

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY18**



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

65

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 DC 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 USC. § 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 2018, the District of Columbia's student population included 13,369 children with disabilities. In FFY 2018, children in the District of Columbia were served by 65 LEAs, including the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) and 64 public charter school LEAs.

OSSE's System of General Supervision

OSSE's general supervision system consists of eight general supervisory components identified by the US 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 IDEA Part B Indicators identified by the US Department of Education. DC's SPP serves to keep the State publicly accountable for improving results for children with disabilities and also acts as a roadmap for DC's continuous efforts to improve educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities.

Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation

The District of Columbia's special education policies and procedures align with and support the implementation of the IDEA, and are enforceable under Title 5 of the District of Columbia's Municipal Regulations. Regulations governing services provided in the District of Columbia Public Schools and charter schools are found in Subtitle E, Title 5, Chapter 30 (5 DCMR §E-3000-3033). 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.

OSSE has published a range of policy guidance documents on the compliant implementation of requirements described in various State policies.

Link to District of Columbia Special Education Policies and Guidance can be found here:

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

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.

Integrated Monitoring Activities

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, focused monitoring, review of dispute resolution activities, self-assessments, oversight of nonpublic special education schools, Phase I and Phase II IDEA Part B grant applications, and reviews of audit findings.

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 electronically track each finding of noncompliance, the required corrective action(s), and timelines and documentation of correction.

OSSE's fiscal team also oversees the annual fiscal audit process. In FFY 2018, LEAs that spent \$750,000 or more in federal funds were required to receive a 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, all public charter schools in the District receive an annual audit regardless of the level of expenditures.

Data on Processes and Results

OSSE's general supervision system is driven by ongoing, systemic data review processes 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 that 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 December 2018, OSSE released the new School Transparency and Reporting (STAR) accountability system and the DC School Report Card to replace "Learn DC" and align with the requirements of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The DC School Report Card website gives DC families a look into every public school in the District. The report card includes each school's rating on the STAR Framework and a breadth of qualitative and quantitative information about each school.

The DC School Report Card can be found here: <https://dcschoolreportcard.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

Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions

OSSE's Division of Systems and Supports, K-12 implements a coordinated risk-based monitoring approach across key K-12 grants. In this model, OSSE is deliberate in providing differentiated levels of oversight to LEAs based on a review of financial and programmatic data across indicators.

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 which can include but are not limited to:

- Advising the LEA of available sources of technical assistance and requiring the LEA to work with appropriate entities
- Directing the use of funds
- Imposing special conditions
- Requiring corrective action plans, continuous improvement plans or compliance agreements
- Recovering funds or withholding further payments

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 manages the state's due process and mediation programs.

In FFY 2018, OSSE continued to administer the state complaint process within the Division of Systems and Support, K-12. OSSE reviews dispute resolution data collected 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.

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.

OSSE 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.

A calendar of training and technical assistance opportunities provided is maintained on OSSE's website: <https://osse.dc.gov/events>.

Also, 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.

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-2019:

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 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 December 2019, 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 receive additional support and resources from technical assistance centers to ensure the improvements in desired outcomes for students with disabilities.

OSSE participates in phone cross-state collaborative phone calls to continue discussions from the RBA Cross-State Learning Collaborative Conference.

Longstanding Noncompliance:

OSSE continues to work primarily with OSEP to address challenges related to closing out longstanding noncompliance in a manner that is appropriate and meets requirements pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

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 OSSE's Division of Teaching and Learning. The Division of Teaching and Learning oversees the professional development offered to professionals in the District of Columbia and is devoted to increasing knowledge and competence for all staff who provide services to children with disabilities. This team is comprised of subject matter experts in the areas of secondary transition, positive behavioral supports, response to intervention, content-specific instructional best practice, and requirements related to special education law and regulation.

The State also 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 can 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's technical assistance team also works closely with its assessment team to ensure alignment and coherence between instruction and assessment.

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, OSSE has established multiple communities of practice in which LEAs learn strategies proven effective to help children with disabilities be successful while being 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).

Last, OSSE works closely with the District of Columbia Public Charter School Board to ensure that charter schools receive timely information and that issues are addressed in a coordinated manner. Past examples of such efforts are the joint special education training offered each spring to opening charter schools as well as coordinated support to LEAs. OSSE uses data collected from participant surveys, focus groups, and other SEA activities to determine the need for additional areas of training, and to determine whether professional development offerings are effective in building expert knowledge and skill.

Stakeholder Involvement

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

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 a 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 posted 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.

The FFY 2019 targets were set 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 to present to D.C.'s State Advisory Panel on Special Education.
4. OSSE publicly posted the presentation on its website for public feedback.
5. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

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

NO

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 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 2017 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 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

As required by 34 CFR Section 300.602(b)(1)(i)(A), the State reports to the public annually on each LEA's 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 posted to OSSE's website and can be found here: <http://osse.dc.gov/service/specialized-education-data-and-reports>

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

With its FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must provide a Web link demonstrating that the State has fully reported to the public on the performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR for FFY 2017. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR due in February 2020, the State must report FFY 2018 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 in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities

implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies, and evidence-based practices that were implemented by the State and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data. If, in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State is not able demonstrate progress in implementing its coherent improvement strategies, including progress in the areas of infrastructure improvement strategies or the implementation of evidence-based practices with fidelity, the State must provide its root cause analysis for each of these challenges.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a FFY 2019 target for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

OSEP conducted a Differentiated Monitoring and Support visit to the State on September 18, 19, 23, and 24, 2019 and is currently developing a response that will be issued under separate cover.

