

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

REVISED APRIL 18, 2011

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development

The District of Columbia Public Schools gathered and analyzed data for the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP) through the collaborative efforts of District of Columbia Public Schools stakeholders – parents, community groups, teachers, administrators, related service providers, school system personnel, other government agencies, the state advisory panel, state office representatives, and the parent training advisory council. A cross-section of individuals from the above-listed groups assembled and conducted a variety of meetings in furtherance of this objective.

The District of Columbia Public Schools is comprised of several school districts/LEAs that are represented by two distinct groups - DCPS LEA schools; and DCPS public charter schools. There are **40** DCPS public charter schools some of whom are their own LEAs - the largest has an enrollment of under **3,000** and the next largest has an enrollment in the low hundreds. Overall, DCPS LEA schools' enrollment is 62,306 which provide the districts in the "state" of the District of Columbia.

The initial meeting involved brainstorming, reviewing old and new indicators, and developing a process for completing and submitting the SPP. The SPP committee is comprised of representatives from each one of the subgroups. The SPP committee determined that indicators should be grouped by commonality. Overall, the meeting resulted in the explanation of the assignment and the delegation of tasks.

Within the respective work groups, data analysts were paired with program analysts in order to exhaustively discuss and analyze the indicators presented. Subgroups were delineated and formed from the overall group. Data analysts were individuals (typically DCPS personnel) with institutional knowledge of DCPS and its various programs. Program analysts were individuals (typically stakeholder representatives) with direct or indirect dealings with both the SEA and the LEAs who could provide anecdotal and practical information about DCPS and its various programs. Once the data analyses and programmatic analyses were completed in the subgroups, the specific subgroup presented its indicator for review to the SPP committee.

The SPP committee convened weekly to discuss issues related to the data analysis. Once the indicators were submitted, the SPP committee worked collectively to reconcile and resolve any outstanding issues pertaining to the indicators. Once consensus was reached by the SPP committee, the SPP committee revised drafts and finalized the SPP.

The SPP will be disseminated by the District of Columbia Public Schools to the following entities: the State Advisory Panel, select parent groups and DCPS central offices. The SPP will be posted on the District of Columbia Public Schools website for public viewing.

Overview of the 2010 State Performance Plan Revisions

The Public Education Reform Amendment Act of 2007 created the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) to serve as a state-level education agency. The Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE), as the State Education Agency (SEA) for the District of Columbia, is responsible for ensuring Local Educational Agency (LEA) compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, at 20 U.S.C. § 1400, et seq.).

OSSE's Division of Special Education (DSE) is responsible for overseeing the development and promulgation of state policy governing special education; monitoring LEAs for compliance with IDEA as well as other federal and local regulations and court-ordered consent decrees; allocation and administration of IDEA grant funds to LEAs and other public agencies; provision of training and technical assistance to LEAs; and investigation and resolution of state complaints relating to special education. OSSE also administers the District's due process hearing system, through the Student Hearing Office (SHO).

DSE is also responsible for the regulation of nonpublic placements under local statute. This includes setting rates for nonpublic schools; budgeting for, processing, and paying the invoices from nonpublic schools; monitoring the quality of nonpublic schools serving District children; taking corrective action against schools not meeting District standards; and issuing Certificates of Approval (COA) to nonpublic special education schools.

The Department also houses the DC Early Intervention Prevention/Infants and Toddlers with Developmental Disabilities (EIP/ITDD) Unit, which serves as the lead agency for early intervention services in the District of Columbia. As such, DSE is responsible for ensuring the delivery of high quality services to children with disabilities birth through twenty-one.

The District's Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) serves as a road map that outlines performance goals and annual targets that ensure accelerated reform. This annual data collection and review process allows OSSE to make data-based decisions that ensure the appropriate allocation of resources to areas of greatest need. The SPP and the APR are the critical levers for assisting OSSE in meeting its special education reform goal as outlined in its five-year strategic plan, which is to "ensure students with disabilities receive an excellent education and life-skills training to become well-educated, independent, and productive members of their community."^[1]

Progress in key performance areas is reviewed and reported on annually via the Annual Performance Report (APR). In addition, states must revise Indicator and measurement table language to ensure continuous alignment with revisions made at the federal level. Last, states must update SPPs to reflect any changes made to definitions, baselines, targets, and improvement activities made with broad stakeholder input. Changes are noted via red strike through of outdated information and yellow highlighting of updated information.

This revised SPP reflects the changes currently required by OSEP. In preparation for the development of the next SPP cycle, which begins in the 2011- 2012 SY, OSSE will begin the process of reviewing the SPP in its entirety with the State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAP) and seek additional input via quarterly meetings with LEA representatives during the 2010-2011 SY.

Overview of the January 31, 2011 State Performance Plan Revisions

On November 22, 2010, OSEP informed States that on February 1, 2011, States must submit:

- 1) A revised SPP (using the SPP template) that specifies, for each indicator, annual targets (reflecting improvement over the State's baseline data for that indicator), and improvement activities for each year through FFY 2012 (July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013).
- 2) Baseline data, targets and improvement activities for Indicators 4B, 13 and 14 (using the SPP template). In addition, submit a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's revised SPP, including any revisions, is available as well as where the State has reported to the public on the performance of each LEA in the State against the State's targets in the SPP.

This revised SPP is in response to these required components. On January 20, 2011 OSSE presented revised/proposed targets for FFY 2010 – FFY 2012 to the SAP. The SAP was provided an opportunity to comment on the targets before, during and after this meeting. The SAP provided input regarding Indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 14, 18 and 19. Following the SAP meeting, OSSE used the stakeholder input to finalize targets. OSSE revised each indicator to include annual targets (reflecting improvement over the State's baseline data for that indicator) approved by the SAP, and improvement activities for each year through FFY 2012 (July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013). Additionally, OSSE included baseline data, targets and improvement activities for Indicators 4B, 13 and 14 (using the SPP template). Finally, with input from stakeholders, OSSE revised FFY 2010 targets for Indicators 18 and 19 to more closely align with current actual target data and indicate a range for which OSSE believes demonstrates a rigorous target.

Changes from OSSE's April 23, 2010 Revised SPP are noted via strikeout, where information has been deleted, and yellow highlighting for updated information.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.
(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement for all youth.

of graduates with IEPs receiving a regular diploma

of graduates with IEPs receiving a regular diploma + # of 9th grade students who dropped out in SY04-05 + # of 10th grade students who dropped out in SY05-06 + # of 11th grade students who dropped out in SY06-07 + # of 12th grade students who dropped out in SY07-08

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The graduation rate measures the percentage of 9th-grade students who graduate four years later (*See formula below). To graduate, **every** DCPS Student must complete 24.0 Carnegie Units successfully, regardless of the program in which the student is enrolled. The student and the parent of a child under the age of 18 must sign a letter of understanding in the senior year. One Carnegie Unit equals two semesters of study in a particular subject. The distribution of course requirements is as follows:

GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS

Course	Carnegie Units
Art	0.5
CTE and or college level courses ¹	2.0
English	4.0
World language	2.0
Health/Physical Education	1.5
Mathematics (must include Algebra I, Geometry and Algebra II at a minimum) ²)	4.0
Music	0.5
Science (including three lab sciences)	4.0
Social Studies to include World History 1 and 2; US History; US Government and DC History	4.0
Electives	1.5
100 hours of community service; requirements shall be established by the Superintendent	0.0

¹ The Career/Technology Education (CTE) and college level course requirement shall be met by identified AP, IB, HI-SCIP and CTE courses as well as courses taken at accredited colleges.

² All student must enroll in Algebra no later than 9th grade commencing with the 2007-2008 school year.

Students must complete at least one credit bearing course during the third or subsequent SHS years that requires a culminating composition or project that is formally presented	
All 11 th graders must write a coherent thesis that conveys a clear and distinctive position (11.W-E.2.) All 12 th graders must write and present a coherent thesis (12.W-E.3.)	
Total	24.0

DISCUSSION OF BASELINE DATA

2005-2006	% of students with IEPs graduated with a high school diploma 42% 304/724
-----------	--

In the 2005/2006 APR, DCPS defined graduation rate as a cohort based computation derived from the following formula:

Number of Graduates in Year X / (Number of Graduates in Year X + Number of Grade 12 Dropouts in Year X + Number of Grade 11 Dropouts in Year (X-1) + Number of Grade 10 Dropouts in Year (X-2) + Number of Grade 9 Dropouts in Year (X-3))

The APR indicates that the measurement for Students with IEPs should be the same measure as for all students.

Baseline data for students with IEPs on graduation rate was not calculated for 03/04 and 04/05 data was not reported in the February 07 APR.

For the 2006/2007 APR, data is still unavailable to calculate a graduation rate for students with IEPs based on the cohort formula stated above. .

The FFY 2008 APR is the first year that OSSE used the graduation rate calculation used for Title I adequate yearly progress determinations. In FFY 2008, OSEP requires the SEA to examine data for the year before the reporting year and compare the results to the target. Thus, for the FFY 2008 APR, OSSE is analyzing data from the 2007-2008 school year.

These data predate OSSE's implementation of the Special Education Data System (SEDS). The data used in reporting this indicator in compliance with ESEA standards were supplied to OSSE via spreadsheets completed by the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) and the Public Charter School Board (PCSB). The special education status of children dropping out and graduating was validated, to the extent possible, using SEDS, which incorporates data imported from Encore, DCPS's legacy special education database.

OSSE used the "leaver rate" methodology created by NCES for determining graduation rate in SY 2007-2008. The calculation for determining the graduation rate for SY 2007-2008 was: (total number of graduates in 2008) / (total number of graduates in 2008 + total number of dropouts in grade 12 in 2007- 2008 + total number of dropouts in grade 11 in 2006-2007 + total number of dropouts in grade 10 in 2005-2006 + total number of dropouts in grade 9 in 2004-2005). The data used in the calculation are presented in the following chart:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
-----	--------------------------------

2005 (2005-2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the graduation rate to 73 percent overall. • Increase the graduation rate to 63 percent for students with disabilities.
2006 (2006-2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase graduation rate to 42.5.5% for students with disabilities
2007 (2007-2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase graduation rate to 66.23% for students with disabilities.
2008 (2008-2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase graduation rate to 66.23% for students with disabilities.
2009 (2009-2010)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase graduation rate to 85% for students with disabilities.
2010 (2010-2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase graduation rate to 85% for students with disabilities.
2011 (2010-2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase graduation rate to 85% for students with disabilities.
2012 (2010-2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase graduation rate to 85% for students with disabilities.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p>REVISION: Create a State data Collection System to adequately capture exit data.</p> <p>Data will be used to verify whether students exiting from special education with a “Graduation” status, whether they:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) were within the appropriate age range, and/or whether they had reentered the system. 2) exited with a high school diploma or certificate of IEP 	SPRING 2008	OSSE OIT
State Transition Council will review disaggregated graduation and dropout data and make recommendations to the OSSE for focused monitoring for LEAs falling well below state average for graduation and dropout rates	SUMMER 2008	State Interagency Transition Team
<p>Establish a state-wide inclusion model to increase access to the general education curriculum.</p> <p>REVISION</p> <p>Design protocol for data analysis at the LEA level to evaluate students’ access to general education curriculum in regular education environments. Protocol will include inquiry regarding: 1.)IEP justifications for removal from regular education environments;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.) IEP components establishing foundation for access to general education curriculum, 3.) to establish that accommodations for participation in general education curriculum are determined 4.) Extent to which general education teachers are aware of and fulfill IEP implementation responsibilities; 5.)Extent to which general and regular education 	<p>2005 – 2007</p> <p>SPRING 2008</p>	OSSE

teachers use methods for collaboration that maximize students' access to general education curriculum; 6.)Teacher competency in core academic subjects.		
Develop policy and procedure to inform parents and students of the requirements of 23.5 - 26 Carnegie Units to receive a diploma.	SPRING 2006	
Provide professional development on implementation of RTI at the secondary level and implementation of co-teaching models being adopted by all LEAs.	2007-2009	Regional Technical Assistance Center
Review all LEA policies and procedures for practices that assure the provision of services, supports, aids accommodations, and interventions to assure access to and participation in general curriculum and assessments, and promote high school graduation with a regular high school diploma.	2007-2009	OSSE Special Education Director
A training module on high quality transition planning and ways to engage students in the transition planning process to ensure students are involved in meaningful activities related to their transition to postsecondary life	Spring 2007	State Transition Coordinator/State Interagency Transition Council
Analyze data across indicators related to graduation (dropout, transition, parental involvement, suspensions and expulsions) to establish corollary relationships for focused monitoring	Summer 2008 through Fall 2008	State Transition Council and OSSE Drop-Out Prevention Team
OSSE will examine transition-related activities and align them with the National Standards and Indicators for Secondary Education and Transition for program effectiveness. OSSE will disseminate standards after completion to interagency partners, Special Education Personnel, Directors of Special Education, and institutions of higher education.	Fall 2008 through Winter 2009	State Transition Coordinator/State Interagency Transition Council
Summer Transition Institute, including special educators and an interagency team members with the focus on graduation and drop-out prevention	Summer 2008 and on-going	State Transition Office
Develop a best practices manual on effective practices/strategies based on schools that have made progress in improving graduation rates.	2010	Develop a best practices manual on effective practices/strategies based on schools that have made progress in improving graduation rates.

