students.

OSSE's LEA Support Model builds upon reform efforts initiated through the first phase of ESEA waiver implementation and intentionally draws from the successful experiences of other SEAs, such as Rhode Island^[1] and Illinois, which have reorganized the way in which they interface with LEAs via the Collaborative Learning for Outcomes (CLO) model. In the new LEA support model, the SEA is deliberative in providing supports to LEAs based on data and the SEA fosters collaboration among LEAs and school leaders by providing opportunities for school leaders to connect with one another through learning communities organized by the SEA. The four strands of work, and potential areas of impact for the SSIP, are described below:

1. Reorganizing How OSSE Does Business: OSSE Cross-Functional Support Teams and the OSSE Support Tool

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

In August 2014, OSSE launched cross-functional LEA Support Teams comprised of staff from Elementary, Secondary, and Specialized Education, the Office of Data, Assessment and Research, and the Office of Grants Compliance and Management. Initially OSSE launched seven teams, six of which were assigned to support “clusters” of up to ten charter LEAs each and one of which supports DC Public Schools and interagency partnerships. However, after receiving input from a core “design team” of representative LEAs regarding the important role OSSE could play in coordination of agency services, OSSE decided to separate the interagency focus from the DCPS team and instead create eight teams in total, seven LEA support teams and one interagency support team. The eight teams are based upon a simple theory of action that drives the reorganization of OSSE’s work:

The seven LEA Support Teams, which are designed to support the improvement efforts of the schools within their cluster, were immediately tasked with reviewing FFY 2014 20% Title I set aside applications required for designated Focus and Priority schools. In September, OSSE collaborated with an educational consulting firm to develop a rubric for application review and offered all teams intensive training on the context for the use of the rubric, including the ESEA waiver, the seven turnaround principles, and the required elements of the set aside application. The training sessions also included a scoring simulation to promote inter-rater reliability.

OSSE simultaneously offered LEAs an overview of the rubric and provided a timeline for submission and resources for technical assistance available from the SEA in October prior to the application deadline. Last, OSSE provided the team facilitators with coaching related to shared leadership, consensus building, and conflict resolution in order to ensure that they were best positioned to effectively lead their teams through the set aside application review process.

In fall 2014, OSSE also used the OSSE Support Tool, a web-based application, to support LEAs with questions related to the annual enrollment audit and IDEA child count process, tracking LEA/school performance and responding timely to questions received from their LEAs.

The LEA Support Teams will continue to serve as a resource through which OSSE can provide cross-functional support to high schools receiving both universal and targeted supports in the SSIP, as described below.

2. Providing Foundational Support: The OSSE LEA Support Institutes

On November 7, 2014, OSSE hosted its first LEA Support Institute, entitled “It Takes a City!”. The focus of this institute was driven by feedback from an LEA Design Team which OSSE assembled to advise the SEA on its core work. This team noted that one of the most important roles OSSE could play in LEA success would be that of brokering non-academic agency supports and services. Based on this premise, OSSE created an institute that was designed to give school staff multiple interactive vehicles to learn about and benefit from agency resources. The day, which was launched by the Mayor, was a clear success, based on participant evaluations, with over 250 attendees and key child serving agencies across the city. OSSE was also pleased to integrate a fall work session in the afternoon of the event designed specifically for the Learning Support Network school leaders.

OSSE subsequently held its second LEA Support Institute in January 2015 focused on common core implementation and next generation assessments. OSSE will be holding its third and final Institute in May 2015 that will focus on the dissemination of best practices to, by, and between LEAs.

The challenges and successes of the SSIP will be disseminated through future LEA Support Institutes.

3. Providing Targeted Support: LEA Learning Support Network

OSSE’s launch of the Learning Support Network, an intensive intervention designed to support struggling Focus and Priority schools in their fourth year, is fully underway. OSSE is partnering with an educational consulting firm to provide onsite, targeted data driven technical assistance to Focus and Priority schools via a root-cause analysis and match needs with research based interventions such as Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS), Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and Response to Intervention (RTI). OSSE is providing all schools with on-site coaching, job-alike collaboration with colleagues, and a “line of credit,” a limited amount of funds to support identified reform efforts that the coaches support.

All Priority schools in the Learning Support Network will be included in the SIMR intervention cohort and will be able to access additional assistance through this network.

4. Fostering LEA Best Practice Dissemination

OSSE awarded \$1.7 million in best practice grants for to District of Columbia public schools that have successfully implemented academic improvement strategies and are willing to partner with other schools to disseminate and support the replication of these practices. The purpose of the grant is to reward schools for implementing best and promising practices, to foster innovation through the dissemination of these practices, and to provide funding to build effective relationships between higher-performing schools and schools in need of appropriate supports aimed at raising student achievement. Grantees will be required to partner with at least one school in Focus or Priority status.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

In the future, OSSE plans to invite high schools with demonstrated SIMR improvement success will be invited to participate in similar grant opportunities.