Intro - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 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 in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2011	39.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	44.00%	45.80%	49.80%	54.80%	60.00%
Data	40.95%	40.88%	46.28%	49.51%	53.12%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	60.00%	52.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 a 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 posted 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.

The FFY 2019 targets were set 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 to present to D.C.'s State Advisory Panel on Special Education.
4. OSSE publicly posted the presentation on its website for public feedback.
5. 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
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	483
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	1,030
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	46.89%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
483	1,030	53.12%	60.00%	46.89%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

OSSE attributes slippage in graduation rates to a revision in one LEA's graduation policy and practices in SY 2018-19. OSSE worked with the LEA to ensure that it is meeting the state's regulatory requirements for graduation.

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 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

Music 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 or 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.

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY 2019 target for graduation was lowered from the FFY 2018 target to align with the target set in D.C.'s ESSA State Plan that was approved by the U.S. Department of Education. The FFY 2013-2018 APR targets for graduation were established before the passing of the ESSA.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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

OPTION 2:

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

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2012	6.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	5.80%	5.60%	5.30%	5.10%	4.80%
Data	16.74%	8.08%	23.79%	19.84%	19.96%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	4.60%	4.60%

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 a 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 posted 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.

The FFY 2019 targets were set 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 to present to D.C.'s State Advisory Panel on Special Education.

4. OSSE publicly posted the presentation on its website for public feedback.

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

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	496
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	73
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	2
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	793
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	0

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/no)

YES

If yes, provide justification for the changes below.

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:

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

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

OSSE calculated the status dropout rate 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 SY 2014-15, hence were due to be four-year graduates in SY 2017-18. Dropout students are considered any students of the Adjusted Cohort who were non-graduates as of August 31, 2018, and who did not enroll during SY 2017-18.

Additionally, students who received a GED or IEP certificate by August 31, 2018, were not considered dropouts.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
190	1,030	19.96%	4.60%	18.45%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

Dropout students are considered any students of the Adjusted Cohort who were non-graduates as of August 31, 2018, and who did not enroll during SY 2018-19. Students who received a GED or IEP certificate by August 31, 2018, were not considered drop-outs.

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2014	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	87.59%	Actual	97.89%	87.59%	90.95%	91.46%	94.49%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2014	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	86.12%	Actual	98.48%	86.12%	91.51%	90.98%	94.41%

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%

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 a 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 posted 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.

The FFY 2019 targets were set 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 to present to D.C.'s State Advisory Panel on Special Education.
4. OSSE publicly posted the presentation on its website for public feedback.
5. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	1,166	1,203	1,255	1,156	1,027	968					933
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	176	129	128	99	115	103					88
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	905	975	1,035	919	798	719					652
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	27	59	66	78	57	65					51

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	1,169	1,204	1,256	1,156	1,028	969					901
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	110	79	83	63	69	68					60
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	966	1,020	1,075	958	842	753					663
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	29	59	67	77	57	64					51

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	7,708	7,244	94.49%	95.00%	93.98%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	7,683	7,213	94.41%	95.00%	93.88%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

OSSE's public reporting on State-wide assessment results can be found here:
<http://results.osse.dc.gov/> (information on this page has also been provided as an attachment)

This publicly reported information can also be found in the file titled "2018-19 PARCC and MSAA Participation and Performance Results for Students with Disabilities", located here: <https://osse.dc.gov/page/2018-19-parcc-results-and-resources>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The prepopulated data accurately reflects OSSE's resubmitted EdFacts data.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2014	Target >=		27.00%	27.00%	34.00%	42.00%
A	Overall	4.20%	Actual		4.20%	4.52%	7.05%	7.94%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2014	Target >=		30.00%	30.00%	37.00%	48.00%
A	Overall	3.90%	Actual		3.90%	5.63%	8.07%	8.94%

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	52.00%	21.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	60.00%	20.00%

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 a 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 posted 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.

The FFY 2019 targets were set 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 to present to D.C.'s State Advisory Panel on Special Education.
4. OSSE publicly posted the presentation on its website for public feedback.
5. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	1,101	1,156	1,220	1,088	961	881					770
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	28	23	23	13	11	5					3
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	55	61	71	55	74	65					50
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	10	23	30	35	24	19					28

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	1,097	1,150	1,216	1,090	959	879					756
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	30	22	10	8	4	4					2

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	117	89	79	51	30	33					7
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	10	26	36	29	25	31					25

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	7,177	706	7.94%	52.00%	9.84%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	7,147	668	8.94%	60.00%	9.35%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

OSSE's public reporting on State-wide assessment results can be found here: <http://results.osse.dc.gov/> (information on this page has also been provided as an attachment below)

This publicly reported information can also be found in the file titled "2018-19 PARCC and MSAA Participation and Performance Results for Students with Disabilities", located here: <https://osse.dc.gov/page/2018-19-parcc-results-and-resources>.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY 2019 target for this indicator was lowered from the FFY 2018 target for reading and math to align with the targets set in D.C.'s ESSA State Plan that was approved by the U.S. Department of Education. The FFY 2013-2018 APR targets were established prior to the passing of the ESSA and the development of D.C.'s ESSA State Plan.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

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

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	12.90%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	38.10%	2.17%	12.24%	12.90%	11.76%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%

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 a 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 posted 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.