Collaborate with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities to identify effective strategies/interventions to support school completion.

2007-2011

OSSE/State Transition Coordinator

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Completion of Secondary Transition Monitoring Pursuant to OSSE's Memorandum of Agreement with OSEP: Pursuant to OSSE's MOA with OSEP, the Quality Assurance and Monitoring (QAM) unit began regular monitoring of 100 IEPs of students with disabilities aged 16 or older to ensure compliance with requirements related to secondary transition content.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, QAM Unit
Implementation of a Training Series to Support Secondary Success: The DSE's Training and Technical Assistance (TTA) Unit facilitated a robust training series in SY 2009-2010 which will continue annually through 2013. This LEA training series includes trainings specifically designed to ensure the success of students in secondary grades. Specifically, the training series includes the following training content: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing measurable annual goals and objectives for transition services utilizing SEDS • Integrating best practices for addressing the needs of students with disabilities into professional learning and teaching activities • Determining student progress at the secondary level • Implementing an effective Response to Intervention (RTI) framework in secondary schools • Developing and implementing research-based secondary school reading interventions • Identifying programs and activities that will help students reach their post secondary school goals by 	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit

<p>linking graduation, dropout, secondary transition, and post-school outcomes to drive student improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing technical assistance on the 15 Strategies for Dropout Prevention from the National Dropout Center 		
<p>Completion and Implementation of a State Action Plan: This Community of Practice has met 3 times to continue the work related to ensuring that student's with opportunities can access a regular or alternate diploma and are well-prepared for transition to life beyond high school. The team is also in the process of developing a State Action Plan and will implement the plan upon completion.</p>	<p>Ongoing through June 30, 2013</p>	<p>Director, TTA Unit DSE Leadership Team</p>
<p>Refinement of SEDS to facilitate best practice and compliance related to required secondary transition content</p>	<p>FFY 2010</p>	<p>Director, Data Unit and Policy Unit</p>
<p>Creation of guidance aligned with release of updated SEDS content</p>	<p>FFY 2010</p>	<p>Director, Data Unit and Policy Unit</p>

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.
(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a) (3) (A))

Measurement: The total number of students with IEPs dropping out grades 7-12 divided by the total membership in grades 7-12.

$$\frac{\text{Total \# of dropouts (students with IEPs) from grades 7-12}}{\text{Total enrollment in grades 7-12}}$$

The dropout rate is calculated from data pulled from grade seven through grade twelve. A dropout is defined as any student who was in attendance on the date of the official count of one school year and not in attendance on the official date the of the following school year. Students may have left school for any one of the following reasons:

- No show/ Nonattendance
- Whereabouts unknown
- Work
- Voluntary (e.g. marriage, military, hardship)
- Adult education that is not part of the District instructional program

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The local schools input the information into DC STARS that is housed in OIT. The information is coded with a category that identifies students that are considered drop-outs. From these coded students the number identified as drop-out is determined.

DCPS uses various tracking systems and hard copy surveys in order to collect and determine the drop-out information for State reporting purposes. The data collection includes the following: Student Services spreadsheet, which includes DCPS LEA's information on all students beyond ten days. The Office of Accountability calculates the rates for drop-outs.

How District of Columbia SEA Defines Dropouts:

Dropouts are defined as students who are enrolled in school on the official membership day in October of one year (e.g., 2006) in this example) and not enrolled in school on the official membership day in October of the following year (e.g., 2007) and **whose reason for leaving school is one of the following.**

- Whereabouts Unknown
- No Show
- Voluntary
- Work
- Adult Education

■ Non-Attendance

Common Core of Data: How Drop-out Status is Determined:

The DC SEA, Office of Accountability currently uses the NCES definition of drop-out. The NCES defined a dropout as an individual who

1. was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year (e.g., 1998-99); and
2. was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year (e.g., 1999-2000); and
3. has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and
4. does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
 - a. transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs);
 - b. temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or
 - c. death.

Individuals who complete 1 year of school but fail to enroll at the beginning of the subsequent year ("summer dropouts") are counted as dropouts from the school year and grade in which they fail to enroll. Those who leave secondary education but are enrolled in an adult education program at the beginning of the school year are considered dropouts. However, note that dropout status is determined by a student's status on October 1. Students who receive their GED certificate by October 1 are not counted as dropouts if the state or district recognizes this as an approved program. Although a student whose whereabouts is unknown is considered a dropout, states are not required to count students who leave the United States as dropouts even if there is no information about such students' subsequent enrollment status. A student can be counted as a dropout only once for a single school year but can, if he or she repeatedly drops out and re-enrolls, appear as a dropout in more than 1 year.

How DC SEA Calculates Drop-Out Rates:

For grade 9 (for example), the dropout rate = the number of dropouts divided by the enrollment, repeat for other grade (see example in blue)

October 2007 – grade 9

School X has 200 students enrolled in October 2007

October 2008 – of the 200, 20 have dropped out; 20 have transferred in from Texas; and 25 transferred out (to charter schools in Florida)

Therefore, dropouts = 20 (based on above categories)

Denominator = $200 - 25 = 195$

Ungraded students – The data for drop-outs include students through the age of 19. Ungraded students were assigned age-appropriate grades.

Starting in 2007-2008-NGA method – must collect the year that students enter grade 9 for the first time (including transfers in to state, districts, and schools)

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The original set of data is collected and reported by the Office of Accountability which includes information on general education students.

Total # drop-outs grades 7-12 with IEPs

Total # of students with disabilities enrolled (Total membership) grades 7-12 with IEPs

NEW BASELINE DATA

2005 (2005-2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 7.2% (3703/269)
-----------------------------	--

REVISED MEASURABLE AND RIGOROUS TARGETS

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce the dropout rate to 7.0 percent for students with disabilities.
2007 (2007-2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce the dropout rate to 6.8 percent for students with disabilities.
2008 (2008-2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce the percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school to 6.6%.
2009 (2009-2010)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce the percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school to 6.4%.
2010 (2010-2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce the percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school to 6.2%.
2011 (2011-2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce the percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school to 6.0%.
2012 (2012-2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce the percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school to 5.8%.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Establish a comprehensive data management system REVISION: Create a State data Collection System to adequately capture exit data.	2005-2006 Spring 2008	Data Analyst OSSE OIT
DCPS will work with OIT to design criteria for LEAs to submit state data requirements. Designate a team to effectively monitor the submission and collection of data.	Spring 2006	OIT, Director of SEA/LEA Affairs
Provide information about this reporting requirement, training on drop-out data collection to LEAs	Spring 2006	OIT,

<p>Implement the High School Restructuring Plan Plan and design academic intervention programs to include students with disabilities with a focus at the ninth and tenth grades.</p> <p>Develop and implement the Certificate of Employability to high school graduates</p> <p>Create greater access for students with disabilities to career and technology programs and vocational education training.</p>	<p>August 2007 and ongoing</p>	<p>SEA Data Management Team</p>
<p>Implement a positive behavioral support system in every secondary school.</p> <p>Introduce new instructional pathways such as technology, math and sciences, and world languages..</p> <p>Implement the flexible time for graduation</p>	<p>February 1 2007</p>	
<p>A training module on high quality transition planning and ways to engage students in the transition planning process to ensure students are involved in meaningful activities related to their transition to postsecondary life</p>	<p>Spring 2007</p>	
<p>Require schools with high dropout rates to engage in analysis of cause and develop specific improvement/corrective action plans to address deficiencies.</p>	<p>Spring 2008 and on-going</p>	<p>OSSE Drop-out Prevention Team</p>
<p>State Transition Council will review disaggregated graduation and dropout data and make recommendations to the OSSE for focused monitoring for LEAs falling well below state average for graduation and dropout rates</p>	<p>Summer 2008</p>	<p>State Transition Council</p>
<p>Analyze data across indicators related to graduation (dropout, transition, parental involvement, suspensions and expulsions) to establish corollary relationships for focused monitoring</p>	<p>Summer 2008 through Fall 2008</p>	<p>State Transition Council and OSSE Drop-Out Prevention Team</p>
<p>OSSE will examine transition-related activities and align them with the National Standards and Indicators for Secondary Education and Transition for program effectiveness. OSSE will disseminate standards after completion to interagency partners, Special Education Personnel, Directors of Special Education, and institutions of higher education.</p>	<p>Fall 2008 through Spring 2009</p>	<p>OSSE/Transition Coordinator</p>
<p>OSSE will host a Dropout Intervention Forum, which will provide an overview of dropout issues including: predictors, prevention strategies, and dropout prevention programs.</p>	<p>Fall 2009 Through 2011</p>	<p>OSSE and Drop-out Prevention Team</p>

OSSE will provide technical assistance and resources to LEAs on methods of decreasing dropout rates.	Fall 2008 and on-going	OSSE and Drop-Out Prevention Team
Questions regarding reasons for drop-out will be included in the Post-School Outcome Survey for Indicator 14 in an effort to analyze reasons for drop-out and support creation of programs.	Spring 2006 and annually.	State Transition Office

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Completion of Secondary Transition Monitoring Pursuant to OSSE's Memorandum of Agreement with OSEP: Pursuant to OSSE's MOA with OSEP, the Quality Assurance and Monitoring (QAM) unit began regular monitoring of 100 IEPs of students with disabilities aged 16 or older to ensure compliance with requirements related to secondary transition content.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, QAM Unit
Implementation of a Training Series to Support Secondary Success: The DSE's Training and Technical Assistance (TTA) Unit facilitated a robust training series in SY 2009-2010 which will continue annually through 2013. This LEA training series includes trainings specifically designed to ensure the success of students in secondary grades. Specifically, the training series includes the following training content: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing measurable annual goals and objectives for transition services utilizing SEDS • Integrating best practices for addressing the needs of students with disabilities into professional learning and teaching activities • Determining student progress at the secondary level • Implementing an effective Response to Intervention (RTI) framework in secondary schools • Developing and implementing research-based secondary school 	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit

<p>reading interventions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying programs and activities that will help students reach their post secondary school goals by linking graduation, dropout, secondary transition, and post-school outcomes to drive student improvement Providing technical assistance on the 15 Strategies for Dropout Prevention from the National Dropout Center 		
<p>Completion and Implementation of a State Action Plan: This Community of Practice has met 3 times to continue the work related to ensuring that student's with opportunities can access a regular or alternate diploma and are well-prepared for transition to life beyond high school. The team is also in the process of developing a State Action Plan and will implement the plan upon completion.</p>	<p>Ongoing through June 30, 2010</p>	<p>Director, TTA Unit DSE Leadership Team</p>
<p>Refinement of SEDS to facilitate best practice and compliance related to required secondary transition content</p>	<p>FFY 2010</p>	<p>Director, Data Unit; Policy and QAM Units</p>
<p>Creation of guidance aligned with release of updated SEDS content</p>	<p>FFY 2010</p>	<p>Director, Data Unit; Policy and QAM Units</p>

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Measurement:

- A. **AYP Percent** = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size)] times 100.
- B. **Participation rate percent** = [(# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated 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.
- C. **Proficiency rate percent** = [(# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)].

Indicator 3A

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The data for this indicator were based on the results of the DC CAS, the statewide assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics and the DC CAS-Alt, a portfolio-based assessment used to measure achievement of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities on alternate achievement standards. The data were calculated by the OSSE Office of Assessments and Accountability and are the same data as reported for ESEA purposes.

Clarification of Definitions for Indicator 3A:

The minimum number of students ("n" size) for an LEA to be included in this indicator is 25, based on the *District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent Accountability Plan*; previously the FFY 2007 APR used an n-size of 40 students. This change is due to the alignment of this indicator with Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) data used for accountability reporting under Title I of the ESEA. This calculation only takes into account AYP assessment targets for reading/language arts and mathematics proficiency, not targets for graduation or other elements of AYP. The definition of meeting the state's AYP target for the disability sub-group is found in section 1111(b)(2)(C) of Title I of the ESEA. The data derived for this analysis is found at: <http://www.nclb.osse.dc.gov/reportcards.asp>.

