



# State Advisory Panel Review

State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report

---

Thursday, March 9, 2017



# State Performance Plan and the Annual Report

- The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires all states to have a special education performance plan.
- The **State Performance Plan (SPP)** is a six-year plan that describes special education services in DC and our plan for continued improvement. The SPP covers 17 content areas, referred to as indicators.
- The U.S. Department of Education (USED) requires states to report on their performance against the targets outlined in the SPP for each indicator via the **Annual Performance Report (APR)**, and uses the results from this report to make an annual determination on DC's overall performance.



# Compliance Indicators

The US Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) sets the same targets for all states for compliance indicators.

- Indicator 4A and 4B- Significant Discrepancy (0%)
- Indicator 9 and 10- Disproportionate Representation (0%)
- Indicator 11- Timely Initial Evaluation
- Indicator 12- C to B Transition
- Indicator 13- Secondary Transition



# Results Indicators

USED requires states to work with a variety of stakeholders to set targets for all results indicators.

- Indicator 1- Graduation
- Indicator 2- Dropout
- Indicator 3- Statewide Assessments
- Indicator 5- Least Restrictive Environment
- Indicator 6- Preschool Settings
- Indicator 7- Child Outcome Summary
- Indicator 8- Parent Satisfaction
- Indicator 14- Postsecondary Outcomes
- Indicator 15- Resolution Agreements
- Indicator 16- Mediation



# Role of the SAP

- Provide policy and procedural guidance with respect to special education and related services for children with disabilities in the State. (Part B/Section 619) CFR 300.167
- Among the roles of the SAP are to advise, suggest and/or make recommendations to OSSE.
- Individual SAP members make a significant contribution to the panel by sharing the unique perspectives of the stakeholder groups that they represent.



# Annual Reporting Requirements

- The APR is typically due to USDE on **February 1** of each year. The report spans the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY), which is July 1- June 30.
- USED will review all APRs from February to April and make requests to states for clarification, as needed. States typically have 7-10 days to provide requested clarification.
- USED will then review final APR submissions and use the reported results to make an official determination on states' performance regarding implementation of the IDEA.
- In June, states are notified of their determination level and any resulting requirements (e.g. special conditions reporting). This June, we will be provided our determination level primarily based upon performance as documented in our APR submission for FFY 2015 (July 1, 2015- June 30, 2016, or school year 2015-2016).



# Annual Targets

- DC's current performance plan covers FFYs 2013 through 2018, and contains targets for each indicator for each year of the plan.
- The SPP is made up of “compliance” and “results” indicators.
- USED sets the targets for compliance indicators related to disproportionality, evaluation timelines, early childhood transition, secondary transition, correction of noncompliance, State complaint timelines, due process timelines, and data accuracy.
- OSSE sets the target levels for all results indicators with the help of stakeholders, including members of the State Advisory Panel.
- What happens if we don't meet our targets? USED may:
  - Require professional development on focus areas
  - Impose special conditions on DC's IDEA grant, including but not limited to additional monitoring and reporting obligations
  - Direct how OSSE uses federal IDEA funds (\$\$\$)



# Review of APR Indicators and SPP Targets (2013 to 2018)





# Graduation and Dropout Rates

- **Indicator 1 (results):** The percent of students with disabilities graduating high school with a regular diploma (not a certificate or GED).

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target (%)	44%	45.8%	49.8%	54.8%	60%	60%

- **Indicator 2 (results):** The percent of students with disabilities dropping out of high school.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target (%)	5.8%	5.6%	5.3%	5.1%	4.8%	4.6%



# Statewide Assessments - Participation

- **Indicator 3A:** The percent of school districts (LEAs) meeting their targets for students with disabilities on statewide assessments.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target (%)	16%	22%	22%	30%	40%	50%

- **Indicator 3B:** The percent of students with disabilities taking the statewide assessment.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target (%)	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%



# Statewide Assessment- Proficiency

- **Indicator 3C (results):** The percent of students with disabilities scoring “proficient” or higher on the statewide assessment.