The FFY 2019 targets were set 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 to present to D.C.'s State Advisory Panel on Special Education.
4. OSSE publicly posted the presentation on its website for public feedback.
5. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

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

22

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1	44	11.76%	0.00%	2.27%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The State defines "significant discrepancy" as the suspension or expulsion of any child with a disability for more than ten days cumulatively in a school year by an LEA at a rate that is greater than 1.5 times the equivalent rate for children without disabilities in the same LEA. In order to be identified as having significant discrepancy an LEA must meet the following criteria: 1) The LEA must meet the minimum "n" size of 40 students with IEPs; and 2) The LEA has suspended and/or expelled at least five students with disabilities (cell size), and 3) The rate of suspensions or expulsions of children with a disability within a specific racial and ethnic group is greater than 1.5 times the rate of suspensions or expulsions of all students without disabilities within the same LEA.

In SY 2017-18, the District of Columbia had 66 LEAs. Twenty-two (22) LEAs were excluded because they did not meet the "n" size and/or cell size requirements. One of the remaining 44 LEAs met the state's definition of significant discrepancy. The one LEA that had a significant discrepancy was found to have noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and did not comply with IDEA requirements.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017- 2018 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 one (1) LEA identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school for children with IEP's in SY 2018-19 (using SY 2017-18 data), OSSE required the completion of self-study activities and reviewed the LEA's 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 LEA's policies, procedures, and practices complied with IDEA.

As part of this self-study, the LEAs were required to review a number of student records and provide existing policies, procedures, and practices for OSSE to review in comparison with regulatory requirements under the IDEA.

OSSE reviewed the results of the self-studies submitted by the LEAs, and the policies, procedures, and practices. OSSE determined that one (1) LEA did have a significant discrepancy and required revisions to their policies and practices.

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:

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

OSEP Memo 09-02 issued on October 17, 2008, provided guidance regarding the correction of previously identified noncompliance. Specifically, Memo 09-02 established that States must ensure that any noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible, but in no case, more than one year from date of identification.

On June 30, 2019, OSSE issued an LEA-level finding of noncompliance to the LEA and required specific revision of policies, procedures, and practices from the LEAs and correction of any LEA- identified student-level noncompliance identified by the LEA during its file review. OSSE did not issue individual student-level findings as LEAs were only required to submit a tally sheet/summary of their findings.

Upon receipt of updated policies, procedures, and practices, and evidence of correction of student-level noncompliance, OSSE reviews the materials for compliance with IDEA requirements and to ensure that all required revisions had been completed. OSSE then reviews subsequent data from each LEA to ensure that each LEA correctly implements the regulatory requirements at issue. If the updated policies, procedures, and practices do not show evidence of the required revisions, OSSE provides additional guidance on changes required to render the LEA's policies, procedures, or practices compliant with IDEA. The one-year timeline for correction of noncompliance has not yet expired for the finding, and the State's review of LEA revisions and subsequent data is still underway.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OSSE conducted a subsequent review of LEA policies, procedures, and practices, and conducted a subsequent review of LEA discipline data to verify that the noncompliance had been corrected and that the LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement for all students with IEPs.

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

The LEAs identified in FFY 2017 were required to revise their policies, procedures, and practices and to correct any student level noncompliance identified by the LEA during its file review. OSSE's IDEA Monitoring Team required the LEA to submit a Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) that aligned with the required revisions related to the significant discrepancy finding. The CIP was approved by OSSE and closely monitored throughout the school year. In addition to the CIP, the LEA was required to report to their assigned OSSE IDEA monitor on the progress of the CIP's action items. OSSE reviewed the student files to confirm the correction of student-level noncompliance. Upon correction of the student level noncompliance, OSSE reviewed additional files to verify that the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

The LEA's CIP included developing a checklist for staff to use when a student with a disability is being considered for a long-term suspension and providing training(s) to staff members, which focused on building capacity.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

The State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2018 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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))

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of 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) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

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

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

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	2.94%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	7.14%	2.17%	4.08%	2.94%	11.76%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019

Target	0%	0%
--------	----	----

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

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

22

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3	2	44	11.76%	0%	4.55%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The State defines "significant discrepancy" as the suspension or expulsion of any child with a disability for more than ten 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. In order to be identified as having significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity an LEA must meet the following criteria: 1) The LEA must meet the minimum "n" size of 40 students with IEPs; and 2) The LEA has suspended and/or expelled at least three students with disabilities in a particular racial and ethnic category (cell size), and 3) The rate of suspensions or expulsions of children with a disability within a specific racial and ethnic group is greater than 1.5 times the rate of suspensions or expulsions of all students without disabilities.

In SY 2017-18, the District of Columbia had 66 LEAs. Twenty-two (22) LEAs were excluded because they did not meet the "n" size and/or cell size requirements. Three of the remaining 44 LEAs met the State's definition of a significant discrepancy. Two (2) of the three (3) LEAs that had a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity in a specific disability category, were found to have noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and did not comply with IDEA requirements.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 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 three (3) LEAs that the State identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs in FFY 2018 (using SY 2017-18 data), the State required completion of self-study activities and reviewed the LEA's 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 for OSSE to review in comparison with regulatory requirements under the IDEA.

OSSE reviewed the results of the self-studies submitted by the LEAs, and the policies, procedures, and practices. OSSE determined that the two (2) LEAs' policies, procedures, and practices contributed to their identified significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity.