In the process of developing the Accountability Plan, OSSE's Department of Assessment and Accountability held regular meetings with LEAs to receive stakeholder input and presented a final draft plan to the State Board of Education for approval. Descriptors for the state general reading and math assessments were approved by the state Board of Education in July 2006. Standard-setting and performance level descriptors for the state alternate assessment were approved by the State Board of Education in October 2007. Standard-setting and performance level descriptors for the state general and alternate science assessments were approved in October 2008.

Display 3A-1: LEAs Making AYP

	FFY 2008
No. of LEAs with the minimum "n" size of students with disabilities	15
No. of LEAs that met AYP	2
Percent of LEAs that met AYP	13.33%

Determining Annual Targets

The annual Adequate Yearly Progress targets were determined in the manner prescribed by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) using test data from the 2001-2002 school year. Proficiency was defined as scoring at the 40th percentile or higher. This was used to compute the proficiency rate for each school and for each citywide subgroup. Two possible targets were then calculated, one based on school data and one based on subgroup data.

- The target based on school data was determined by ranking the schools according to the percent proficient from high to low. The number of students in each school was then summed from the lowest ranking schools until 20% of the students were accounted for. The percent proficient for the school at this 20% enrollment point was a tentative target.
- The lowest subgroup proficiency rate was the other tentative target.

NCLB required that the higher of the two targets was used as the baseline and the school-based targets were selected. There are separate elementary and secondary targets for Reading and Math shown below.

2004-2005		
<u>Level</u>	<u>Reading</u>	<u>Math</u>
Elementary	30.3	38.4
Secondary	13.7	19.8

After the baseline targets were established the annual targets had to be increased on a path to 100% in 2014. DCPS decided to increase the targets every 2 years, which will result in 6 increases from 2002 until 2014.

Safe Harbor

A school or subgroup that does not reach the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) target can still make AYP by achieving Safe Harbor. This can be done by reducing the difference between the group's percent proficient in the previous year and 100 percent by at least 10 percent. For example, if a group has 20 percent proficient in a year, it has 80 percent not proficient. Therefore, the group must reduce the percent not proficient by 8 percentage points to 72 percent, which would convert to 28 percent proficient.

The procedure explained above follows the requirements of NCLB.

Alternate Assessment

Students who are unable to function on the regular assessment are assessed using the DCPS Alternate Assessment. Their work is scored on a 5-point scale by a set of trained DCPS teachers and their scores are counted as proficient (score of 4 or 5) or not proficient for AYP purposes. They are included in the school data and in all subgroups for which they qualify (e.g., ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, LEP/NEP).

The data is collected by the Office of Accountability through a process that ensures the security and confidentiality of the process.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

There were three LEAs that had at least 40 disabled students in the grades tested. None of these LEAs made AYP. The other 39 did not have the 40 students required in reporting AYP. The 39 are charter schools all with low enrollments in the tested grades. DCPS LEA elementary schools not making AYP were based on students with disabilities (SWD). On the secondary level the only group making AYP in reading was Asian; no group made it in math. Charters did not make AYP due to students with disabilities on the elementary level and on the secondary level for reading.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

In addition to the LEAs meeting the criteria to be included in the evaluation, many of the other LEA's also did not make AYP. Thus, a remedy needs to be applied to all LEAs.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
	The percentages below represent projected rigorous targets based on a minimum enrollment of 25 students with disabilities in the LEAs.
2005 (2005-2006)	NCLB targets for reading: elementary, 53.54%; secondary, 42.46% NCLB targets for mathematics: elementary, 58.94%; secondary, 46.54%
2006 (2006-2007)	NCLB targets for reading: elementary, 53.54%; secondary, 42.46% NCLB targets for mathematics: elementary, 58.94%; secondary, 46.54%
2007 (2007-2008)	NCLB targets for reading: elementary, 65.16% ; secondary, 56.84% NCLB targets for mathematics: elementary, 69.21%; secondary, 59.91%
2008 (2008-2009)	At least 50% of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size will meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup.
2009 (2009-2010)	At least 50% of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size will meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup.
2010 (2010-2011)	At least 50% of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size will meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup.
2011 (2011-2012)	At least 50% of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size will meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup.
2012 (2012-2013)	At least 50% of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size will meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Train teachers with job embedded strategies that are aligned with the standards and curriculum. Differentiated instruction training.	Ongoing	LEAs
Positive behavior support strategy training.	Ongoing	OSE
Community-based collaboration with city agencies to promote the importance of preparation and participation in school testing programs with support and incentives.	Spring 2006	DC Housing Authority Recreation Dept Health Dept Local Media

*Note: The FFY 2008 targets were revised after stakeholder input was received. FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 will be revised after stakeholder input has been received.

Indicator 3B

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The review of the policies and guidelines for participation in the assessment for students with disabilities provide for all students to be accommodated.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The required AYP participation rate is 95% and currently DCPS is at 84% for students with disabilities.

Reg. Assess. w/o Acc.	Reg. Assess. w/Acc.	Alternate Assess. w/St.	Alternate Asses. w/A.St.	Total in Group
1076	2265	n/a	241	3582

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Review of the 618 data for 04-05 charts of the 3,582 student taking the assessment there were 2265 taking the assessment with accommodations.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beginning with 84% in the overall participation rate in the baseline year with gains of 4% a year based on the NCLB target, reaching 95% by 2007.
2006 (2006-2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beginning with 84% in the overall participation rate in the baseline year with gains of 4% a year based on the NCLB target, reaching 95% by 2007.
2007 (2007-2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beginning with 84% in the overall participation rate in the baseline year with gains of 4% a year based on the NCLB target, reaching 95% by 2007.
2008 (2008-2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation rate for children with IEPs will be 95%.
2009 (2009-2010)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation rate for children with IEPs will be 95%.
2010 (2010-2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation rate for children with IEPs will be 95%.
2011 (2011-2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation rate for children with IEPs will be 95%.
2012 (2012-2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation rate for children with IEPs will be 95%.

Improvement Activities**Timelines****Resources**

Professional development for teachers on best practices for testing strategies.	2006 – 2011	School Support Unit (SSU) Directors of Content
Staff development and training to inform teachers of the availability and types of resources and accommodations.	Spring 2006	School Support Unit LEA Directors
Incorporate incentives/rewards for student participation.	Spring 2007	Assistant Superintendents Principals Special Education Coordinators (SES)
Parent training/involvement through collaboration with the PTA.	Spring 2007	Parent Training Institute (PTI)

Indicator 3C

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Participation Rate

The participation rate for AYP purposes for schools and subgroups is calculated by dividing the number of students tested by the number enrolled. Only Full Academic Year students are included in the AYP participation rate. These are students who were enrolled on the official membership day in early October and on the first day of testing in April.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**REPORT CARDS**

REPORT CARD ALL SCHOOLS						Year : 2005 Group : STATE REPORTS	
GROUP	NUMBER IN GROUP	READING			MATH		
		Number Tested	% Tested	% Proficient	Number Tested	% Tested	% Proficient
ETHNICITY							
(1) (2)	67	64	95.52%	37.88%	62	92.54%	40.91%
Asian/Pacific Islanders (2)	272	256	94.12%	57.14%	257	94.49%	81.95%
Black, non-Hispanic (2)	19,093	17,508	91.70%	37.63%	17,319	90.71%	42.00%
Hispanic (2)	1,898	1,799	94.78%	40.76%	1,812	95.47%	56.63%
Amer. Indian/Alaskan Native*	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
White, non-Hispanic (2)	906	853	94.15%	83.06%	855	94.37%	84.39%
GENDER (3)							
(1)	58	56	96.55%	29.82%	54	93.10%	35.09%
Female	11,072	10,358	93.55%	43.96%	10,289	92.93%	48.40%
Male	11,113	10,073	90.64%	36.07%	9,969	89.71%	42.53%

SPECIAL EDUCATION							
Disabled (2) (4)	4,585	3,935	85.82%	15.99%	3,868	84.36%	15.77%
Non-disabled (2)	17,658	16,552	93.74%	46.24%	16,444	93.12%	53.17%
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY							
Lep/Nep (2)	1,493	1,426	95.51%	37.15%	1,424	95.38%	59.38%
Non-Lep/Nep (2)	20,750	19,061	91.86%	40.33%	18,888	91.03%	44.65%
ECONOMIC STATUS							
Econ. Disadvantaged (2)	14,840	14,026	94.51%	37.35%	13,882	93.54%	43.87%
Non-Econ. Disadvantaged (2)	7,403	6,461	87.28%	45.26%	6,430	86.86%	48.57%
MIGRANT STATUS (3)							
Migrant (2)	47	47	100.00%	45.65%	47	100.00%	65.22%
Non-migrant (2)	22,196	20,440	92.09%	39.97%	20,265	91.30%	45.39%
TOTAL (2)	22,243	20,487	92.11%	39.99%	20,312	91.32%	45.43%

REPORT CARD NOTES

* No data are displayed for groups with less than 10 students.

(1) Group membership is not known.

(2) This group includes at least one LEP/NEP student who has been in a U. S. school for less than one year. These students are counted in percent tested but not in percent proficient. For a more detailed explanation see [Question 9](#) in the NCLB-related questions on the Home Page.

(3) Females, males, and migrants are not subject to AYP targets.

(4) This group includes at least one student who took the alternate assessment.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The baseline data indicates that 16% of students with disabilities scored proficient out of the 84% of students with disabilities participating in the state-wide assessment.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Equip 100% of schools with wiring capability to support the technology necessary. Beginning with 16% in the baseline year, gain 11% a year based on the NCLB target.
2006 (2006-2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beginning with 16% in the baseline year, gain 11% a year based on the NCLB target.
2007 (2007-2008)	The proficiency rate of children with IEPs measured against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards will be 60.53%.
2008 (2008-2009)	The proficiency rate of children with IEPs measured against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards will be 60.53%.
2009 (2009-2010)	The proficiency rate of children with IEPs measured against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards will be 73.69% —60.53% for elementary reading; 55.21% for elementary math; 57.69% for secondary reading; 55.14% for secondary math.
2010 (2010-2011)	The proficiency rate of children with IEPs measured against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards will be 73.69% —73.69% for elementary

	reading; 70.14% for elementary math; 71.79% for secondary reading; 70.27% for secondary math.
2011 (2011-2012)	The proficiency rate of children with IEPs measured against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards will be 73.69% for elementary reading; 70.14% for elementary math; 71.79% for secondary reading; 70.27% for secondary math.
2012 (2012-2013)	The proficiency rate of children with IEPs measured against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards will be 86.85% for elementary reading; 85.07% for elementary math; 85.90% for secondary reading; 85.14% for secondary math.