FFY	Subject Area	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target (%)	Math	30%	30%	30%	37%	48%	60%
	Reading	27%	27%	27%	34%	42%	52%



# Significant Discrepancy - Discipline

- **Indicator 4A (compliance):** The percent of school districts (LEAs) with a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspension/expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year between children with disabilities and their non-disabled peers.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target (%)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

- **Indicator 4B (compliance):** The percent of school districts with a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target (%)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%



# Critical Concept for Indicators 5 and 6

- Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) = Students with disabilities must be educated with non-disabled peers, to the greatest extent appropriate.



# LRE and Preschool Settings

- **Indicator 5:** The percent of students with disabilities served in the following settings:

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A. Regular classroom 80% or more of the school day	50%	53%	56%	59%	61%	64%
B. Regular classroom less than 40% of the day	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	12%
C. Separate schools, residential programs, hospital/home	15%	14%	13%	12%	11%	10%

- **Indicator 6:** The percent of children ages 3 to 5 with disabilities attending a:

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A. Regular early childhood program & receiving majority of services there	55%	56%	57%	58%	59%	60%
B. Separate special education class, school, or residential program	16%	16%	14%	12%	11%	10%



# Child Outcome Summary (COS)

## Percent of students who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited the program.

Summary Statement 1: Substantial Growth	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Improved positive social-emotional skills	75	76	76	77	78	80
Acquire and use of knowledge and skills	82	83	83	84	85	87
Use appropriate behavior to meet needs	79	80	80	81	82	84

## Percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each area by the time they exited the program.

Summary Statement 2: Functioning Age Appropriately	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Improved positive social-emotional skills	63	64	64	65	66	68
Acquire and use of knowledge and skills	63	64	64	65	66	68
Use appropriate behavior to meet needs	75	76	76	77	78	80



# Parent Involvement

- **Indicator 8:** The percent of parents reporting their child’s school facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target (%)	75%	80%	80%	85%	85%	85%

- OSSE measures parent involvement by surveying parents of students receiving special education services. The survey asks questions like:
  - Does your child’s school ensure you understand your rights as a parent(s)?
  - Does your child’s school communicate regularly with you on the progress your child is making?
  - Does your child’s school provide opportunities for parents to provide input and participate fully in IEP meetings?
  - Are you treated as an equal partner by your child’s teachers, and other school professionals?





# Disproportionate Representation

- **Indicator 9 (compliance):** The percent of school districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target (%)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

- **Indicator 10 (compliance):** The percent of school districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target (%)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%



# Child Find and C to B Transition

- **Indicator 11 (compliance):** The percent of children evaluated within 60 days from parental consent for the evaluation, or within the state established timeline.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target (%)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- **Indicator 12 (compliance):** The percent of children referred from Part C prior to age 3, who are eligible for Part B who have an IEP developed and implemented by the child's 3<sup>rd</sup> birthday.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target (%)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%



# Secondary Transition

- **Indicator 13 (compliance):** The 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 course of study, that will reasonable enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target (%)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%



# Postsecondary Outcomes

- **Indicator 14 (results):** The percent of students with an IEP no longer in high school doing the following within one year of leaving school:

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A. Enrolled in higher education	27%	28%	29%	30%	31%	32%
A+B. Competitively employed, or enrolled in higher education	34%	39%	44%	49%	54%	59%
A+B+C. Attending some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed, or enrolled in higher education	40%	45%	50%	56%	63%	74%



# Critical Concept for Indicators 15 and 16

## Resolution Agreements:

- When parents and schools cannot reach agreement about a student's special education program, the IDEA offers several "dispute resolution" options, or methods of getting the disagreement resolved.
- **Resolution sessions** occur after a parent has filed a request for a due process hearing. Resolution sessions give parents and districts an opportunity to meet and try to resolve the problems identified in the parent's due process hearing request.