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:

The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

OSEP Memo 09-02 issued on October 17, 2008, provided guidance regarding the correction of previously identified noncompliance. Specifically, Memo 09-02 established that States must ensure that any noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible, but in no case, more than one year from date of identification.

On June 30, 2019, OSSE issued an LEA-level finding of noncompliance to the LEA and required specific revision of policies, procedures, and practices from the LEAs and correction of any student-level noncompliance identified by the LEA during its file review. OSSE did not issue individual student-level

findings as LEAs were only required to submit a tally sheet/summary of their findings.

Upon receipt of updated policies, procedures, and practices, and evidence of correction of LEA-identified student-level noncompliance, OSSE reviews the materials for compliance with IDEA requirements and to ensure that all required revisions had been completed. OSSE then reviews subsequent data from each LEA to ensure that each LEA correctly implements the regulatory requirements at issue. If the updated policies, procedures, and practices do not show evidence of the required revisions, OSSE provides additional guidance on changes required to render the LEA's policies, procedures, or practices compliant with IDEA. The one-year timeline for correction of noncompliance has not yet expired for the finding, and the State's review of LEA revisions and subsequent data is still underway.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OSSE conducted a subsequent review of LEA policies, procedures, and practices, and conducted a subsequent review of LEA discipline data to verify that the noncompliance had been corrected and that the LEAs are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement for all students with IEPs.

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

The LEAs identified in FFY 2017 were required to revise their policies, procedures, and practices and to correct any student level noncompliance identified by the LEA during its file review. OSSE's IDEA Monitoring Team required the LEA to submit a Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) that aligned with the required revisions related to the significant discrepancy finding. The CIP was approved by OSSE and closely monitored throughout the school year. In addition to the CIP, the LEA was required to report to their assigned OSSE IDEA monitor on the progress of the CIP's action items. OSSE reviewed the student files to confirm the correction of student-level noncompliance. Upon correction of the student level noncompliance, OSSE reviewed additional files to verify that the LEA is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

The LEA's CIP included developing a checklist for staff to use when a student with a disability is being considered for a long-term suspension and providing training(s) to staff members, which focused on building capacity.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2018 have corrected the noncompliance, 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 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 2018.

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): 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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

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

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	50.00%	53.00%	56.00%	59.00%	61.00%
A	22.91%	Data	53.51%	54.59%	55.61%	56.47%	56.63%
B	2005	Target <=	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%
B	18.60%	Data	15.64%	15.24%	17.38%	15.23%	15.31%
C	2005	Target <=	15.00%	14.00%	13.00%	12.00%	11.00%
C	24.40%	Data	12.40%	11.53%	10.04%	9.41%	9.03%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	64.00%	64.00%
Target B <=	14.00%	14.00%
Target C <=	10.00%	10.00%

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 a 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 posted 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.

The FFY 2019 targets were set 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 to present to D.C.'s State Advisory Panel on Special Education.
4. OSSE publicly posted the presentation on its website for public feedback.
5. 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
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	12,218
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	6,961
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	1,907
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,004
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	32
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	8

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

NO

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	6,961	12,218	56.63%	64.00%	56.97%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	1,907	12,218	15.31%	14.00%	15.61%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,044	12,218	9.03%	10.00%	8.54%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For indicator 5A, 6,961 students were served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day. The state did not meet its target, but 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, 1,907 students were served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day. The state did not meet its target, but 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 some students, this incremental transition will include moving into an environment with extensive academic and behavioral support outside of the regular classroom to allow for a smoother reintegration into the general education setting.

For indicator 5C, 1,044 students were served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. Of the 1,044 students in this category, only 40 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 met its target and is pleased to continue to report a decrease in the number of students served in the most restrictive settings.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

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

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	55.00%	56.00%	57.00%	58.00%	59.00%
A	53.00%	Data	49.34%	48.99%	43.17%	45.37%	51.70%
B	2011	Target <=	16.00%	16.00%	14.00%	12.00%	11.00%
B	18.00%	Data	19.92%	4.34%	7.75%	16.66%	16.21%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	60.00%	60.00%
Target B <=	10.00%	10.00%

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 a 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 posted 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.

The FFY 2019 targets were set 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 to present to D.C.'s State Advisory Panel on Special Education.
4. OSSE publicly posted the presentation on its website for public feedback.
5. 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
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	1,895
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	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	927
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	308
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	19
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	927	1,895	51.70%	60.00%	48.92%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	327	1,895	16.21%	10.00%	17.26%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	In recent years, the District has strengthened its child find efforts, resulting in a higher identification of children ages 3 to 5 with developmental delays. OSSE conducted additional data analysis and concluded that an increased number of children with developmental delays present with significant social, emotional, and language deficits that adversely impact their ability to access learning. OSSE determined that the increases in more restrictive environments are supported by student-level data to ensure those students are being educated in their least restrictive environments.
B	In recent years, the District has strengthened its child find efforts, resulting in a higher identification of children ages 3 to 5 with developmental delays. OSSE conducted additional data analysis and concluded that an increased number of children with developmental delays present with significant social, emotional, and language deficits that adversely impact their ability to access learning. OSSE determined that the increases in more restrictive environments are supported by student-level data to ensure those students are being educated in their least restrictive environments.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

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

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2010	Target >=	75.00%	76.00%	76.00%	77.00%	78.00%
A1	50.00%	Data	82.05%	75.33%	85.71%	90.62%	84.62%