*Note: The FFY 2007, FFY 2008, FFY 2009 and FFY 2010 targets were revised to align with ESEA targets.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Align standards and assessments Ensure that the schools not meeting AYP are participants in the supplemental educational services as mandated by Title One. Implement comprehensive reading programs. Positive behavior support evidenced in building-wide and classroom behavior management systems.	Fall 2005 Ongoing	Office of Accountability Office of Academic Services
Schedule teacher training on strategies on teaching for learning. Create an inviting, welcoming and clean school environment.	Winter Break 2005-2006 and Ongoing	Office of Assessment & Accountability (OAA) OAS
Identify incentives for attendance. Provide basic materials, supplies and equipment for general teaching of ALL students. (textbooks, supplemental materials, audio-visual equipment, computers, scientific calculators, science kits, geography kits, etc.) Materials, supplies, equipment and training on the uses to promote differentiated instruction.	2006 - 2011	OAA OAS
Community based, off school property, functions to promote the importance of preparation for learning in the home and community to benefit school.	2006 – 2011	OAA OAS
Character development.	Spring 2007	OAA OAS
Exposure to the city as a classroom incorporated into the standards.	Fall 2007	OAA OAS
Implement scientific and comprehensive research- based technology programs.	Spring 2007	NOVANET SuccessMaker LeapFrog

Improvement activities for Indicators 3A, 3B and 3C include:

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Provide all administrators an opportunity to meet with TTA staff to take a close look at individual school performance data to discuss where the LEAs are with respect to meeting AYP.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff
Professional development workshops were conducted on interpreting data (e.g. "So What Does This All Mean?"). As a result, attendees learned how to identify sources of student data, and based on the data, isolate area(s) of deficiency, create goals and/or determine the appropriateness of existing goals, create interim assessments to determine instructional effectiveness, and track student progress over time.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Ongoing professional development opportunities are offered to teachers, paraprofessionals, and support staff on lesson-planning and the use of UDL. Participants learn to plan lessons using information about student competencies and deficiencies.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Work in conjunction with QAM to analyze data both at the LEA and school level to determine appropriate technical assistance, and provide resources for increasing the participation and improving the performance of students with disabilities on statewide assessments.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; Director, QAM Unit
Increase training and support for LEAs in the RTI Pilot. Selected schools and/or LEAs within the District will receive ongoing training and support in implementing RTI. The support will begin with a summer 2009 "Boot Camp" that has been designed to introduce all teaching and administrative personnel to the tenets of RTI while assisting personnel in transitioning into the first days of school armed with tools to assist in school-wide intervention. Training and resources will be funded by OSSE. In addition to training and technical support	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors

offered by TTA, all participating campuses will receive training from nationally recognized experts in academic and behavioral interventions.		
Provide professional development in reading training and technical assistance with a focus on needs of special education teachers.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Provide an ongoing <i>Leadership Training</i> series aimed at assisting school leaders to build capacity, develop and articulate their vision and mission, shape school culture, achieve data sophistication, and develop and support master teachers (as well as parent and community outreach initiatives).	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4a: 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
- 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))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = $\left[\left(\frac{\text{\# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs}}{\text{\# of districts in the State}} \right) \times 100 \right]$
- B. Percent = $\left[\left(\frac{\text{\# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards}}{\text{\# of districts in the state}} \right) \times 100 \right]$

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

The state defines 'significant discrepancy' as *the suspension and expulsion of any child with a disability for 10 or more cumulative days in a school year by an LEA with a qualifying subgroup at a rate that is higher than the equivalent rate for non-disabled peers.*

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

FFY 2008 is the first year for which OSSE is able to report data for this indicator, due to the fact that OSSE adopted a new definition for significant discrepancy with broad stakeholder input.

These data are derived from SY 2007-2008 (FFY 2007) as required and constitute baseline data for this indicator. Data are analyzed and reported for LEAs with a qualifying subgroup. A qualifying subgroup is defined as an LEA serving a minimum of 40 students with disabilities.

In July, 2008, shortly after the close of the FFY 2007 IDEA reporting period, OSSE launched the Interim Collection Tool (ICT), a web-based application that enabled LEAs to report discipline data for the purpose of 618 reporting. While FFY 2007 special education discipline data were collected by the ICT, corresponding general education discipline data were incomplete. To comply with reporting FFY 2007 discipline data in accordance with OSSE's definition of significant discrepancy for the FFY 2008 APR, OSSE subsequently requested that all LEAs submit via spreadsheet FFY 2007 general education discipline data on students subject to suspensions or expulsions of greater than ten days. For FFY 2008, to be reported on February 1, 2011, OSSE simultaneously collected general and special education discipline data using a revised web-based application, the Interim Data Collection Tool (IDCT).

Baseline Data for FFY 2007 (2007-2008):**Display 4A-1: Percent of LEAs with Significant Discrepancy**

LEAs with qualifying subgroup		14	
Number of LEAs with significant discrepancy		6	
Percent of LEAs with significant discrepancy		42.86%	
LEAs with qualifying subgroup	General education discipline rate	Special education discipline rate	Number of special education students disciplined equal to or greater than ten cumulative days
1	0.75%	0.92%	121
2	0.00%	0.00%	1
3	0.00%	0.00%	0
4	1.09%	0.00%	0
5	0.00%	0.00%	0
6	8.29%	5.74%	14
7	4.21%	1.23%	1
8	0.76%	1.79%	1
9	0.32%	1.52%	1
10	0.00%	3.70%	2
11	0.00%	0.00%	0
12	0.00%	0.00%	0
13	0.00%	4.00%	2
14	0.00%	1.32%	1

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Of 14 LEAs with a qualifying subgroup, 6 LEAs were identified as having a significant discrepancy based on the state's definition, a total of 42.86% of qualifying LEAs. The target for Indicator 4A of 0% was not met.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices for Identified LEAs:

Upon identification of LEAs who meet the criteria of significant discrepancy, states must complete a review of the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPS), the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures and practices comply with the applicable requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Act of 2004.

OSSE has notified the six (6) LEAs that they must submit for review their policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards. This review will be completed prior to June 30, 2010 in order to ensure that the identified LEAs have compliant policies, practices and procedures in place prior to the beginning of the 2010- 2011 SY. OSSE will report on the results of this review in the FFY2009 APR.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Baseline data does not include LEA charter schools. There data was not disaggregated by number of suspended days, disability or ethnicity. However, as reported in last APR a student with a disability from a charter LEA has a greater chance of being suspended than a student in a noncharter school.

Number of LEAs with significant discrepancies.		None to report to date.
# of LEAs	LEAs w/ General Education SUSPENSION/ EXPULSION	LEA w/ Special Education SUSPENSION/ EXPULSION
*41 LEAs	**22	**19
DCPS LEA Students Suspended/Expelled		
1 LEA (DCPS)	1079 (General Ed.) (Includes less than 10 days also)	188 (Special Education) (Includes less than 10 days also) (Suspended students only, DCPS did not expel any students.)
		26 (Included in the 188 for over 10 days for drugs or weapons)

*Only the DCPS LEA has the disaggregated data by number of days, disability and ethnicity. The 618 Data Report will include this information for the number of LEAs in the 05-06 count. Based on information available rigorous targets have been set.

** The forty charter LEAs include all suspensions and expulsions not only the ones for more than 10 days.

The 04-05 data suggest that the students suspended for ten days or more for drugs or weapons is 26 as compared to the 1,228, the number suspended or expelled for that period for all infractions. The student enrollment is **62,306**, of which **11,297** are students with disabilities. All of the suspended or expelled students in this category are members of one ethnic group with the exception of one student.

> 10 Suspensions or Expulsions for Drugs (D) or Weapons (W)	03-04			04-05		
	> 10 Days All Students	DRUGS > 10 SPED	WEAPON S > 10 SPED	> 10 Days All Students	DRUGS > 10 SPED	WEAPONS > 10 SPED
Suspensions/ Expulsions > 10 Days	1,705 (2.619%)	n/a	n/a	1,228 (1.970%)	n/a	n/a
Special Ed. Suspensions/ Expulsions > 10 Days	167 (1.39)	10	46	99 (.876%)	13	13

There were 1,705 students overall suspended or expelled for 10 days or more across all categories of this number 167 were students with disabilities in the 03-04 school year. Fifty-six of these students were suspended or expelled as a result of drugs or weapons; 10 for drugs and 46 for weapons.

There were a total of 1,228 students suspended or expelled for 10 days or more across all categories and of this number 99 were students with disabilities in the 04-05 school year. Twenty-six of these students were suspended or expelled as a result of drugs or weapons; 13 for drugs and 13 for weapons.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The comparison of the data for the 03-04 and the 04-05 school years shows a drop in the numbers of students unilaterally removed for drugs and weapons between the two years referenced. The reduction in numbers is manifested in the surveys submitted from charter schools and forms submitted from DC LEA to their respective offices for documentation.

The data supports a greater need for attention in the area of disruptive school behavior in the verbal and physical category (confrontational words and fighting), in addition to the focus on eliminating drugs and weapons in the educational environment.

CORRECTION TO THE 618 DATA

The data submitted for the 03-04 school year included students with disabilities removed for less than 10 days for offenses not related to weapons or drugs. The report should have noted the revision of the data for school year 2003-2004 is listed below:

	1A	1B	1C	2	3A	3B	3C
2003-2004	56	10	46	None	0	0	0
2004-2005	26	13	13	None	0	0	0

a review of all of the data suggests that students with disabilities are not being suspended at the rate of their non-disabled peers. In addition students without disabilities who exhibit disruptive classroom behaviors are more regularly referred for eligibility determination rather than an effective intervention program.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce suspensions and expulsions due to weapons and drugs to 0% for students with a disability.• Reduce the number of districts with significant discrepancies by 2% from baseline.
2006 (2006-2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce the number of districts with significant discrepancies by an additional 2% from baseline.
2007 (2007-2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce the number of districts with significant discrepancies by an additional 2% from baseline.
2008 (2008-2009)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 0% of LEAs will have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.
2009 (2009-2010)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 0% of LEAs will have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.
2010 (2010-2011)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 0% of LEAs will have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.
2011 (2011-2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 0% of LEAs will have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.
2012 (2012-2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 0% of LEAs will have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

Completed and Ongoing Indicator 4A Improvement Activities:

OSSE will offer recurring cycles of professional development in order to deliver training and technical assistance to decrease the number of students being suspended or expelled. In many cases, the activities listed for improvement are ones that should *be* required for the LEAs to increase the level of IDEA compliance in all districts.

1. Provided ongoing professional development workshops to all LEAs on IDEA.
 - Training and Technical Assistance was provided to all LEAs on IDEA and basic requirements. (TTA)
2. Provided professional development to Student Support Teams from all LEAs regarding addressing behavioral and academic concerns that could potentially lead to suspension and expulsions. (e.g. Positive Behavior Supports, Functional Behavior Assessment training (FBA).
 - TTA provided training to all LEAs regarding addressing behavioral and academic concerns through the Student Support Team. (TTA)
3. Conducted professional development workshops on compliance issues related to student behavior (i.e. manifestation processes for students with disabilities, De-escalating Student Behavior)
 - Targeted training was provided to LEAs requiring training and/or technical assistance sessions on compliance issues related to managing student behavior. (TTA)
4. Consulted with national experts to further the skill set of LEA staff and understanding of students who experience severe emotional difficulties. OSSE consulted with national experts during its annual Special Education Symposium. (TTA)
5. Partnered with LEAs and the Department of Mental Health to review alternative approaches for addressing the needs of students who lack social competency skills, experience severe emotional difficulties; writing school-wide discipline goals for school improvement plans. (TTA)
6. Researched other state models for addressing the behavioral needs of students with disabilities utilizing research tools, participation in webinars and conference calls with other states. (TTA)

Proposed Improvement Activities for FFY 2009:

1. Continue to provide technical assistance with the use of SEDS as a data collection tool to support the PBIS initiative. (TTA)
2. Survey LEAs to determine needs for more intensive behavioral supports and subsequent training including, but not limited to, Crisis Prevention Institute training. (TTA)
3. Partner with QAM to provide training for LEAs on alternatives to suspension and train LEA staff on how to write appropriate positive behavior goals for IEPs. (TTA)
4. Provide bi-weekly technical assistance sessions with targeted LEAs participating in the RTI model to promote the integration of positive behavior supports as a form of tiered intervention. (TTA)
5. Provide technical assistance sessions for targeted LEAs on how to collect data to inform the FBA process and development of BIPs. (TTA)

6. In conjunction with QAM, develop a LEA survey to determine potential need for more intensive supports and subsequent training from other agencies. (TTA)
7. Provide trainings to all LEAs to determine factors which contribute to significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension and expulsion of students with disabilities. (TTA)
8. Provide trainings and continuous technical assistance sessions to help LEAs analyze data on suspension and expulsion rates and correction of any significant discrepancies. (TTA)
9. Continue to consult with national experts to increase the SEA and LEA staff skill set and understanding of students who experience severe emotional difficulties. (TTA)

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Provide training and Technical Assistance to all LEAs on IDEA and basic requirements.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Provide professional development to Student Support Teams from all LEAs regarding addressing behavioral and academic concerns that could potentially lead to suspension and expulsions. (e.g. Positive Behavior Supports, Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) training.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Conduct professional development workshops on compliance issues related to student behavior (i.e. manifestation processes for students with disabilities, Deescalating Student Behavior)	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Consult with national experts to further the skill set of LEA staff and understanding of students who experience severe emotional difficulties. OSSE consulted with national experts during its annual Special Education Symposium.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Partner with LEAs and the Department of Mental Health to review alternative approaches for addressing the needs of students who lack social competency skills, experience severe emotional difficulties; writing school-wide discipline goals for school improvement plans.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; Department of Mental Health
Research other State models for addressing the behavioral needs of students with disabilities utilizing research tools, participation in webinars and conference calls with other States.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; technical assistance providers

Continue to provide technical assistance with the use of SEDS as a data collection tool to support the PBIS initiative.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; Director, Data Unit
Survey LEAs to determine needs for more intensive behavioral supports and subsequent training including, but not limited to, Crisis Prevention Institute training.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff
Partner with QAM to provide training for LEAs on alternatives to suspension and train LEA staff on how to write appropriate positive behavior goals for IEPs.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; Director, QAM Unit
Provide bi-weekly technical assistance sessions with targeted LEAs participating in the RTI model to promote the integration of positive behavior supports as a form of tiered intervention.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Provide technical assistance sessions for targeted LEAs on how to collect data to inform the FBA process and development of BIPs.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
In conjunction with QAM, develop a LEA survey to determine potential need for more intensive supports and subsequent training from other agencies.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; Director, QAM Unit
Provide trainings to all LEAs to determine factors which contribute to significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension and expulsion of students with disabilities.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Provide trainings and continuous technical assistance sessions to help LEAs analyze data on suspension and expulsion rates and correction of any significant discrepancies.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Continue to consult with national experts to increase the SEA and LEA staff skill set and understanding of students who experience severe emotional difficulties.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4B: 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))

Measurement:

Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards)}}{\text{(\# of districts in the State)}} \right] \times 100$.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

OSSE defines 'significant discrepancy' as the suspension and expulsion of any child with a disability in any racial/ethnic category for ten or more cumulative days in a school year by an LEA with a qualifying subgroup at a rate that is higher than the equivalent rate for non-disabled peers in the same racial/ethnic category. A qualifying subgroup is defined as a group with a minimum "n" size of 40 children with disabilities.