## Mediation:

- In **mediation**, the parents and the school meet with a trained, impartial person, called a mediator.
- The mediator helps the parents and school communicate. The mediator does not make decisions for the parties, but helps the parents and school think about options and come to agreement.



# Resolution Agreements and Mediation

- **Indicator 15 Resolution Agreements:** The percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target (%)	20-35%	22-37%	25-40%	27-42%	29-44%	31-46%

- **Indicator 16 Mediation:** The percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target (%)	60-75%	62-77%	64-79%	66-81%	68-83%	70-85%



# Review of DC's Performance for FFY 2015



# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)





# SSIP Theory of Action

## If we improve students' readiness for high school...

1. If students are prepared for high school processes and expectations...
2. If students are supported through regular adult monitoring...

**STUDENTS**

## Then students will gain the skills necessary to thrive and succeed in high school.

1. Then students will better understand how to succeed.
2. Then students will remain engaged in school.

## If we improve high schools' readiness for incoming 9<sup>th</sup> grade students...

1. If middle and high school staffs coordinate to share information...
2. If we provide comprehensive professional development for secondary special educators...

**SCHOOLS**

## Then schools will be better equipped to serve the needs of 9<sup>th</sup> graders.

1. Then staff can better support a smooth entry into high school.
2. Then staff will be better equipped to serve diverse learners.

## If we coordinate and leverage city-wide efforts and data systems...

1. If cross agency communication is improved to support a highly mobile student body...
2. If state-level student data is made available timely and accurately...

**STATE**

## Then state infrastructure will provide a strong foundation for 9<sup>th</sup> grade success.

1. Then mobile students will be better supported during transitions to stay on track for graduation.
2. Then schools can better prepare for incoming students.



# SSIP Goals

	FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015 (SY 2014-15)		FFY 2016 (SY 2015-16)		FFY 2017 (SY 2016-17)		FFY 2018 (SY 2017-18)	
	BASELINE	SSIP target	SSIP target	ESSA plan	SSIP target	ESSA plan	SSIP target	ESSA plan	SSIP target	ESSA plan
<b>Four-Year Target ≥</b>	Baseline	36.00%	38.00%	42.9%	43.00%	44.9%	49.00%	46.8%	60.00%	48.8%
<b>Four-Year Actual</b>	34.00%	38.60%	42.90%		[49.5%]					
<b>Five-Year Actual*</b>	--	47.90%	[*]							
<b>Six-Year Actual*</b>	--	[*]								



# SSIP Evidence Based Practices Implementation

Universal Strategies (all schools)	Targeted Strategies (subpopulation of schools)
State-level mobility workgroup	8 <sup>th</sup> -to-9 <sup>th</sup> grade transition activities and coordinated case review
Master Teacher Cadre	
Middle school literacy Community of Practice	
Professional development in evidence-based schoolwide support models (PBIS, RTI, UDL)	Check and Connect
Restorative Practices	



# SSIP Targeted Strategy Implementation

- DC is in the first year of implementation of this plan, which is designed to align activities and funding support with school improvement efforts under ESEA.
  - Targeted strategy implementation with SIMR schools is through the Learning Support Network (LSN), OSSE’s state intervention model under the ESEA waiver.
- SY2016-2017 Implementation Progress
  - Fall 2016: schools assessed current needs and reviewed improvement strategy options in consultation with coaches.
  - Winter 2017: schools selected improvement strategy and incorporated activities into LSN action plan.
  - Winter/ Spring 2017: schools and coaches plan for implementation.
- Summer 2017 Planned Activities
  - Schools: implementation of formal training and summer transition activities.
  - OSSE: host formal training; facilitate 8<sup>th</sup>-to-9<sup>th</sup> Grade Student Information Exchange (with RaiseDC); launch database for early access to SWD data.



Q&A



| Thank you!