A2	2010	Target >=	63.00%	64.00%	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%
A2	29.20%	Data	69.16%	65.70%	73.62%	73.38%	65.45%
B1	2010	Target >=	82.00%	83.00%	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%
B1	78.30%	Data	80.12%	77.57%	87.42%	90.38%	85.56%
B2	2010	Target >=	63.00%	64.00%	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%
B2	16.70%	Data	67.40%	61.88%	74.77%	76.10%	69.70%
C1	2010	Target >=	79.00%	80.00%	80.00%	81.00%	82.00%
C1	0.00%	Data	79.37%	77.37%	86.15%	90.32%	92.03%
C2	2010	Target >=	75.00%	76.00%	76.00%	77.00%	78.00%
C2	62.50%	Data	75.33%	73.99%	82.11%	84.70%	86.26%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	80.00%	80.00%
Target A2 >=	68.00%	68.00%
Target B1 >=	87.00%	87.00%
Target B2 >=	68.00%	68.00%
Target C1 >=	84.00%	84.00%
Target C2 >=	80.00%	80.00%

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 a 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 posted 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.

The FFY 2019 targets were set 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 to present to D.C.'s State Advisory Panel on Special Education.
4. OSSE publicly posted the presentation on its website for public feedback.
5. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

545

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	14	2.57%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	38	6.97%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	117	21.47%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	247	45.32%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	129	23.67%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	364	416	84.62%	80.00%	87.50%	Met Target	No Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	376	545	65.45%	68.00%	68.99%	Met Target	No Slippage

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	14	2.57%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	34	6.24%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	122	22.39%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	242	44.40%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	133	24.40%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	364	412	85.56%	87.00%	88.35%	Met Target	No Slippage
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	375	545	69.70%	68.00%	68.81%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
program. Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)							

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	68	12.48%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	30	5.50%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	61	11.19%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	140	25.69%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	246	45.14%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	201	299	92.03%	84.00%	67.22%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	386	545	86.26%	80.00%	70.83%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C1	<p>The District's performance on Indicator 7C, progress category "a," increased from 1.21 percentage in FFY17 to 12.48 percentage in FFY18. OSSE conducted data analysis and hypothesized that an increased number of children, identified as having developmental delays, present with significant social, emotional, and language deficits that adversely impact their ability to access learning. These deficits may impact the children's ability to use appropriate behavior to meet their needs, as specified in section C of the Child Outcome Summary (COS).</p> <p>Additionally, 32 percent of preschool children in all disability categories, began receiving special education services in PreK-4, which resulted in a much shorter window of time for children to receive direct services and improve these outcomes. We hope to see increased improvement over time for these children.</p> <p>OSSE will continue to analyze data quality and engage in conversations around additional data points that will help us better understand the challenge of progress. OSSE will also provide professional development and technical support to local LEAs to improve the outcomes of children experiencing significant social, emotional, and language delays.</p>
C2	<p>The District's performance on Indicator 7C, progress category "a," increased from 1.21 percentage in FFY17 to 12.48 percentage in FFY18. OSSE conducted data analysis and hypothesized that an increased number of children, identified as having developmental delays, present with significant social, emotional, and language deficits that adversely impact their ability to access learning. These deficits may impact the children's ability to use appropriate behavior to meet their needs, as specified in section C of the Child Outcome Summary (COS).</p> <p>Additionally, 32 percent of preschool children in all disability categories, began receiving special education services in PreK-4, which resulted in a much shorter window of time for children to receive direct services and improve these outcomes. We hope to see increased improvement over time for these children.</p> <p>OSSE will continue to analyze data quality and engage in conversations around additional data points that will help us better understand the challenge of progress. OSSE will also provide professional development and technical support to local LEAs to improve the outcomes of children experiencing significant social, emotional, and language delays.</p>

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

YES

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

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

Beginning in 2009, all LEA preschool programs providing services under IDEA, Part B were required to use the Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS) to measure the required outcomes outlined above. Programs are required to collect and report performance data within 90 days of a child's entry into a preschool program, and within 60 days prior to a child's exit. Entry and exit data must be reported to OSSE on a rolling basis in the DC-CATS system.

As data is entered on a rolling basis, OSSE conducts bi-annual data verification checks to ensure that all preschool students who receive special education services ages 3-5 have COS scores entered into the system. Upon verification of COS data entry, the DC-CATS system generates a report. This report is used for reporting on APR indicator 7.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

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

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:

- 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 a 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 posted 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.

The FFY 2019 targets were set 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 to present to D.C.'s State Advisory Panel on Special Education.
- OSSE publicly posted the presentation on its website for public feedback.
- Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	68.20%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017

Target >=	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data	81.76%	84.47%	83.60%	86.44%	88.87%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
496	573	88.87%	85.00%	86.56%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

13,369

Percentage of respondent parents

4.29%

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 mailed to parents of both preschool and school-aged students with IEPs. All questions apply to both parents of preschool and school-aged children. OSSE also mailed surveys in Spanish (see attachment) as an effort to increase the number of Latino respondents. The mailing included self-addressed business reply envelopes along with instructions regarding the option to complete the survey online.

Also, distribution occurred at family-focused events throughout various wards within the District of Columbia. During these events, parents were also provided the opportunity to fill out a hard copy of the survey or provide verbal responses collected by an OSSE staff member.

OSSE staff members also 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.