2E & F) List of Representatives Involved in SSIP Phase I Development & State Infrastructure Analysis

- OSSE's Division of Elementary Secondary & Specialized Education
- OSSE's Office of Data, Accountability, Assessment and Research
- DC Graduation Pathways Report Authors (Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education, Raise DC, District of Columbia Public Schools, Public Charter School Representatives, Tembo Consulting)
- DCPS Central office staff (Office of Special Education and Office of the Chief of Schools)
- DCPS High School Principals
- Public Charter School Board staff
- State Board of Education members
- Special Education State Advisory Panel members
- Title I Committee of Practitioners
- Secondary Transition Community of Practice
- OSSE's Post-Secondary Division
- Special Education Co-operative
- District of Columbia Association for Special Education
- Parents and community stakeholders through ten community meetings that addressed PARRC testing, the ESEA Waiver Process, the equitable access to excellent teachers plan and SSIP development.

[U.S. Department of Education Reform Network, "Collaborative Learning for Outcomes: Connecting LEAs with the Rhode Island Department of Education," website, February 3, 2014, http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/implementation-support-unit/tech-assist/clo-brief.pdf](http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/implementation-support-unit/tech-assist/clo-brief.pdf)

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

The District of Columbia will increase the rate of graduation with a regular diploma for all students with disabilities with a focus on students who attend a high school that has a graduation rate of less than 50% for students with disabilities, and is also in Focus or Priority school status under the ESEA Flexibility waiver accountability system.

Description

3A) State SIMR and Alignment with an SPP/APR Indicator:

The District of Columbia will increase the rate of graduation with a regular diploma for all students with disabilities with a focus on students who attend a high school that has a graduation rate of less than 50% for students with disabilities, and is also in Focus or Priority school status under the ESEA Flexibility waiver accountability system.

This SIMR is the same as Indicator 1 of the State's Part B SPP/APR, "percent of youth graduating from high school with a regular diploma," with an identified focus on a subpopulation of the cohort. As described in detail in other sections of the SSIP, the State will improve graduation rates for the SIMR cohort by implementing two tiers of intervention, with universal intervention strategies available for all schools, and targeted improvement activities for high schools with graduation rates of less than 50% for students with disabilities that are also in Focus or Priority status under the DC's ESEA Waiver. The approach the District will use is premised upon a theory of action that pushes in supports during two points of vulnerability: 8th to 9th grade transition and 9th to 10th grade transition.

OSSE believes that in order to build systemic capacity and improve outcomes, we need to simultaneously help students get ready for high school while helping high schools get ready for their students.



After analyzing existing data, OSSE originally identified 11 high schools out of 43 high schools in the District of Columbia that would make up a SIMR of Focus and Priority schools with graduation rates for students with disabilities of less than 50%. After extensive stakeholder feedback expressing concern for the graduation outcomes of students with disabilities in non-SIMR schools and suggesting interventions for all high schools, the SIMR was broadened to be the same as Indicator 1, which addresses the graduation rate for all students with disabilities. The group of high schools originally proposed by OSSE to be the SIMR population was redefined to be the group of high schools who will receive targeted interventions within the overall SSIP strategy. The following analysis describes the targeted subpopulation of the SIMR Cohort.

Between FFY 2014 and FFY 2018, the State will focus targeted improvement strategies on the subpopulation of District of Columbia students with disabilities who attend one of the 11 identified SIMR cohort high schools which has historically graduated fewer than 50% of students with disabilities and is also identified as a Focus or Priority school for ESEA purposes. During this same time frame, OSSE will implement universal improvement strategies designed to improve the graduation rate in all high schools, including nonpublic special education high schools.

How Improving the Graduation Rate for Students with Disabilities in the SIMR Subpopulation will Improve the Statewide Graduation Rate for Students with Disabilities

The targeted intervention SIMR subpopulation was selected to target educational inequities for students with disabilities that may result from attending a school that is in Focus or Priority status; in some cases the schools are in Focus or Priority status because of the achievement gaps that exist between students with disabilities and students in general. Students attending SIMR subpopulation schools receiving targeted interventions stand to gain the most benefit from OSSE's efforts to improve educational quality and results through the SSIP. In addition, focusing on students with disabilities in these 11 schools includes a large enough student population to influence DC's overall graduation rate for students with disabilities. Across the three years of graduation data analyzed, these schools accounted for 53%, or 2,093 of the 3,984 students with disabilities who were part of the classes graduating between school years 2011-12 and 2013-14.

Consistent gains in the number of students who graduate from each SIMR subpopulation cohort school for the duration of the SSIP (roughly an increase of three to ten additional students graduating, per school, per year, over the duration of the SSIP) will result in a Statewide graduation rate of 60% for students with disabilities, which is in line with the Statewide graduation rate for nondisabled students and the national average graduation rate for students with disabilities. OSSE believes that offering the array of targeted activities to LEAs and students in the SIMR subpopulation cohort will make a 3-10 student increase per school, per year, an achievable average. In addition, by expanding the SIMR cohort to include all high schools, and by instituting universal intervention strategies to address key systemic factors that contribute to disengagement or dropout from school, such as the proposed strategy to address credit transfer issues across District LEAs and other settings, OSSE expects to see increased rates of graduation in all schools. Finally, OSSE believes that a SIMR that draws both on special education and general education factors is in keeping with OSSE's efforts to emphasize the interconnectedness of special education and general education. As noted in the chapter on infrastructure, OSSE has reorganized SEA functions to emphasize that there are no special education successes, problems, or challenges that happen in isolation from general education programming.