In its analysis, the State compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in any racial ethnic/category in each LEA, with a qualifying subgroup, compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same racial/ethnic category in the same LEA.

OSSE used the following comparison methodology to determine whether significant discrepancies occurred: the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs in any racial/ethnic category in each LEA, with a qualifying subgroup, are compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same racial/ethnic category in the same LEA. Twenty-nine (29) LEAs were excluded from the calculation because they did not meet the minimum "n" size of 40 children with disabilities.

Based on the data, OSSE identified 6 LEAs with a significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity for this reporting period. The LEAs were required to provide OSSE with written policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. In the future, OSSE will also request that LEAs found to have significant discrepancies provide information on each of the students that were suspended for more than 10 school days and will

review the files for compliance with IDEA requirements. For the current review, all LEAs were not required to use the State's Special Education Data System (SEDS) therefore OSSE determined that the requirement to submit student files from FFY 2008 was overly burdensome for LEAs.

Based on the review of policies, procedures and practices, OSSE found that the LEA which submitted written policies, procedures and practices had noncompliance in its policies. OSSE required the LEA to revise its policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, specifically regarding the development of behavioral intervention plans, the use of functional behavioral assessments and the proper implementation of manifestation determination meetings.

The finding of noncompliance was issued to the LEA in January 2011 and OSSE will report on the correction of noncompliance in its FFY 2010 APR due February 1, 2012. OSSE will verify all correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (using FFY 2008 data):

42.86%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Describe the results of the State examination of the data.

4B(a). LEAs with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates of Suspension and Expulsion:

Year	Total Number of LEAs	Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies by Race or Ethnicity	Percent
FFY 2009 (using 2008-2009 data)	14	6	42.86%

4B(b). LEAs with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates of Suspensions and Expulsions; and 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.

Year	Total Number of LEAs	Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies, by Race or Ethnicity, and 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	Percent
------	----------------------	---	---------

		procedural safeguards.	
FFY 2009 (using 2008-2009 data)	14	1	7.14%

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices

For each of the 6 LEAs that the State identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in FFY 2008, the State requested the submission of 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 ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.

To date, OSSE has not received submissions from 5 of the 6 LEAs. For the one LEA which submitted, the LEA was found to have noncompliance with Part B requirements. The State notified LEA regarding the results of the review, and related findings of noncompliance, in January, 2011. Within the written notification of the findings of noncompliance, the LEA is required 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 these policies, procedures and practices comply with IDEA. OSSE will report on the correction of this noncompliance in its FFY 2010 APR due February 1, 2012.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009 (2009-2010)	0% (Baseline data set in FFY 2009.)
2010 (2010-2011)	0% of LEAs will have 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.
2011 (2011-2012)	0% of LEAs will have 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.
2012	0% of LEAs will have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate

(2012-2013)	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.
-------------	---

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources (through 2012):

IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Provide training and Technical Assistance to all LEAs on IDEA and basic requirements.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Provide professional development to Student Support Teams from all LEAs regarding addressing behavioral and academic concerns that could potentially lead to suspension and expulsions. (e.g. Positive Behavior Supports, Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) training.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Conduct professional development workshops on compliance issues related to student behavior (i.e. manifestation processes for students with disabilities, De-escalating Student Behavior)	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Consult with national experts to further the skill set of LEA staff and understanding of students who experience severe emotional difficulties. OSSE consulted with national experts during its annual Special Education Symposium.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Partner with LEAs and the Department of Mental Health to review alternative approaches for addressing the needs of students who lack social competency skills, experience severe emotional difficulties; writing school-wide discipline goals for school improvement plans.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; Department of Mental Health
Research other State models for addressing the behavioral needs of students with disabilities utilizing research tools, participation in webinars and conference calls with other States.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; technical assistance providers
Continue to provide technical assistance with the use of SEDS as a data collection	Ongoing through June	Director, TTA Unit; Director, Data Unit

tool to support the PBIS initiative.	30, 2013	
Survey LEAs to determine needs for more intensive behavioral supports and subsequent training including, but not limited to, Crisis Prevention Institute training.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff
Partner with QAM to provide training for LEAs on alternatives to suspension and train LEA staff on how to write appropriate positive behavior goals for IEPs.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; Director, QAM Unit
Provide bi-weekly technical assistance sessions with targeted LEAs participating in the RTI model to promote the integration of positive behavior supports as a form of tiered intervention.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Provide technical assistance sessions for targeted LEAs on how to collect data to inform the FBA process and development of BIPs.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
In conjunction with QAM, develop a LEA survey to determine potential need for more intensive supports and subsequent training from other agencies.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; Director, QAM Unit
Provide trainings to all LEAs to determine factors which contribute to significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension and expulsion of students with disabilities.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Provide trainings and continuous technical assistance sessions to help LEAs analyze data on suspension and expulsion rates and correction of any significant discrepancies.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Continue to consult with national experts to increase the SEA and LEA staff skill set and understanding of students who experience severe emotional difficulties.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: 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))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class 80\% or more of the day)}}{\text{(total \# of students age 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \times 100 \right]$
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40\% of the day)}}{\text{(total \# of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \times 100 \right]$
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements)}}{\text{(total \# of students age 6 through 21 with IEPs)}} \times 100 \right]$

Indicator 5A

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

A review of the LRE data for the 2003-2004 school year indicated over representation.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

A review of the LRE data for the 2004-2005 school year indicated 1.722% removed <21% of the day.

	A	B	C	E
Ethnicity	Students w/IEPs < 21%	Enrollment w/IEPs	Total Enrollment	Percent Removed %
All Groups	1,073	11,294	62,306	9.5
Whites	90	397	3,192	22.7
Blacks	882	10199	52,032	8.6
Hispanics	89	652	6,011	13.7
Asian	n/a	45	1,038	X
American Indian	n/a	n/a	33	X
FORMULA	$A / B = D * 100 = E$			

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The data reported a total of 1073 students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 **less** than 21% of the day.

District of Columbia Schools: ENCORE & 618 Data

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Increase students placed less than 21% of the day to 10.5%.
2006 (2006-2007)	Increase students placed less than 21% of the day to 11.5%.
2007 (2007-2008)	Increase students placed less than 21% of the day to 12.5%.
2008	Increase the percent of students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the

(2008-2009)	regular class 80% or more of the day to 13.5%.
2009 (2009-2010)	Increase the percent of students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day to 14.5%.
2010 (2010-2011)	Increase the percent of students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day to 15.5%.
2011 (2011-2012)	Increase the percent of students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day to 16.5%.
2012 (2012-2013)	Increase the percent of students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day to 17.5%.

Improvement Activities	*Timelines	Resources
Staff development on differentiated instruction. Increase the number of model inclusion programs in schools.	Ongoing	School Support Staff
Staff training on the use accommodations and modifications of general education curriculum. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create three pre-K-12 models schools that use best practices to ensure that students with disabilities are taught in the least restrictive environment. 	Ongoing	School Support Staff
General and special training on the implementation of standards	Ongoing	School Support Staff Office of Accountability
Training on the use of the instructional materials and supplies including supplemental materials and intervention programs.	Spring 2006	School Support Staff Office of Compliance
Staff training on the collection of documentation to support exiting students with disabilities from services. Establish inclusion programs in every quadrant of the city.	2006 - 2008	School Support Staff Office of Compliance
Expand inclusion programs in every LEA	2009	OSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain model inclusion schools in 2010-2011 school year. 	2011	OSE

***Staff development efforts began the spring of 2005 and will continue.**

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Indicator 5b

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

A review of the LRE data for the 2003-2004 school year indicated under and over representation of student with disabilities being removed from regular class greater than 60% of the school day.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The data reported a total of 1744 students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 **greater** than 60% of the day.

	A	B	C	E
Ethnicity	Students w/IEPs > 60%	Enrollment w/IEPs	Total Enrollment	Percent Removed %
All Groups	1744	11,294	62,306	15.4
Whites	11	397	3,192	2.8
Blacks	1662	10199	52,032	16.3

Hispanics	67	652	6.011	10.3
Asian	n/a	45	1,038	X
American Indian	n/a	n/a	33	X
FORMULA	$A / C = D * 100 = E$			

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Due to the relatively small populations in some of the ethnicities an over or under representation can be affected by one student; however, in the data there was a significant disproportion in the population for Black students.

District of Columbia Schools: ENCORE & 618 Data

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the number of students removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day to 15.0%.
2006 (2006-2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the number of students removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day to 14.5%.
2007 (2007-2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the number of students removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day to 14.0%.
2008 (2008-2009)	Reduce the percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day to 13.5%.
2009 (2009-2010)	Reduce the percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day to 13.0%.
2010 (2010-2011)	Reduce the percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day to 12.5%.
2011 (2011-2012)	Reduce the percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day to 13%.
2012 (2012-2013)	Reduce the percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day to 15%.

Improvement Activities

Timelines

Resources

Implement effective Student Services Teams in every LEA. Annually increase the number of model inclusion programs in schools. Establish <i>effective</i> intervention programs in 35% of the schools in each LEA.	2006 Ongoing	LEA
Implement training for principals to evaluate teachers on the evidence of classroom teaching strategies for students with a disability being taught in the least restrictive environment. Create a continuum of pre-K-12 models schools that use best practices with ALL students, including students with disabilities. Develop and implement the first models by the 2006-2007 school year.	Summer 2006	LEA
Staff development with general and special education teachers on collaborative planning and teaching.	Ongoing	LEA
Increase the additional model inclusion programs by two per year in the 2007-2009 school years.	2007 - 2010	LEA
Maintain LRE	2011	LEA

Indicator 5c

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The data is collected through the Special Education Tracking System (SETS) that generates reports and presents the reporting data for students with disabilities. The system is being updated to a new system, ENCORE, that the SETS data is currently being merged for the 05-06.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

	A	B	C	E
Ethnicity	Students w/IEPs in Public/Private/Residential/	Enrollment w/IEPs	Total Enrollment	Percent Removed %
All Groups	3,499	11,294	62,306	31.0%
Whites	214	397	3,192	53.9
Blacks	3128	10199	52,032	31.0
Hispanics	131	652	6,011	20.1
Asian	n/a	45	1,038	X
American Indian	n/a	n/a	33	X
FORMULA	$A / C = D * 100 = E$			

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The data reported a total of 3,499 students with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements

District of Columbia Schools: ENCORE

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Reduce the number of students in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements to 30%.
2006 (2006-2007)	Reduce the number of students in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements to 29%.
2007 (2007-2008)	Reduce the number of students in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements to 28%.
2008 (2008-2009)	Reduce the percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements to 27%.
2009 (2009-2010)	Reduce the percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements to 26%.
2010 (2010-2011)	Reduce the percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements to 25%.
2011 (2011-2012)	Reduce the percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements to 20%.
2012 (2012-2013)	Reduce the percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements to 15%.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Implement and monitor comprehensive services plan	Ongoing	SEA & LEAs
Work with CFSA to expand foster parenting within the District.	Ongoing	City Government

Appeal all HODs that are out of compliance with the law. Provide refresher course on issues related to LRE.		
Increase high intensity service delivery availability within all LEAs.	2005-2006	SEA
Establish additional community based programs with support via MOUs with core community service agencies such as Health Services for Children with Special Needs, Dept. of Mental Health, Child & Family Services, Dept. of Youth Rehabilitation Services Agency, Rehabilitation Services Administration, Mental Retardation and Developmental Administration.	2006-2007	LEA
Create a continuum in the local school to provide for children in need of high intensity level services.	2007-2008	LEA
Build collaboration with other city agencies to develop state services.	2009 -2010	LEA
Develop a plan of comprehensive services for students with high intensity service needs.		