To arrive at the percent of parents who report that the school facilitated their involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, 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 eight (8) items received a 100% score; respondents who rated their experiences with the school a "6" (Very Strongly Disagree) on each of the eight items received a 0% score. Respondents who rated their experiences with the school a "3" (Agree) on each of the eight (8) items received a 60% score. (Note: a respondent who on average rated their experiences a "3" (e.g., a respondent who rated two (2) items a "3," 3 items a "2" and three (3) items a "4,") would also receive a percentage of a maximum score of 60%). A parent who has a percent of a 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 agrees that the school facilitated his/her involvement.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	NO

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

The District recognizes this is an area for improvement. OSSE is exploring strategies to increase the response rate for the parent's survey, including partnering with LEAs to assist with the distribution and collection of the survey to parents. Also, OSSE is exploring different modalities to provide access to the parent survey, including easier access for electronic submissions.

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.

The demographic data of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education. The data breakdown shows that parents of white or Asian or Pacific Islander students were more than twice as likely to respond to the parent survey compared to parents of African American, Hispanic, and Native American students.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.23%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

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

31

39

Part B

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 and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
11	0	34	3.23%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

OSSE used its SY 2018-2019 Enrollment Audit and Child Count data for the calculation to determine disproportionate representation. All LEAs included in the denominator met the "n" size described below:

Definition of "Disproportionate Representation" and Methodology:

OSSE has adopted a weighted risk ratio threshold of 2.5 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, or risk 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 percentage of students being of a particular racial/ethnic group.

The District of Columbia's weighted risk ratio threshold 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:

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 meet the minimum "n" size of at least 40 students with IEPs to be included in this indicator. In addition, within LEAs of 40 or more students with IEPs, the LEA must also meet the cell size of at least five (5) students with disabilities of a single race/ethnicity category.

In FFY 2018, 31 LEAs were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the minimum "n" size and/or cell size

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.

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

Using the criteria established in the section above, OSSE determined that 11 of 34 LEAs that met the "n" size and cell size were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation.

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

For each of the 11 LEAs that the State identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education or related services, OSSE 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 practices documentation to OSSE for comparison with child find, evaluation and eligibility requirements.

All 11 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 none of the LEAs had disproportionate representation as a result of policies, procedures, and practices that did not comply with IDEA requirements.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In the FFY 2017 APR, DC reported that one (1) LEA had disproportionate representation as a result of policies, procedures, and practice that did not comply with IDEA requirements. Upon further review, there were zero (0) LEAs found to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education, but the LEA was found to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories (indicator 10). This information is reflected in DC's FFY 2017 report to the public.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2017 SPP/APR required the State to include in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator demonstrating in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that the one district identified in FFY 2017 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that the 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. Additionally, the State was required to describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. The State explained that, in the FFY 2017 APR, that one (1) LEA had disproportionate representation as a result of policies, procedures, and practice that did not comply with IDEA requirements. Upon further review, there were zero (0) LEAs found to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education, but the LEA was found to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories (indicator 10). Therefore, no further action is required.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	5.88%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	3.85%	0.00%	3.33%	5.88%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

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

25

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 and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
19	0	40	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

OSSE used its SY 2018-19 Enrollment Audit and Child Count data for the calculation to determine disproportionate representation. All LEAs included in the denominator met the "n" size described below:

Definition of Disproportionate Representation" and Methodology:

OSSE has adopted a weighted risk ratio threshold of 2.5 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. The weighted risk ratio negates any effect on risk caused by a large or small percentage of students being of a particular racial/ethnic group.

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, Emotional Disturbance, Specific Learning Disability, Other Health Impaired, Intellectual Disability, and Speech or Language Impaired.

Minimum group size for inclusion:

An LEA must meet the minimum "n" size of at least 40 students with IEPs to be included in this indicator. In addition, within LEAs of 40 or more students with IEPs, the LEA must also meet the cell size of at least five (5) students with disabilities of a single race/ethnicity category.

In FFY 2018, 25 LEAs were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the minimum "n" size and/or cell size

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.

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

Using the criteria established in the section above, OSSE determined that 19 of the 40 LEAs that met the minimum "n" size and cell size were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation.

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

For each of the 19 LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, OSSE 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 19 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 determined that zero (0) LEAs had disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In the FFY 2017 APR, DC reported that zero (0) LEA's had disproportionate representation as a result of policies, procedures, and practice that did not comply with IDEA requirements. Upon further review, there was 1 (one) LEA found to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education. This information is reflected in DC's FFY 2017 report to the public.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

As a result of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2017, OSSE's IDEA Monitoring team required the LEA to submit a Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) that aligned with the required revisions related to their Disproportionate Representation finding. The CIP was approved by OSSE and closely monitored throughout the school year. In addition to the CIP, the LEA was required to quarterly report to their assigned OSSE IDEA monitor on the

progress of the CIP's action items.

The LEA had one year to complete each action item in the CIP which, included but were not limited to revising the specific language and IDEA references in their policies, provide training to staff members on the updated policies, and post updated policies to the LEA's website. OSSE verified these required actions by reviewing revised policies and LEA websites. Upon completion of the CIP and through subsequent review of data, OSSE found that the LEA now has written policies and procedures that are compliant with the regulatory requirements.

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

The LEA identified in FFY 2017 was required to revise and/or develop written policies and procedures related to the initial evaluation process, and measures for determining eligibility and related services, and correct any student-level noncompliance that the LEA identified while completing its self-study.