3B) The SIMR was Derived from an Analysis of State Data, Stakeholder Input, and Infrastructure

OSSE selected this SIMR after analyzing^[1] three years of State data and finding that in the District of Columbia, for the three school years of 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14, students with disabilities had a four year graduation rate of 34%, which was 26% lower than the four year graduation rate of 60% for nondisabled students over the same period. Conversations with stakeholder groups including LEAs, parents, local education-focused community organizations, and others revealed that the District's low graduation rates for students with disabilities, and related issues such as truancy rates, dropout rates, and rates of post-secondary engagement, are matters of urgent concern to DC's stakeholders.

When surveying the State's infrastructure, OSSE determined that many of the District of Columbia's sister State agencies and Local Education Agencies (LEAs) have prioritized graduation and related issues such as truancy reduction, high school re-engagement, communities of practice on the issue of graduation, and meaningful post-secondary engagement, but these efforts are not always fully coordinated across agencies and programs, and these efforts are often constructed to look at high school completion broadly, without a special focus on students with disabilities. The SSIP presented OSSE with an opportunity to ensure that students with disabilities benefit from the both SSIP-specific improvement strategies and the many programs being implemented to increase graduation rates and related topics throughout DC.

The combination of a problem which was clearly identified by analysis of state-level data; strong internal and external stakeholder recognition of the problem and interest in implementing solutions; and the opportunity to coordinate and leverage the many resources that the District has committed to the challenge to date; made OSSE's selection of improvement of graduation rates for students with disabilities DC's choice for the Indicator 17 SSIP.

Finally, as described in other sections of the SSIP, the selected SIMR presents an opportunity to leverage the new infrastructure alignment of the special education and general education teams at OSSE. Recent and ongoing improvements in OSSE's infrastructure will position OSSE well to achieve the SIMR targets.

3C) The State's SIMR is a Student-level Outcome

The District of Columbia's SIMR, which is identical to Indicator 1, is tied directly to student-level outcomes. While OSSE will examine existing processes that impact graduation, and may change or develop new processes to achieve the SIMR, graduation rates are inherently student-level outcomes, because graduation rates cannot increase without additional students attaining a regular diploma. Please also see section 3A above.

3D) District of Columbia Stakeholders Were Involved with the Selection of the SIMR

OSSE held several in-person meetings and webinars with a variety of stakeholder groups where the SSIP was introduced, and timelines and SIMR selection issues vetted. Stakeholder groups included DCPS central office staff and principals, the Public Charter School Board, a working group of the State Board of Education, members of the Special Education State Advisory Panel, the Title I Committee of Practitioners, the Secondary Transition Community of Practice, the OSSE's Post-Secondary Division, the Special Education Co-op (a professional development network for public charter schools), the District of Columbia Association for Special Education (an association of nonpublic special education schools), and parents and community

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

stakeholders through ten community meetings that addressed the SEA's education priorities.

After extensive stakeholder feedback expressing concern regarding the graduation outcomes of students with disabilities in non-SIMR schools, and suggesting differentiated interventions for all high schools, the SIMR was changed to be the same as Indicator 1 and the originally proposed SIMR group was instead identified as the group of high schools who will receive universal interventions. The following analysis describes the targeted subpopulation of the SIMR Cohort.

3E) Baseline Data and Measurable and Rigorous Targets for the SSIP

FFY 13 Graduation Rates-Baseline Data

From FFY 2011- FFY 2013, DC had an average graduating cohort of 1,330 students with disabilities, and an average graduation rate of 34%. To get to a 60% graduation rate by FFY 18, DC would need to graduate an additional 26%, for a total of 802 students with disabilities, which is an increase of 350 students over the estimated FFY 2013 baseline of 452 students with disabilities who graduated in four years. Note that OSSE is using the data from the three-year combined cohort data analysis as the FFY 2013 baseline.

During FFY 13, the 11 SIMR subpopulation schools graduated approximately 218, or 48%, of DC's estimated 452 graduating students with disabilities. OSSE is setting targets for the entire SIMR cohort to graduate 70 additional students with disabilities per year between FFYs 2014-2018. If the additional graduating students are spread evenly across the SIMR subpopulation cohort, then each SIMR subpopulation school would need to graduate approximately seven additional students per year, for an increase over baseline of 35 additional students with disabilities graduating from each of the cohort schools by FFY 2018. However, based on significant stakeholder feedback, OSSE is setting targets for the entire SIMR group that will initially increase gradually and then begin increasing at a steeper rate as the universal and targeted interventions begin to produce results.

Targets by year are displayed below:

	SY2013 (baseline)	SY2014	SY2015	SY2016	SY2017	SY2018
Graduation Rate	34%	36%	38%	43%	49%	60%
Students Graduating in 4 Years	452/1330	477/1330	512/1330	567/1330	652/1330	802/1330
Additional students needed		+ 25	+ 35	+ 55	+ 85	+ 150

[1] The data analysis, infrastructure analysis, and stakeholder involvement are described in detail in other sections of the Indicator 17 SSIP document.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

4A) A description of how the District's improvement strategies were selected and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s).