Added improvement activities for Indicators 5A, 5B and 5C:

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Continue rollout of the pilot program on responsiveness to intervention (RTI) in targeted LEAs. This pilot program is specifically designed to improve student achievement by providing high quality core reading instruction in general education classrooms paired with excellent interventions to supplement classroom instruction for those students who are in need of additional instructional support.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Develop a brochure on LRE that will be posted on the OSSE website. This brochure will be used as a resource tool for parents, teachers and administrators on providing a free appropriate public education for students in their least restrictive environment.	June 2012	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff
Provide training and technical assistance on the IEP process to assist school staff on the implementation of LRE for students with disabilities as stated on their IEP. In addition, OSSE will develop a Special Education Resource Manual to	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors

guide LEAs through the IEP process. The Special Education Resource Manual will be made available on the OSSE website.		
Provide LEAs with a professional development resource toolkit, which will contain researched-based resources on the topic of LRE. The toolkit will contain guidance documents covering the following: positive behavior supports, assistive technology, UDL, differentiated instruction, collaboration, effective inclusive practices, parent involvement, RTI.	September 2011	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff
Continue to provide ongoing technical assistance to LEAs in change in placement team recommendations and the Statewide RTI pilot program.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- 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))

Measurement:

- A. 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.**
B. 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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The District of Columbia implemented initiatives which promote the inclusion of preschool age children. The District of Columbia is one of three jurisdictions in the United States that has universal pre-kindergarten and is the only jurisdiction that also has full day pre-kindergarten programs. Having universal and all day pre-kindergarten programs allows for optimal opportunities for educational placements for children with disabilities with their typically developing peers. The District of Columbia is also the recipient of a Head Start grant which serves approximately 1,700 three and four year old students. Head Start's standards require that a minimum of 10 % of children enrolled in Head Start must be children with disabilities. This mandate also allows for placement opportunities for preschool aged children with disabilities with their typically developing peers. Barriers that preclude achieving a higher percentage of placement in the least restrictive environment are local school funding formulas and placement opportunities in the community. Children enrolling in their local schools after October 5, are not accounted for in the student weighted formula. This is a challenge for many principals given that 70 % of IEPs of preschool children ages three and four are developed after October 5. The placement of children in community preschool programs is also problematic. Providers who lack training and/or experience, resources, and confidence to service children with disabilities impede community early childhood programs and their willingness to care for children with disabilities.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Report Period July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005	# of Children
Early Childhood Settings	129
Early Childhood Special Education Settings	98
Home	56
Part-time Early Childhood/Part-time Early Childhood Special Education	77

Discussion of Baseline Data:

A review of the baseline data reveals that 72% of children with IEPs receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	77 % of children with IEPs will receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.
2006 (2006-2007)	82 % of children with IEPs will receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.
2007 (2007-2008)	87 % of children with IEPs will receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.
2008 (2008-2009)	92 % of children with IEPs will receive special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers.
2009 (2009-2010)	States were not required to report on Indicator 6.
2010 (2010-2011)	OSSE will develop targets after baseline data have been established.
2011 (2011-2012)	OSSE will develop targets after baseline data have been established.
2012 (2012-2013)	OSSE will develop targets after baseline data have been established.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
The District of Columbia will sign a MOU with the community Head Start program which will include provisions that will grant community Head Start programs the authority to implement IEPs.	March 2006	Early Childhood Supervisor
The District of Columbia SEA will assist LEAs in drafting a proposal which will identify and set-aside funding for the placement of preschool aged children who enroll after October 5.	February 2006 and ongoing	OSE Budget Office
The District of Columbia will include in an MOU established with the Department of Human Service language that grants community preschool programs under the auspices of DHR the authority to implement IEPs.	January 2008 and ongoing	Early Childhood Supervisor
Expand capacity for the placement of three year old children with disabilities in programs with their typically developing peers.	2006 - 2011	OSE
The District of Columbia State Special Education office will provide training to community early childhood programs.	March 2006 and ongoing	619 Coordinator

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: 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))

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

During FFY 2009, the OSSE Training and Technical Assistance department provided training on the selected assessment tool (the Battelle Developmental Inventory), how to complete the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) forms and how to submit the data forms. OSSE also provided guidance on data submission requirements. These approaches were implemented to address data quality.

The OSSE Training and Technical Assistance department also provided training on early-childhood literacy, numeracy, and child behavior and classroom management in order to address program quality and to ensure that teachers and school personnel possessed the necessary knowledge and skills to effectively instruct preschool students and provide opportunities for improved social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills and use of appropriate behaviors.

In FFY 2009, the OSSE collected outcome data through LEA submission of COSFs. OSSE uses census data for this indicator. That is, OSSE will collect data from all children who enter the preschool program. Fourteen (14) LEAs provided OSSE with data. Data were submitted on a quarterly basis yet OSSE incurred challenges during the data collection process. First, there was turnover in the data specialist position that oversaw the data collection and recording, which made it difficult to track data submissions over time. Second, forms were not clearly marked with entry, interim or exit. Thus, the data specialist could not ascertain whether the data was duplicative entry data or interim/exit data. Third, there were inconsistencies in how the COSF forms were completed between LEAs and between staff within an LEA. Much of the data was either incomplete or inaccurate and was discarded.

Because of these challenges, OSSE determined that data collected last year is not valid or reliable and cannot offer baseline data at this time.

Though there were technical and qualitative concerns that arose during the data collection process, the OSSE made important steps towards establishing baseline data and improving outcomes for DC students.

As OSSE worked to obtain valid and reliable data, it also worked with LEAs to increase the quality of instruction in the three childhood outcome areas. OSSE sponsored an Early Childhood Professional Development Series for LEAs that addressed specific topics that relate to early childhood outcomes. Trainings in phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, preskills for alphabetic principles, prewriting, and early numeracy addressed acquisition and use of knowledge and skills; trainings in Response to Intervention (RTI) in a preschool setting

and in managing student behavior addressed development of positive social-emotional skills; trainings in developmentally appropriate instruction and in explicit instruction addressed ability to use appropriate behaviors to meet needs.

Over seven hundred individuals received training during the 26 specific Early Childhood trainings offered in FFY 2009. The series was led by three experts in education: Vicki Gibson, Ph.D., Connie Colbaugh, and Brenda Van Gorder. Dr. Gibson is an international and national consultant, author, speaker, and trainer. Dr. Gibson is the author of the following programs: *We Can Early Childhood Curriculum*; *I Can Draw Pre-Writing Program*; *Letter, Sounds, and Strokes Phonics Program*; and the *We Can Manage the Early Childhood Classroom*.

Connie Colbaugh is senior consultant and coach for Educational Implementation Services of Cambium Learning Group. She provides professional development and classroom demonstrations for teachers, coaches and administrators in districts throughout the nation and in American Samoa. She regularly presents at national institutes on classroom management strategies, effective instructional practices and appropriate independent practice to support student achievement in both general education and special education classrooms.

Brenda Van Gorder is an instructor for the Special Education Department, teaching the Legal & Policy Foundations of Special Education course. Brenda has worked in the special education field for 25 years as a teacher and administrator. Brenda is currently the Director of Preschool Services for the Granite School District, and prior to that was the State and Federal Compliance Officer for Special Education at the Utah State Office of Education.

Baseline Data from FFY 2009: OSSE is unable to provide baseline data from FFY 2009. OSSE will provide baseline data in its FFY 2010 APR due February 1, 2012.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2010	OSSE will set targets after baseline data have been established.
2011	OSSE will set targets after baseline data have been established.
2012	OSSE will set targets after baseline data have been established.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources (through 2012):

COMPLETED ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Childhood Outcomes Summary Forms (COSF) Training	October 27, 2009	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff
Developmental Milestones of Preschool Children - Are They on Track?	October 28, 2009	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI) Training (OSSE purchased BDI kits and LEAs who selected Battelle were provided Battelle kits at no cost).	December 7, 2010	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Struggling Pre-Kindergartners: Laying the Foundation for Success	December 9, 2009	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Early Literacy: Phonological Awareness and Phonics	December 17, 2009	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Response to Intervention (RTI) in a Preschool Setting	January 6, 2010	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Early Literacy: Vocabulary Development	January 20, 2010	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Early Numeracy Skills for Preschool Teachers	January 28, 2010	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Struggling Pre-Kindergartners: Laying the Foundation for Success	February 17, 2010	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Early Literacy: Phonological Awareness and Phonics	February 24, 2010	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
Early Literacy: Vocabulary Development	March 24, 2010	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors
TTA provided focused technical assistance to LEAs to address IEP development, data collection/entry, and IEP accommodations/modifications when it was requested by specific LEAs.	June 2010	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff
Consult the NECTAC and ECO on a monthly basis with questions related to this indicator.	March 2010	Director, TTA Unit; Director, Data Unit

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Conduct training and provide technical assistance for all LEAs on the use of the Childhood Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) assessment instrument to include collecting, scoring, and reporting the data.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff
Consult with National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) and the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) on questions related to this indicator.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; Director, Data Unit
Implement a professional development schedule on specific early literacy and numeracy instructional approaches for all LEAs.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff
Create and provide each LEA with a training and technical assistance resource manual on Early Childhood Outcomes, and post related training modules for LEAs to use as a resource guide.	June 2012	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff
Conduct training and provide continued technical assistance for all LEAs on the use of the COSF assessment instrument to include collecting, scoring and reporting the data.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff
Provide all LEAs with the Early Childhood Transition manual following completion and issuance of the Early Childhood Transition policy.	June 2012	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff
Provide professional development to all LEAs on specific early literacy and numeracy instructional approaches for all LEAs.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: 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))

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The purpose of the Parent Survey is to assist the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) State Education Agency (SEA) in determining the extent to which schools are facilitating parent involvement. The survey data will assist the schools in improving parent involvement and will result in positive outcomes for parents as well as improved outcomes for children.

DCPS SEA used a paper-and-pencil, slightly-modified version of the 26-item National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) Part B K-12 survey. A few items were modified in order to increase the readability of the survey and to make the survey appropriate for parents of age 3-5 children. Each survey was identifiable to the school. DCPS contracted with Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (MPRRC) for assistance with the data collection, data analysis, and report-writing for this indicator.

In November 2006, the Parent Survey was mailed to all parents of students age 3-21 receiving special education services during the 2005-06 school year. Parents were asked to complete and then mail the survey to DCPS. Parents were assured of anonymity.

Approximately 11,000 surveys were mailed and 152 were returned for a response rate of 1.4%. This type of response rate is typical of other DCPS parent surveys. Because of the low response rate, a random sample of 50 parents were called and asked five key questions from the Parent Survey. The responses of the phone interviewees were compared to the responses of those who completed and mailed the Parent Survey. Phone respondents were as favorable as mail respondents on four of the five questions; on one of the five questions, phone respondents were slightly less favorable than written questionnaire respondents. In addition to examining individual item results, a "percent of maximum" score based on the five items was calculated for each respondent. A respondent who answered each of the five items a "6" (Very Strongly Agree) received a 100% score; a respondent who answered each item a "1" (Very Strongly Disagree) on each of the five items received a 0% score. A respondent who answered each item a "4" (Agree) on each of the five items received a 60% score. The mean percent of maximum score for the phone respondents (59%) was slightly lower than the mean percent of maximum score for the mail respondents (67%); this slightly lower mean percent of maximum score was tied to the one of five items on which the phone respondents answered slightly less favorably than the mail respondents. Thus, in general, the results based on the mail respondents are representative of all parents of students with disabilities. Additionally, the phone respondents were asked if they had been involved in any due process hearings, complaints, mediations, or dispute resolutions within the district. The responses of those who said yes to this question were compared to the responses of those who said no. There were no significant differences between the two groups.

The representative sample of the surveys was also assessed by examining the demographic characteristics of the children of the parents who responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of all special education students. This comparison suggests the results are representative. For example, 88% of the parents who returned a survey indicated that their children are Black or African American and 89% of special education students are Black or

African American. In addition, surveys were returned from parents of children of all grade levels and from over 40% of the DCPS schools.