In addition, OSSE issued student-level findings of noncompliance as a result of the self-study completed by the LEA. OSSE verified that each student-level finding was corrected by confirming evidence of correction in the DCCATS system and the Special Education Data System (SEDS). A subsequent review of data was conducted to ensure the LEA complies with requirements related to the initial areas of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes the State reported FFY 2017 APR, that zero (0) LEAs had disproportionate representation as a result of policies, procedures, and practice that did not comply with IDEA requirements. Upon further review, there was one LEA found to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education. The State reported on the correction of the FFY 2017 noncompliance, therefore, no further action is required.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
 - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

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

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	22.30%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	89.42%	90.72%	92.51%	91.07%	92.37%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4,038	3,474	92.37%	100%	86.03%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

Beginning SY 2018-19, per DC's Enhanced Special Education Services Act of 2014, the timeline for completing an eligibility determination changed from 120 days to 60 days. As a result of the timeline change, there was slippage for this indicator. OSSE continues to conduct regular monitoring and provides ongoing training and technical assistance to LEAs to support improvements in timely evaluations.

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

564

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 days beyond the 60- day timeline from evaluation ranged from one (1) day to 88 days.

Twenty (20) cases were due to parental delay, 22 cases were due to children who withdrew from school and reentered during the 60-day timeline, and 62 cases were due to transfer events. Four-hundred and sixty (460) 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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

OSSE uses its statewide Special Education Data Systems (SEDS) to collect data for this indicator. Data is collected for the entire reporting year (July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2018) on all children referred for initial evaluation. OSSE reviews data from all LEAs. Following the review of data, OSSE issues findings of noncompliance to each LEA that did not achieve 100% compliance for evaluation timelines.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
19	19	0	0

FFY 2017 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 2017: (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.

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. The student-level correctionS were demonstrated when OSSE verified that the student had received the evaluation, although late.
- 2) In order to ensure that the LEA demonstrated the 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

OSSE 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 corrected, the state pulled subsequent data to determine whether the LEA was correctly 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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified

that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

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

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	37.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.71%	96.77%	98.44%	94.00%	95.33%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	529
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	75
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	137

d. Number 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.	38
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	55
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.	222

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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.	137	139	95.33%	100%	98.56%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

2

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.

Two (2) children who were served in Part C and referred in Part B for a Part B eligibility determination did not have an IEP developed and implemented by the child's third birthday. This is an improvement from FFY 2017 when five (5) children did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

The number of days beyond the child's third birthday was 14 to 122 days, and reasons for delay included delayed action taken related to initial referral and delay in scheduling meetings.

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

The State implemented a two-phase plan to collect and report data for this indicator. The first phase included collecting data from Part C data systems and completing a direct pull from Part B data systems.

The second phase included a record review for each of the students who did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays, to determine the reason for the delay(s).

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In all instances in which OSSE identifies 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.

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

In FFY 2017, OSSE verified two (2) instances of noncompliance for this indicator. OSSE verified in the Special Education Data System (SEDS) that the LEA had developed and implemented IEPs for each student. Each student-level finding was corrected, and OSSE confirmed that 100% compliance was achieved on a subsequent review of data.

Upon correcting the initial noncompliance, OSSE reviewed subsequent data to ensure the LEA was correctly implementing the IDEA requirement.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: 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))

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition 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) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

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

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	3.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	50.00%	69.67%	63.00%	71.00%	76.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
228	300	76.00%	100%	76.00%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

State monitoring

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

The U. S. Department of Education imposed specific conditions on the District-based in part on the District's noncompliance in the area of secondary transition. As a result, 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.

In FFY 2017, OSSE was approved to apply a new methodology in which secondary transition files from LEAs were reviewed in cohorts. OSSE reviewed 100 IEPs from 4-5 different LEAs each reporting period as part of its specific conditions report submissions. The schedule and pre-selected cohorts are attached.

OSSE monitored the FFY 2018 secondary transition data, in accordance with the procedure outlined above, three times and reported in the FFY 2017 specific conditions reports due to OSEP. Below are the results:

FFY 2018 Review Period Overall Percent Compliant
 July 1, 2018, to September 30, 2018, 93%
 October 1, 2018, to March 31, 2019, 62%
 April 1, 2019, to June 30, 2019, 73%
 FFY 2018 Compliance Rate: 76%

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	NO

If no, please explain

Currently, the District is under specific conditions for secondary transition and reviews LEAs in cohorts on a 3-year cycle, as approved by the U.S. Department of Education. These cohorts were determined before the change in the age requirement for the secondary transition. To maintain consistent monitoring practices across cohorts, OSSE will continue to monitor for age 16 and up until the 3-year cycle ends.

Additionally, OSSE provides ongoing trainings and technical assistance for middle school staff on the secondary transition requirements to prepare LEAs for the changes in OSSE's monitoring of secondary transition to include 14-year-olds.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) confirmed that states should report the initial compliance rate for all compliance indicators. OSSE confirms that initial compliance rates are reported for all compliance indicators as the data are collected from the statewide special education system (SEDS) and do not require file reviews to determine compliance. However, since secondary transition plans are manually reviewed by IDEA monitors, LEAs are provided the opportunity to clarify instances of noncompliance, if necessary.

Upon receiving clarification from OSEP, OSSE revised its monitoring practices to better align with requirements to determine compliance related to secondary transition. OSSE continues to implement the revised monitoring practices and reports the initial compliance rate for secondary transition in its specific conditions reports and APR.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
210	210	0	0

FFY 2017 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 2017 findings of noncompliance remaining open.