I. Review of Evidence-Based Practices

In order to select improvement strategies, OSSE conducted a literature review of promising practices to improve graduation outcomes for students with disabilities. Highlights of the portions of this review which informed the development of OSSE's improvement strategies are outlined below:

A. Ensuring a Successful Transition to High School

According to Williams and Richman (2007), more students fail ninth grade than any other grade, which results in a "ninth grade bulge." However, researchers (Smith, 1997; Morgan & Hertzog, 1998) have reported a dramatic lowering of the drop-out rate and an increase in ninth-grade retention in schools that implement programs using multiple transition strategies. Dedmond (2006) and Mizelle (2005) are among researchers who stress that successful transition programs are varied and multi-dimensional. Although little empirical research exists on the transition to high school or on the effectiveness of strategies implemented to ease the transition, there have been many reports of promising practices, including the following:

- Involve parents and families in the transition process.
- Promote collaboration among middle and high school staff to support the transition process.
- Increase comfort and reduce anxiety through orientation activities.
- Increase awareness of academic programs offered at the high school level.
- Provide resources designed to make the transition easier.
- Design activities for the first weeks of ninth grade.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Continue the use of counseling teams to maintain support throughout the ninth grade year.
- Develop special interventions to support ninth graders who may be struggling academically or socially.

Check & Connect^[1] is an intervention used with students who show warning signs of disengagement with school and who are at risk of dropping out. At the core of *Check & Connect* is a trusting relationship between the student and a caring, trained mentor who both advocates for and challenges the student to keep education salient. Students are referred to *Check & Connect* when they show warning signs of disengaging from school, such as poor attendance, behavioral issues, and/or low grades. In *Check & Connect*, the “Check” component refers to the process where mentors systemically monitor student performance variables (e.g., absences, tardies, behavioral referrals, grades), while the “Connect” component refers to monitoring personalized, timely interventions to help students solve problems, build skills, and enhance competence. Mentors work with caseloads of students and families for at least two years, functioning as liaisons between home and school and striving to build constructive family-school relationships.

Since the 1990s, *Check & Connect* has been successfully implemented across the United States in over 27 states, and internationally. ^[2] As a sustained intervention, *Check & Connect* improves enrollment, attendance, and odds of graduation for students who are disengaged and at risk of dropout. *Check & Connect* has also been shown to improve persistence, enrollment, access to relevant educational services, student involvement in IEP transition planning, and attendance for students with emotional/behavioral disabilities. Additionally, *Check & Connect* is listed in the National Dropout Prevention Center’s Model Programs Database.

B. Preventing Disengagement in High School

A recently released *Literature Map of Dropout Prevention Interventions for Students with Disabilities*^[3] provides an in-depth look at current research on evidence-based practices for lowering the dropout rates of students with disabilities. Of the 19 studies included in the report, 11 described *comprehensive* dropout prevention programs with *multiple components*. The dropout prevention interventions described in the studies fell into three categories: 1) mentoring, 2) interventions targeted to specific disability-related needs, and 3) class setting and exit options. The majority of comprehensive dropout prevention programs shared in common the following interventions: conducting outreach to families, monitoring students’ attendance, providing additional academic support for students, and providing career awareness and job training. Most of the comprehensive dropout prevention programs provided mentoring, academic supports, and instruction on positive behaviors, social skills, and character development. Programs also focused on engaging students through relevant instruction and skills students would need after school, through job training, career awareness, and exposure to postsecondary education. Several of the studies also described programs that provided a personalized learning environment with individualized instruction.

“Dropout prevention and recovery approaches typically focus either on comprehensive school reform or on programs targeted to individual students. Research suggests that it is crucial to combine the best components of both approaches.” ^[4] As demonstrated above, a variety of improvement strategies have been selected for the purpose of instituting improvements at both the school and student level.

Attendance, behavior, and course failure are the strongest student indicators of dropping out of school. (Allensworth & Easton; Neild, Balfanz, & Herzog, 2007). A research-based framework (Balfanz, Herzog, & Mac Iver, 2007; Mac Iver & Mac Iver, 2009) for dropout prevention would include the following elements:

- Identification of indicators of student at risk of dropping out;
- Development and implementation of an early warning system; and,
- Development and implementation of an intervention system linked to an early warning system.

1. Mentoring

Backer and Lauthar (2002) found that, “when students do not have positive relationships with other students and staff members, they experience a lack of social capital, which is not only inversely linked to academic achievement but is directly related to dropout rates. Juvonen (2006) reported that belongingness was connected to decision by youths to dropout or to remain in school.”^[5] Peer mentoring programs can help to address this issue by providing students with increased opportunities for students to connect with their peers through positive relationships. Charlton (1998), Lampert (2005), and Roybal (2011) identified peer mentoring programs in which upperclassman are assigned to support a group of freshman students as a successful transition strategy. Such programs help freshman socially acclimate to the high school (Ellis, Marsh, & Craven, 2009), support students academically (Lampert, 2005), and assist students with homework and study skills (Charlton, 1998). Lepper and Henderlong (2000) reported that peer tutoring can facilitate student motivation. For example, students who need extrinsic motivation may be willing to work harder in order to please their mentors.^[6] Charlton (1998) found that peer support programs had positive effects for both the mentors and the students. The mentees responded well to the personal attention they received. The personal attention helped students develop socially, emotionally, and academically. Mentors, or tutors, experienced gains as well. They were able to develop and refine their listening skills, and their self-esteem increased; they felt needed and appreciated.^[7]

2. Positive Behavioral Supports & Addressing Discipline

Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) is a framework or approach for assisting school personnel in adopting and organizing evidence-based behavioral interventions into an integrated continuum that enhances academic and social behavior outcomes for all students. PBIS is a prevention-oriented way for school personnel to a) organize evidence-based practices, b) improve their implementation of those practices, and c) maximize academic and social behavior outcomes for students. PBIS emphasizes the establishment of organizational supports or systems that give school personnel capacity to use effective interventions accurately and successfully at the school, district, and state level. These supports include a) team-based leadership, b) data-based decision-making, c) continuous monitoring of student behavior, d) regular universal screening, and, e) effective ongoing professional development.