To address this indicator, SEA representatives reviewed the items on the written questionnaire to determine which of the 26 items related to the concept of the schools “facilitating parent involvement.” They determined that all 26 items on the Parent Survey related to this indicator. Thus, each survey respondent received a percent of maximum score based on their responses to all 26 items. A respondent who rated their experiences with the school a “6” (Very Strongly Agree) on each of the 26 items received a 100% score; a respondent who rated their experiences with the school a “1” (Very Strongly Disagree) on each of the 26 items received a 0% score. A respondent who rated their experiences with the school a “4” (Agree) on each of the 26 items received a 60% score. (Note: a respondent who **on average** rated their experiences a “4”, e.g., a respondent who rated 8 items a “4,” 9 items a “3,” and 9 items a “5,” would also receive a percent of maximum score of 60%.)

Then SEA representatives decided where to set the cut-score for determining that the school did indeed facilitate parent involvement. They decided that a 60% cut score represented the most-appropriate cut score. A 60% cut-score is representative of a parent who, on average, agrees with each item; as such, the parent is agreeing that school facilitated his/her involvement. SEA representatives did not believe it was appropriate to insist that respondents “strongly agree” (a cut score of 80%) or “very strongly agree” (a cut score of 100%) that the school facilitated their involvement in order for the respondent to be counted as someone who believes that the school facilitated parent involvement. Thus, any parent who had a percent of maximum score of 60% or above was identified as one who reported that the school facilitated his/her involvement.

Baseline Data for FFY 2006 (2005-2006):

The following table shows that 68.2% of parents reported that the school facilitated their involvement.

Percentage of parents who state that the school facilitated their involvement:

	School facilitated parent involvement
2005 (2005-2006)	68.2%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The first year of data collection indicates that the majority of parents believe that the schools facilitate their involvement; 68.2% of parents state that their child’s school facilitated their involvement.

While this overall “parent involvement” percentage provides a benchmark of the extent to which schools are encouraging and facilitating parent involvement, the SEA has also reviewed individual item results to determine specific areas in which the schools and the unit can make improvements in how they communicate with and relate to parents of special education students.

The SEA is concerned about the low response rate. The response rate of 1.4% is lower than desired. Even though the phone interviews suggest that nonresponse bias is not present, the unit will be using a different survey distribution method during the 2006-07 school year in order to achieve a higher response rate. In spring 2007, other methods besides mail will be used to distribute the survey; for example, the survey will be given to parents attending their regularly scheduled IEP meeting or at other school events that parents attend. Parents will be encouraged to complete the survey before or after the meeting/event, and to then immediately mail the survey. This in-person distribution method should result in a higher response rate this year than last year. In addition,

school principals and staff members will be shown a sample “school report” which will illustrate the type of data they will get providing they have 10 or more parents complete the survey and will be shown how they can use the data to make improvements in their relationship with parents. The Division is hopeful that this will motivate school personnel to encourage their parents to complete the survey.

The SEA set the following targets:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	68.2%
2006 (2006-2007)	68.5%
2007 (2007-2008)	69.2%
2008 (2008-2009)	70.0% of parents with a child receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities.
2009 (2009-2010)	71.0% of parents with a child receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities.
2010 (2010-2011)	72.2% of parents with a child receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities.
2011 (2011-2012)	73% of parents with a child receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities.
2012 (2012-2013)	75% of parents with a child receiving special education services will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

Improvement Activities	Timelines
Action Steps to Review and Revise Policies and Procedures	<i>Target Date</i>
Complete work on the preliminary development of the Parent Involvement survey	August 2006
Finalize the parent involvement survey	Fall 2006
Collaborated with the MPRRC to finalize survey and analyze data.	Fall 2006
Refine survey instruments as needed and begin distribution of survey questionnaires to parents.	November 2006
Collection and analysis of results, ranking of LEAs based upon survey results.	June 2006 on-going
Periodic meetings with TA partners to review data analysis and developing continuous improvement strategies.	Ongoing
Multiple teleconferences with MPRRC to receive TA	Ongoing
Identify questions containing the least favorable response and develop strategies to increase parent participation	March 2007

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Distribute the Parent Survey prior to the end of the school year and extend the survey period.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Assistant Superintendent
Offer the survey in the language spoken in the home and continue utilizing the District of Columbia Language Access Line to assist with the completion of the survey.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Assistant Superintendent
Utilize parent and community based resources to encourage the completion of the survey (i.e. Parent Training and Information Centers and DC Parent Resource Centers).	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Assistant Superintendent
Offer the survey in the language spoken in the home and continue utilizing the District of Columbia Language Access Line to assist with the completion of the survey.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Assistant Superintendent

District of Columbia Public Schools – Parent Involvement Survey

This is a survey for families of children receiving special education services. Your responses will help guide efforts to improve services and results for children and families. *You may skip any item that you feel does not apply to you or your child.*

	Very Strongly Agree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Very Strongly Disagree
<i>School's Effort to Partner with Parents</i>						
<i>School's Performance in Developing Partnerships with Parents</i>						
1. I participate equally with my child's teachers and other professionals in planning my child's educational program.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. My child's teacher and related services providers are usually present at meetings	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. We discuss services and changes in services that my child may need	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. We discuss whether my child needs services beyond the regular school year	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I receive written notice that my child would not receive services in the general education classroom.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I receive information regarding my child's progress through progress notes and IEP report cards.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I am asked for my opinion about how well the special education services my child receives are meeting my child's needs.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. My child's evaluation report is written in terms I can understand	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I receive written information that is easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Teachers are available to speak with me at parent teacher conferences or upon my request.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. I am given the opportunity to participate in manifestation determination review meetings regarding behavioral issues related to my child.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. My child transitioned from early intervention (Birth to 3) to preschool special education without a break in services	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Teachers and Administrators</i>						
13. Ask me what I think about the recommendations that are being discussed about my child's IEP and placement	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Show sensitivity to the needs of students with disabilities and their families.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Encourage me to participate in making decisions regarding my child's services	1	2	3	4	5	6

16. Answer any questions I have about decisions made regarding my child and his/her services and provide me with necessary documents related to these decisions.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Show respect for my culture and how I value it as it relates to my child's education	1	2	3	4	5	6
My Child's School						
18. Has a person on staff who is available to answer questions	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Communicates regularly with me regarding my child's progress on IEP goals	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Gives me choices regarding services that address my child's needs.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Offers me training about special education issues	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Shares with me how to request services that my child needs	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. Offers parents a variety of ways to communicate with teachers including having an interpreter available when necessary	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. Gives parents the help they may need to play an active role in their child's education	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. Provides direct services and linkages to agencies that can assist my child in transitioning from school to adult life (employment, post-secondary education and/or independent living)	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. Explains what options parents have if they disagree with a decision of the school by providing me with a copy of the parent's procedural safeguards manual.....	1	2	3	4	5	6

27. My Child's Race/Ethnicity (*circle one*):

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 Black or African American | 3 White | 5 Asian or Pacific Islander |
| 2 Hispanic or Latino | 4 American Indian or Alaskan Native | |

28. My Child's Primary Disability (*circle one*):

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| 1 Autism | 6 Hearing Impairment | 11 Specific Learning Disability |
| 2 Deaf-blindness | 7 Mental Retardation | 12 Speech/Language Impairment |
| 3 Deafness | 8 Multiple Disabilities | 13 Traumatic Brain Injury |
| 4 Developmental Delay | 9 Orthopedic Impairment | 14 Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| 5 Emotional Disturbance | 10 Other Health Impairment | |

29. My Child's Grade (*circle one*): Preschool K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

30. My Child's Age (*circle one*): 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

31. The Name of My Child's School: _____

32. My Name (optional): _____

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: 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))

Measurement:

Percent = # of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by # of districts in the State times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

OSSE adopted weighted risk ratios of .25 for under-representation and 2.5 for over-representation for FFY 2008 reporting purposes.

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2008, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and under representation) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§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' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2008, i.e., after June 30, 2009. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

DC Public Schools is a majority-minority LEA. For the 2003 – 2004 school year, as reported in the FFY 2003 – 2004 Annual Performance Report, Black students made up 83.6 % of the total student population enrolled in the DC Public School system. Using the composition index to make aggregate comparisons by race and ethnicity in regular and special education enrollment data, disproportionate representation in special education occurs in the District of Columbia when the number of students from a particular racial or ethnic group, who have been identified for special education and related services, exceed the number of students from that racial or ethnic group in the general school population. Thus, it was determined the data established a statistically significant, disproportionate number of Black students had been identified and placed in special education compared to placement rates of students from other racial or ethnic groups.

Disproportionality by Identification		
2005-2006	General Ed. Population	<i>Special Ed. Population</i>
STUDENTS		

White	5.38%	3.41%
Black	83.0%	90.3%
Hispanic	9.90%	5.88%
Asian	1.71%	0.38%
American Indian	0.06%	0.02%
	5.38%	3.41%
	100%	100%

During FFY 2008 (SY 2008-2009), OSSE examined other states' practices and decided on the adoption of a weighted risk ratio definition as a more representative formula for addressing Indicators 9 and 10. OSSE introduced the new proposed definition to the State Advisory Panel (SAP) on Special Education, seeking stakeholder input as required by IDEA. Upon consulting with the SAP, OSSE adopted weighted risk ratios of .25 for under-representation and 2.5 for over-representation for FFY 2008 reporting purposes.

The weighted risk ratio compares the chance, or risk, of children of a particular racial/ethnic group being identified for special education with the chance of children of all other racial/ethnic groups being identified for special education, taking into account the racial/ethnic composition of the student population in the District of Columbia. That is, the weighted risk ratio negates any effect on risk caused by a large or small percent of students being of a particular racial/ethnic group. The District of Columbia's weighted risk ratio limits of .25 to 2.5 means that the OSSE will investigate cases in which a particular racial/ethnic group is less than one quarter or 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.

Minimum group size for inclusion:

OSSE determined that an LEA had to have at least 40 children with disabilities in order for an LEA to be included in this indicator. In addition, within LEAs of 40 or more students with disabilities, at least five students of a single race/ethnicity are required for weighted risk ratio analysis.

2005-06 Risk of Placement in Special Education					
2005 – 2006	Total Students	Percent per Race	Special Ed. Population	Percentage of Students w/Disabilities	Risk Index
STUDENTS					
White	3210	5.38%	383	3.41%	11.9%
Black	49440	82.9%	10141	90.3%	20.5%
Hispanic	5903	9.90%	661	5.88%	11.1%
Asian	1024	1.71%	43	0.38%	4.19%
American Indian	39	0.065%	3	0.02%	7.69%

	59616	100%	11231	100%	100%
--	--------------	-------------	--------------	-------------	-------------

The numbers reported in this reporting period, (20.5%) indicate Black students who attend DC Public Schools are at a higher risk of being identified and placed in special education, compared to 11.9% for White students, 11.1% for Hispanic students, 4.2% for Asian students and 7.69 for American Indian.

The total student enrollment decreased since the last reporting period, with the exception of Asians and Native Americans that showed a slight increase. As a result the risk index reflects a decrease in most races from the last reporting period. This is reflected in the following: Black, (20.5%) Whites (11.9%) and Hispanic (11.1%) populations and there was a slight increase for Asians (4.19%) and American Indians (7.69%).

The new disproportionality indicator, however, requests states to identify all disproportionality in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification. Furthermore, studies in the literature suggest that over-representation and disproportionality as it affects Black students is particularly acute with respect to the over-representation of Black males. Thus, the District's State Education Agency will refine its analysis of disproportionality to include data disaggregated by race, ethnicity, and gender.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Baseline data and targets will be reported in the FFY 2008 (2008 – 2009) APR due in February 20010.

Disproportionality by Identification		
2005-2006	General Ed. Population	<i>Special Ed. Population</i>
STUDENTS		
White	5.38%	3.41%
Black	83.0%	90.3%
Hispanic	9.90%	5.88%
Asian	1.71%	0.38%
American Indian	0.06%	0.02%
	5.38%	3.41%
	100%	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

In response to the data on disproportionality submitted in the Federal Fiscal Year 2003 Annual Performance Report submitted by DC Public Schools, the Office of Special Education Programs directed DCPS to provide in its SPP either (1) the results of its review of policies, procedures and practices intended to address any identified significant disproportionality in the identification or placement of students with disabilities or (2) if this information is not available, a plan, including strategies, proposed evidence of change, targets and timelines to ensure that policies, procedures and practices are reviewed and, if necessary, revised no later than one year from the date that OSEP accepts the plan.