The State has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017:

- (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 the 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 the LEA's first submission does not correct noncompliance, OSSE compliance monitors follow-up with the LEA to 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 an appropriate measurable post-secondary goal that addresses education or training).

After OSSE verified the correction of individual student-level findings of noncompliance for a specific regulatory requirement, OSSE reviewed

subsequent LEA data. Specifically, OSSE verified the 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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

In its December 1, 2019 Specific Conditions progress report, the State reported compliance data for two reporting periods. For the April 1, 2019 through June 30, 2019 reporting period, the State reported that 73% of youth aged 16 and above had IEPs that included the required secondary transition content. Three of four LEAs monitored during this review period demonstrated 100% compliance with the secondary transition requirements. The State further reported that, for the July 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019 review period, 64% of youth aged 16 and above had IEPs that included the required secondary transition content. Neither of the two LEAs monitored during this review period demonstrated 100% compliance with the secondary transition requirements. In its May 1, 2020 Specific Conditions progress report, the State reported data for the period October 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020, that reflect 74% of youth aged 16 and above had IEPs that included the required secondary transition content. None of the three LEAs monitored during this review period demonstrated 100% compliance with the secondary transition requirements. OSEP notes that for the period April 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020, 70% of youth aged 16 and above had IEPs that included the required secondary transition content.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 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 2019 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 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Post-school outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

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: States 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.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2012	Target >=	27.00%	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%
A	23.00%	Data	17.20%	17.29%	12.13%	20.59%	24.37%
B	2012	Target >=	34.00%	39.00%	44.00%	49.00%	54.00%
B	25.62%	Data	24.10%	25.94%	18.62%	29.99%	34.22%
C	2012	Target >=	40.00%	45.00%	50.00%	56.00%	63.00%
C	30.81%	Data	31.60%	36.93%	32.96%	36.11%	54.86%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	32.00%	32.00%
Target B >=	59.00%	59.00%
Target C >=	74.00%	74.00%

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 a 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 posted 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.

The FFY 2019 targets were set 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 to present to D.C.'s State Advisory Panel on Special Education.
- OSSE publicly posted the presentation on its website for public feedback.
- Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

FFY 2018 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	736
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	175
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	39
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)	15
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).	96

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	175	736	24.37%	32.00%	23.78%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	214	736	34.22%	59.00%	29.08%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	325	736	54.86%	74.00%	44.16%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	OSSE attributes slippage for this indicator to limitations in available data sources. Due to our proximity to surrounding states, MD and VA, it is very common for youths to live in DC but work in MD or VA. Currently, OSSE does not have access to employment data from these surrounding states, and as a result, OSSE cannot account for students working in those states.
C	OSSE attributes slippage for this indicator to limitations in data sources. OSSE utilizes data from the National Clearing House to account for some students enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, however, at this time OSSE does not have access to data for all students enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training programs.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	NO

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. The District recognizes that several students are unaccounted for in this data. OSSE does not use surveys or sampling for this indicator and therefore strives to account for all students in the cohort. Due to the limitations in data sources, OSSE is unable to account for all students.

	Yes / 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?	NO

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

OSSE recognizes the complexity of obtaining employment data from its neighboring states and continues to explore options in reporting on this indicator. OSSE is actively working with partner agencies to develop data-sharing agreements that may support data collection for indicator 14. Also, OSSE is working to resume data collection from the University of the District of Columbia (UDC).

In addition, OSSE is exploring other reporting options for this indicator, including sampling and surveys.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2018 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2019 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.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	238
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	42

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 a 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 posted 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.

The FFY 2019 targets were set 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 to present to D.C.'s State Advisory Panel on Special Education.
4. OSSE publicly posted the presentation on its website for public feedback.
5. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	3.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	20.00% - 35.00%	22.00% - 37.00%	25.00% - 40.00%	27.00% - 42.00%	29.00% - 44.00%
Data	2.74%	14.32%	13.90%	17.57%	14.29%

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	31.00%	46.00%	31.00%	46.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
42	238	14.29%	31.00%	46.00%	17.65%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	18
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 a 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 posted 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.

The FFY 2019 targets were set 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 to present to D.C.'s State Advisory Panel on Special Education.
4. OSSE publicly posted the presentation on its website for public feedback.
5. Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise targets as appropriate.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	23.10%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	60.00% - 75.00%	62.00% - 77.00%	64.00% - 79.00%	66.00% - 81.00%	68.00% - 83.00%
Data	66.67%	64.71%	66.67%	68.42%	75.00%

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	70.00%	85.00%	70.00%	85.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2	10	23	75.00%	70.00%	85.00%	52.17%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

OSSE attributes slippage for this indicator to the disputes' increasing complexities. Each case is unique, and the complexities are increasing, which has resulted in a decrease in the number of mediation agreements. Mediations are confidential. Mediators are only required to share outcomes for cases that resulted in an agreement. Reasons for non-agreements remain confidential and are not accessible to OSSE.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSSE's data for indicator 16 required resubmission, and therefore, the prepopulated data for this indicator does not accurately reflect mediation outcomes. The overwrite data accurately represents the District's outcomes for mediation. OSSE will resubmit it's EdFacts data during the Dispute Resolution reopening period in May.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Nikki Stewart

Title:

Assistant Superintendent for Systems and Supports, K-12

Email:

nikki.stewart@dc.gov

Phone:

202-957-7748

Submitted on:

04/30/20 3:46:26 PM