The School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS) model is particularly relevant to the challenge of discipline disproportionality for three reasons:

First, because of its focus on establishing a clear, consistent, and positive social culture, identifying and teaching clear expectations for behavior can

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

reduce ambiguity for both students (e.g., it is not assumed that all students know what being respectful at school "looks like") and adults (e.g., expectations and violations are clearer, reducing ambiguity). These expectations can be developed collaboratively with students, families, and community members, as well as assessed for their congruence with the range of cultural groups in the school (Fallon, O'Keeffe, & Sugai, 2012). Second, the SWPBIS focus on clear discipline definitions and procedures can reduce ambiguity in discipline decisions, decreasing the effects of implicit bias (Lai, Hoffman, Nosek, & Greenwald, 2013). Third, the focus of SWPBIS on instructional approaches to discipline and integration with academic systems can keep students in the classroom and learning instead of removed from instruction (Sugai, O'Keeffe, & Fallon, 2012).^[8]

C. Addressing the Needs of Highly Mobile Students

Research has shown that high student mobility contributes to poor academic achievement and is correlated with student dropout or failure to graduate. High student mobility rates in urban environments stem from a number of factors, including students leaving selective and charter schools, students returning from incarceration the juvenile justice system, and family movement from one neighborhood to another. New students have to begin instructional programs anew. New school may not have information about the student or may have limited knowledge of incoming students' academic needs.

Strategies utilized by other states and school districts to address some of the negative effects of high student mobility include:

- Examining school and district data to pinpoint the characteristics of highly mobile students.
- Minimizing school-related contributions to student mobility. Districts can adopt enrollment and transfer policies that decrease student mobility and reduce disruptions to student learning when transfers are necessary.
- Educating parents through establishing a formal program to educate parents about how to minimize the negative effects of necessary changes in residences or schools.^[9]

II. Improvement Strategies

OSSE's selected SSIP strategies, which are anchored in a review of evidence-based practices and needs identified by local data analysis, are detailed below. OSSE's improvement is systemic in that it includes activities supported by based on data.

Delivery of support is framed out in five strands, four of which are "universal" supports (provided to all high schools) and one of which is "targeted" support (provided to SIMR subgroup high schools and middle schools in their feeder patterns):

1. State-level mobility workgroup to address the needs of highly mobile students
2. Special education community of practice for practitioners serving students with disabilities in secondary grades
3. Creation of a Master Teacher Cadre (MTC), a cadre of current teacher leaders who are identified to provide peer-to-peer coaching in high school classrooms serving students with disabilities
4. Professional development in evidence- based school-side support models (PBIS, RTI, and UDL)
5. Targeted support for SIMR subpopulation high schools and their neighborhood feeder schools.

Universal Improvement Strategies

1. *State-level mobility workgroup to address the needs of highly mobile students*

Through the SSIP development meetings, OSSE has encountered multiple stakeholders who have raised the issue of credit transfer as being particularly problematic for highly mobile students within the District. It appears that students often experience a loss of credits when transferring to a new LEA following a geographic move, school change, or other life change. To address this issue, OSSE plans to establish a working group to examine the barriers that mobility-related issues may be posing toward credit transfer and attainment. The working group will include representatives from various DC government agencies (including CFSA, DYRS, adult education, etc.), administrators, guidance counselors, and charter LEA and DCPS representatives (perhaps including representatives from DCPS non-public monitoring unit) who will work together to gather more information about this issue, examine current procedures for credit transfer between LEAs and other programs students may be enrolled in, and work to establish a more uniform protocols and agreements to ensure that students are able to retain as many credits as possible and stay on track toward advancing to graduation.

OSSE will support LEAs in their efforts to continue to track and plan for students with disabilities as they move from 9th to 10th grade, to ensure successful grade promotion or the provision of targeted interventions to assist off-track students in getting back on track.

OSSE will offer LEAs and schools support with data review protocols and develop special programs or interventions to support ninth graders who may be struggling academically or socially.^[10] These may include:

- Interventions aimed at addressing student instructional needs of students by offering peer support programs or literacy interventions that focus support on struggling readers or second language learners.
- Providing intervention specialists to work on specific initiatives or to help address the needs of specific students.
- Providing additional support or tutoring and/or adjust the course load for struggling students.

2. *Special education community of practice for practitioners serving students with disabilities in secondary grades*

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Evidence has shown that professional learning communities (PLCs) increase teacher collaboration, student-focused learning, teacher empowerment, and continuous student learning and achievement over time. At present, OSSE is in the process of partnering with a DC IHE (Institute of Higher Education) to facilitate monthly PLC meetings aimed at bridging the research to practice gap, increasing knowledge and skills, building camaraderie, and increasing educator retention rates designed to bring about an ultimate improvement in student outcomes. PLCs will be oriented toward both teachers and instructional leaders.

3. Creation of a Master Teacher Cadre (MTC), a cadre of current teacher leaders who are identified to provide peer-to-peer coaching in high school classrooms serving students with disabilities

Evidence has shown that teachers should have the opportunity to collaborate and be involved in knowledge sharing, engage in participant driven learning, access successful new practices, and successfully transition into the roles of mentors and leaders. The Master Teacher Cadre Initiative will convene 40 educators with secondary special education, ESL, and STEM expertise in monthly meetings to allow educators to share best practices, access OSSE staff expertise, provide suggestions and recommendations for programming, and to partner with OSSE in the design and delivery of professional development opportunities across the District.

4. Professional development in evidence-based school-wide support models (UDL, RTI, PBIS) and UDL) and specific disability-related areas and topics

At present, the Division of Elementary, Secondary, and Specialized Education offers ongoing trainings to schools and districts on Universal Design for Learning (UDL), Response to Intervention (RTI) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). OSSE will work with LEAs to ensure that existing school-wide programs are being implemented with fidelity and support capacity building in order to expand these models to a greater number of schools, to allow them to provide greater support to students with disabilities who are at risk of not graduating.

OSSE has also begun to create an online resource repository for special education practitioners for the purpose of providing information on evidence-based best practices. OSSE staff members are presently engaged in offering training and technical assistance on how to use these identified practices.

Additionally, OSSE is providing assistance in creating lesson plan starters that allow educators to more easily implement and apply the recommended interventions and strategies in their daily practice.

Through the SSIP development meetings, numerous stakeholders identified specific areas of needed professional development, including around improving appropriately modifying and assessing learning standards and improving instruction for students with disabilities in general and for students with intellectual disabilities in particular. OSSE will work with high schools determine school-identified areas of need for additional targeted professional development.

In connection to OSEP's determination that DC is in the category of "needs intervention" and in alignment with the resulting special conditions, OSSE's Division of Elementary, Secondary, and Specialized Education will continue to provide training and technical assistance on compliance and best practices in secondary transition planning. In-person trainings, webinars, and a resource website will be made available to assist practitioners in conducting age-appropriate transition assessment, career awareness and exploration activities, annual and postsecondary transition goal development, and providing corresponding transition services and activities, including a course of study.

Additional work in the area of self-determination skill development and student-led IEP practices will be supported through ongoing professional development trainings, on-site technical assistance, the creation of a Student-led IEP Professional Learning Community, and the continuation of the CIRCLES transition planning model pilot project.

Lastly, a more concentrated effort to offer training and support to middle school educators and administrators will be made in order to promote readiness for the recently passed DC law that requires transition planning for students with disabilities to begin at age 14 beginning in SY 2016-2017 and to support previously mentioned efforts to increase information sharing and joint planning between middle and high schools for students with disabilities.

Targeted Improvement Strategies

1. Eighth to Ninth Grade Orientation Activities

OSSE plans to offer LEAs support with developing strategies to facilitate middle to high school transition activities, including hosting connection/orientation activities that allow District 8th graders to visit their new high school, meet current high school students through meet and greet sessions, and participate in high school orientation activities beginning in the spring of 8th grade year (rather than in the summer) to provide more support for students as they transition to high school.

2. Peer to Peer Mentoring

In alignment with best practices, OSSE will work with select high schools to create a peer to peer mentoring program through which incoming 9th grade students with disabilities will be paired with upperclassmen that will provide academic and social support throughout the 9th grade year. As an incentive for participation, OSSE will encourage LEAs to consider documented mentoring hours as volunteer community service hours that upperclassmen can use toward satisfying the 100 community service hour requirement for earning a high school diploma.

3. *Coordinated case review between middle and high school special education staff to support smooth entry for students with disabilities*[\[11\]](#)

OSSE will encourage opportunities for professional conversation among school personnel from the middle and high schools in planning 8th to 9th grade transition initiatives. OSSE will support schools in continued case review between middle and high school special education staff to support smooth entry for students with disabilities. This could include the use of counseling teams to maintain support throughout the ninth grade year or the provision of designated graduation coaches or advisors to support students throughout their high school experience. It might also include identifying students with behavioral needs and provide counseling or social support from peers and professionals.

4. *Check and Connect Program*

OSSE will work with the SIMR subpopulation to ensure that existing Check & Connect programs are being implemented with fidelity and to support capacity building in order to expand the Check & Connect model, or similar evidence-based models. This approach will support schools as they develop strategies to provide greater support to students with disabilities who are at risk of not graduating.

4B) A description that demonstrates how the improvement strategies are sound, logical, and aligned

As a result of data analysis around these issues, OSSE is aware of the most common predictive factors that indicate whether students are at risk of dropping out or not. The District’s SSIP is designed to 1) use the data to drive systemic intervention and 2) leverage and align the work being done via the ESEA Waiver to support IDEA efforts related to improvement.

The identified improvement strategies include case management and other individualized supports that specifically use data to identify challenges and strategically address the transition from middle school to high school and prevent dropout between 9th and 10th grade.

The State’s selected improvement strategies are evidenced-based and are a logical fit with the State’s SIMR, which focuses on improving the four-year graduation rate for students with disabilities.

As noted above, the above mentioned strategies are a logical fit given their alignment with current or existing efforts underway via the ESEA Waiver as well as additional efforts that are similarly working toward the goal of increasing graduation rates for all students within the District of Columbia. Several of these efforts are listed below:

College and Credential Completion Network (C3N): The College and Credential Completion Network (C3N) brings together local college access providers, government agencies, philanthropic foundations, community-based organizations, institutions of higher learning, and non-profits that are all committed to the common goal of improving the District’s level of college and credential attainment. As the post-secondary change network of Raise DC (a cross-sector partnership of local public, private, philanthropic and non-profit stakeholders), C3N is fully aligned with the mission of the city’s cradle-to-career initiative; namely, to raise DC by connecting resources to provide every young person the opportunity to attain a post-secondary credential.

DC ReEngagement Center: As with many other US cities, DC faces a crisis of connection for youth and young adults. There are currently at least 7,493 youth (ages 16 – 24) residing in the District of Columbia who are not enrolled in school or other educational programs and who do not have a high school diploma or credential. In response to this need, the District has established a ReEngagement Center[\[12\]](#) to serve as a “single-door” through which youth who have dropped out can reconnect back to educational options and other critical services to support their attainment of a high school diploma or GED. The OSSE is spearheading this effort with strong support from the Office of the Deputy Mayor of Education, the Department of Employment Services, other key partner agencies, Raise DC’s Disconnected Youth Change Network, schools, and community-based organizations.

A Capital Commitment: DCPS Five-Year Strategic Plan: The SIMR and identified improvement strategies are in direct alignment with DCPS’ five-year strategic plan, *A Capital Commitment*, which identifies five goals that are guiding DCPS’ work through 2017 [\[13\]](#), including:

- Goal 3: Increase Graduation Rate – At least 75% of entering 9th graders will graduate from high school in four years. Strategies that DCPS has identified to achieve this goal include implementing a portfolio system in grades 6-12 that allows students to discover interests, set goals, and create thoughtful plans for high school and beyond. Additionally, DCPS has committed to: provide targeted resources to schools with low promotion rates for first-time 9th graders, including an intensive summer bridge program; invest in an Early Warning Intervention system to be used in identifying students who need support to graduate on time; and, explore new ways to make the high school experience vibrant and relevant.
- Goal 2: Invest in Struggling Schools – DCPS’ 40 lowest-performing schools [\[14\]](#) will increase proficiency rates by 40 percentage points. DCPS’ lowest-performing schools serve large populations of students who need extra support, including low-income students, English language learners, and students with special needs. To help accelerate achievement, DCPS is offering the *Proving What’s Possible* grant[\[15\]](#) to low-performing schools that are improving instruction, extending learning time, and making targeted technology investments, and investing in recruiting and retaining highly effective educators with a focus on placing these educators in their 40 lowest-performing schools.

As multiple initiatives and stakeholder groups are already currently working toward a similar goal OSSE will share the planned improvement strategies and actively develop partnerships to leverage city-wide efforts to increase graduation rates for all DC students.

4C & D) How the selection and implementation of improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build capacity to achieve the SIMR for children with disabilities.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The District of Columbia Graduation Pathways Project Summary assessed the root causes of why students disengage, fall off track, drop out, or fail to graduate. OSSE's selected improvement strategies are aimed at addressing these issues, including through strategies in the following areas:

1. *Early Warning Modeling*

The Graduation Pathways Project found that 26% of the total variation in students' high school outcomes is observable by the end of grade 8. Seven factors emerged as both predictive of off-time graduation: 1) special education status in grade 8, 2) limited English proficiency in grade 8, 3) overage at high school entry, 4) basic or below basic performance on grade 8 CAS, 4) suspensions before HS, 5) absences before HS, 6) course failures before HS. Additionally, the study found that 13% of the variation in student outcomes is attributable to differences in middle school quality and not individual student characteristics or high school variation.

By instituting 8th to 9th grade transition programs and individualized case management, high schools will be able to more quickly identify students who exhibit these risk factors and provide appropriate interventions aimed at providing academic and behavior supports that students may need to successfully complete early high school grades. Activities designed to facilitate a smoother middle to high school transition program such as peer to peer mentoring, tutoring, and orientation activities will increase the likelihood of student engagement and level of connectedness, thus leading to higher attendance.

2. *High School Effectiveness*

Even when adjusting for incoming 9th grade performance, there is significant variation between schools' rates of on-time graduation. The Graduation Pathways Report found a 69% point difference in on-time graduation rates between schools of students entering the top quartile of 8th grade performance.

This data demonstrates that variation in school quality and effectiveness is directly related to student graduation rates. In an effort to address this root cause, the above mentioned improvement strategies will be offered to schools that are designated as ESEA Focus and Priority Schools.

3. *Credits & Absences*

The Graduation Pathways report found that once DC students entered high school, they could be grouped into six distinct segments. The segments were demarcated through various indicators, but the two most striking characteristics separating students who were almost *Immediately Disengaged* and those who were almost certainly *College Bound* were the earning of credits and the accumulation of absences, whether excused or unexcused. The professional development strategies, particularly around PBIS, are designed to address many of the underlying conditions that lead to absences and to address instructional barriers to earning credits. The Credit Transfer Working Group will also begin to identify any administrative barriers to students earning and keeping credits.

4. *Student Mobility & Credit Attainment*

The Graduation Pathways Report indicated that 30% of students do not start and end high school at the same school. Mobile students were lower performing on grade 8 DC CAS and were less likely to graduate. Through formation of a Credit Transfer Working Group OSSE can begin to gather more information and increase understanding about potential root causes and identify appropriate interventions.

4E) A description of stakeholder involvement in the selection of coherent improvement strategies.

Overall, OSSE solicited broad stakeholder input for setting and revising SSIP targets using the following process:

OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national graduation and dropout related-data, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area. Subject matter experts then proposed improvement strategies for achieving the State Identified Measurable Result and a rationale for the proposed activities.

OSSE created a presentation including information about the SSIP process, the rationale behind OSEP's new requirement, and the proposed State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). A survey was created in both paper and web-format to capture stakeholder feedback.

OSSE advertised the SSIP development process and desire for community feedback to various stakeholder groups including parents, LEA personnel, and other local agencies. OSSE held multiple live presentations, including a number of Parent and Community Conversations at schools across the District, and invited audience members to provide feedback on the proposed targets. The presentation and survey were sent to additional parent stakeholder groups and feedback was invited.

OSSE collected feedback by collecting surveys at the end of selected in-person presentations. OSSE also collected all questions and comments posed during in-person presentations. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments, and consulted with State leadership to revise the SSIP as appropriate.

The feedback provided by stakeholders was rich and varied and provided a wealth of suggestions that OSSE will continue to review and incorporate into Phase II of the SSIP. The most prevalent feedback themes included the need to intervene to alter student trajectories long before high school, the need to improve instruction for students with disabilities, and the complexities and impact of mid-year student mobility between schools and LEAs. Among the most frequent of suggestions was the need for schools and LEAs to be measured and appropriately recognized for their five-, six-, and sometimes seven-year graduation rates, given that students with disabilities are entitled to receive a free and appropriate education up until age 22. OSSE is committed to analyzing and reporting data in subsequent SSIPs that accounts for students with disabilities earning regular high school diplomas outside of the 4-year graduation schedule as well as analyzing and reporting data regarding students with disabilities who exit high schools with certificates of IEP

completion.

[1] For more information on the Check and Connect invention, visit <http://checkandconnect.umn.edu/model/>.

[2] <http://checkandconnect.umn.edu/research/findings.html>

[3] Information in this section adapted from Wilkins, J. & Huckabee, S. (2014). *A literature map of dropout prevention interventions for students with disabilities*. Clemson, SC: National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities, Clemson University. Available at <http://www.ndpc-sd.org/documents/wilkins-huckabee-lit-review.pdf>.

[4] The George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education (2012). *Evidence Based Resources for Keeping Students on Track to Graduation*. Prepared for the Virginia Department of Education. Available at http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/school_improvement/title1/1003_g/resources/evidence_based_resources.pdf.

[5] Id at 478.

[6] Id at 483.

[7] Id at 483.

[8] Excerpt from McIntosh, Girvan, Horner, Smolkowski, & Sugai, (2014) *Recommendations for Addressing Discipline Disproportionality in Education*, available at <https://www.pbis.org/school/equity-pbis/recommendations> .

[9] Last three ideas from District Administration (June 2005). *Student Mobility and Achievement*. Available at <http://www.districtadministration.com/article/student-mobility-and-achievement>

[10] Strategies supported by evidence and suggestions outlined in Information in this section supported by *Supporting Student Transition From Middle to High School: Texas Comprehensive Briefing Paper*, available at <http://txcc.sedl.org/resources/briefs/number1/>.

[11] Information in this section supported by *Supporting Student Transition From Middle to High School: Texas Comprehensive Briefing Paper*, available at <http://txcc.sedl.org/resources/briefs/number1/>.

[12] <http://osse.dc.gov/service/dc-reengagement-center>

[13] For more information on *A Capital Commitment*, visit <http://dcps.dc.gov/DCPS/About+DCPS/A+Capital+Commitment++DCPS+Strategic+Plan>

[14] For more information on DCPS' 40 lowest-performing schools, visit <http://dcps.dc.gov/DCPS/Files/downloads/ABOUT%20DCPS/Strategic%20Documents/40%20Lowest-Performing%20Schools.pdf>.

[15] For more information on the *Proving What's Possible* grant winners and projects, visit <http://dcps.dc.gov/DCPS/About+DCPS/Strategic+Documents/Proving+What%27s+Possible> .

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

 Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Please see attachment.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Please see attachment.

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Please see attachment.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Please see attachment.

Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

Please see attachment.

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

Please see attachment.

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SiMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

Please see attachment.

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

Please see attachment.

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to targets

Please see attachment.

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

Please see attachment.

OSEP Response

--

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

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.

Selected: 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: AmyMaisterra

Title: Assistant Superintendent

Email: amy.maisterra@dc.gov

Phone: 202-481-3757