DC Public Schools and the State Education Agency will institute an aggressive corrective action plan to ensure that policies, procedures, and practices are reviewed, and if necessary, revised to eliminate any disproportionality that is

the result of inappropriate identification practices within one (1) year from the date that OSEP accepts the State Performance Plan.

Strategies To Eliminate Disproportionality

A subgroup of the broad stakeholders has been established to assist SEID staff in providing a framework for identifying, monitoring and addressing disproportionality in LEAs within the District. The subgroup, made up of a diverse group of individuals selected from the broad group of stakeholders who have assisted in the development of the State Performance Plan, will provide input on the critical issues that may be unique to the District of Columbia that impact or otherwise bear upon the reasons for over-representation in special education. The subgroup will, in particular, focus specific attention on the issues that relate to why Blacks in general, Black males in particular, are selected, referred, and identified for special education and placement in identified disability categories and more restrictive settings than are students from other racial/ethnic groups as evidenced by the 2003 – 2004 data.

The State Education Agency through the State Enforcement & Investigation Division for Special Education Programs will use multiple sources of data to refine, determine and isolate those policies, procedures, and practices that likely contribute to on-going disproportionality in any LEA in the District and to what extent, if any, the disproportionality is the result of inappropriate identification and placement practices. The ENCORE special education data tracking system that replaced the SETS tracking system, continues to be the primary source for data collection. Likewise, DC Public Schools now uses DC STARS, a state-wide student information and tracking system for all students. Both tracking systems are designed to provide more reliable data collection and analysis which, in turn, will enable the State Education Agency staff to conduct more rigorous research and data analysis on disproportionality issues.

Methodology To Ensure That Policies, Procedures and Practices Are Revised No Later Than One Year from the Date of Approval of the SPP

The State Education Agency will review, analyze and examine existing policies, procedures, and practices as needed to determine (1) whether changes need to occur in how students are identified and referred for special education and related services (2) whether systemic conditions exist that directly or indirectly result in disproportionality due to inappropriate identification and (3) what changes in policies and procedures are required to eliminate any inappropriate disproportionality.

To assist LEAs to improve results for children with disabilities and to comply with all requirements of the IDEA and its implementing regulations, the SEA for the District of Columbia uses a continuous improvement monitoring process. LEAs and schools within the DC Public School system are monitored by the State Education Agency through on-site monitoring reviews by state monitoring teams, record reviews of students' cumulative special education folders, and extensive interviews with special education teachers, administrators, related service providers, parents and other stakeholders. Eliminating disproportionality will be a monitoring priority of the S.E.I.D., particularly with respect to the over-representation of Black students in special education in general, in the specific disability categories of mental retardation and emotional disturbance, and their over-representation in the most restrictive educational settings in particular, through its compliance monitoring process. In addition, the data also suggest that language-based minority students have exceptionally high risk of identification with speech and language disabilities that may really be the result of barriers in acquiring the skills needed to master the English language as opposed to suffering individual speech and language disorders. (See Indicator 10 for statistical comparisons) Demographic data will be collected from all LEAs within the District of Columbia through monitoring reviews and self-assessment surveys developed by the S.E.I.D. Office of Monitoring and Program Certification. These surveys are distributed to all LEAs in the District scheduled for monitoring reviews during any given reporting period. Campus-based data will be collected that identifies all procedures followed by the school / LEA in referring and identifying students with disabilities, the procedures established for determining when a student requires a change in placement to more restrictive settings, and disciplinary methods and positive behavioral intervention strategies and supports used to prevent suspensions, expulsions, and the removal of students to more restrictive settings.

LEA Improvement and Corrective Action

The State Enforcement & Investigation Division for Special Education Programs will adopt a multi-tiered remedial model for correcting identified disproportionality that is the result of inappropriate identification and placement. LEAs will be identified for state-level technical assistance and support based upon the magnitude of the disproportionality reflected in the LEA's or school's child find, placement, and monitoring data. The greater the statistical disparity in the number of Black students in particular that are referred to and placed in special education, the greater the likelihood that there is inappropriate identification of Black students to special education, which in turn, will result in a more intensive level of state intervention.

Any identified disproportionality within any District LEA will be examined to determine why disproportionate representation is occurring and specifically, whether it's the result of inappropriate identification. A "Disproportionality Rating Scale" will be used to rank every LEA and DCPS school according to the degree of disproportionality found at that school. LEAs and schools will be grouped by ratings of "acceptable", "in need of improvement" and "unacceptable". The goal will be to identify, statistically, those LEAs that may require more intensive state technical assistance & professional development focused upon reducing disproportionality through adoption and utilization of appropriate identification practices. LEAs fall into this category based upon criteria that will be developed by the State Education Agency with input and collaboration from the Disproportionality Subgroup.

All LEAs and campuses identified as exhibiting problems with disproportionality (i.e., that receive ratings of "in need of improvement" or "unacceptable") will be required to participate in state-developed technical assistance and professional development activities designed to eliminate inappropriate disproportionality.

LEAs and Schools With "Unacceptable" Ratings

LEAs and schools that have the highest level of identified disproportionality will be subjected to Focused Monitoring site visits to review the LEA's policies and procedures for referring students for special education and for eliminating practices and procedures that result in inappropriate identification of students. Each LEA will be required to assess their current practices and develop technical assistance and professional development plans so that referrals, identification, and placement in special education are made with careful consideration for opportunities to assist students to remain in regular education programs, as well as to examine the tools and processes used to determine special education identification and placement.

These LEAs may be required to develop campus improvement plans that are intended to target and eliminate inappropriate identification that results disproportionality. LEAs that fall into this category will be required to assess their performance and processes to consider areas where practice or procedures may be producing disproportionality that is the result in inappropriate identification.

	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	By FFY 2005 0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2006 (2006-2007)	By FFY 2006 0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2007 (2007-2008)	By FFY 2007 0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2008 (2008-2009)	By FFY 2008 0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2009 (2009-2010)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

2010 (2010-2011)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2011 (2011-2012)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2012 (2012-2013)	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resource
Review all data sources including DCPS 618 data, ENCORE data reports, and Monitoring Self-Assessment Survey results to identify LEAs and schools within DCPS with disproportionate representation.	2006	DCPS SEA
SEA sponsored conference including disproportionality for DCPS LEAs.	May 2007 & July 2007	DCPS SEA MSRRC
Begin training for use of Focus Monitoring site visits to determine which LEAs need to revise specific LEA policies, procedures and/or practices used to identify and place students with disabilities in special education. Monitoring visits will result in the development of campus or LEA improvement plans that describe, with specificity, the concrete steps to be taken to eliminate disproportionality and over-representation at the individual campus or LEA.	2007 Ongoing	DCPS SEA Monitoring Unit NCSEAM
Provide technical assistance and professional development to LEAs to increase knowledge and awareness about issues related to disproportionality, over-representation, and cultural diversity for improving educational outcomes for students.	Ongoing	DCPS SEA MSRRC NCCRESt
Routinely use baseline data, data collection, state-level monitoring and annually as needed to achieve established targets and to eliminate disproportionality that is the result of inappropriate identification and placement.	2009 -2011	DCPS SEA

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Continue to refine the data collection process to ensure that SEDS collects all data required for federal reporting purposes.	Ongoing	OSSE Data Team and contractors
Continue to provide user training on all modifications/improvements to the SEDS.	Ongoing	OSSE Data Team and contractors
Provide technical assistance to facilitate the self-review and provide on-site technical assistance to LEAs to address identified inappropriate policies, procedures and practices.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	OSSE Training & Technical Assistance staff and contractors

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: 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)]

Measurement: Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification)}}{\text{(\# of districts in the State)}} \right] \text{ times } 100.$

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

OSSE adopted weighted risk ratios of .25 for under-representation and 2.5 for over-representation for FFY 2008 reporting purposes.

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2008, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and under representation) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§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' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2008, i.e., after June 30, 2009. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Disproportionate representation within an LEA in the District of Columbia exists whenever any racial, ethnic, or linguistic segment of the student population in the District of Columbia that are classified within specific disability categories at a greater or lesser rate than other similarly situated racial or ethnic groups. The District of Columbia State Education Agency historically has applied the composition index for determining disproportionality. The composition index is a method of analysis used to evaluate the number of special education students from different racial and ethnic groups to the total number of students in the general education population from the same racial and ethnic group. By making aggregate comparisons by race and ethnicity for disability classification categories, disproportionate over representation within specific disability categories occurs in the District of Columbia when the number of students from a particular racial or ethnic group who have been identified exceed the number of students from that racial or ethnic group in the general school population. Thus, the data established a statistically significant disproportionate number of Black students had been identified for eligibility for special education and related services in the following classifications: mental retardation, emotional disturbance, traumatic brain injury, development delay, and multiple disabilities.

2003-2004	DISPROPORTIONALITY BY DISABILITY CLASSIFICATION
STUDENTS	
White	None

Black	Mental Retardation, Emotional Disturbance, Orthopedic Impairment, Multiple Disabilities, Traumatic Brain Injury, Developmental Delay
Hispanic	None
Asian	None
American Indian	None

DISABILITY CATEGORY	White	Risk	Black	Risk	Hispanic	Risk	Asian	Risk	Amer. Indian	Risk
Specific Learning Disabilities	224	52.7 %	5,503	47.1 %	49 1	62.3 %	24	52.1 %	0	
Mental Retardation	12	2.82 %	1,517	12.9 %	38	4.82 %	2	4.34 %	0	
Emotional Disturbance	33	7.76 %	2,193	18.7 %	53	6.72 %	2	4.34 %	0	
Hearing Impairments	14	3.29 %	74	.63%	20	2.53 %	1	2.17 %	0	
Speech & Language	69	16.2 %	1,131	9.68 %	94	11.9 %	11	23.9 %	1	100%
Visual Impairments	2	.47%	25	.21%	2	.25%	0	0%	0	
Orthopedic Impairments	1	.23%	58	.49%	3	.38%	0	0%	0	
Other Health Impaired	14	3.29 %	247	2.11 %	24	3.04 %	1	2.17 %	0	
Deaf – Blindness	1	.23%	7	.05%	1	.12%	0	0%	0	
Autism	14	3.29 %	179	1.53 %	14	1.78 %	1	2.17 %	0	
Traumatic Brain Injury	1	.23%	21	.18%	1	.12%	0	0%	0	
Developmental Delays	3	.70%	51	.43%	3	.38%	0	0%	0	
Multiple Disabilities	37	8.70 %	675	5.77 %	44	5.58 %	4	8.69 %	0	
TOTALS	425	100%	11,681	100%	8 78	100%	46	100%	1	100%

The State Education Agency also developed a risk index to identify potential over-representation in specific disability categories. As previously discussed in Indicator 9, use of a risk index allows a more refined determination of the relative risk that a member of a specific subset of the student population will be identified and placed in a specific disability category. First, it allows a direct comparison between racial and ethnic groups within specific disabilities categories. Second, it allows identification of statistical placement patterns not readily apparent using the composition index method. And third, the risk index is useful in illuminating potential disproportionality and patterns of over or under identification regardless of whether the demographic subgroup is a large or small proportion of the overall student population. Thus, utilization of the risk index, and using a cut-off of 10% risk to define potential disproportionality in various disability categories, the data suggest that of all students who have been identified as being eligible for special education, all ethnic and racial subgroups have a greater risk of being identified with a learning disability than any other disability category. In addition, 12.9% and 18.7% of all Black students placed in special education are at risk of being identified as being mentally retarded and suffering from an emotional disturbance, respectively. Finally, 16.2% of all White students, 11.9% of all Hispanic students, and 23.9% of all Asian students placed in special education are at risk of being identified with a speech and language disability. The data suggest that language-based minority students have exceptionally high risk of identification with speech and language disabilities. Further analysis will be conducted to determine whether this may really be the result of barriers in acquiring the skills needed to master the English language as opposed to suffering individual speech and language disorders. (The State Education Agency's plan to eliminate disproportionality is attached as an addendum to the SPP).

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

This is a new indicator. Baseline data and targets will be reported in the FFY 2005 (2005 – 2006) APR due in February 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Since this is a new indicator, baseline data is not being provided and no discussion of the baseline data is required at this time.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2005 (2005-2006)	The target for this indicator will be zero "0" disproportionality for all LEAs in the District of Columbia
2006 (2006-2007)	The target for this indicator will be zero "0" disproportionality for all LEAs in the District of Columbia
2007 (2007-2008)	The target for this indicator will be zero "0" disproportionality for all LEAs in the District of Columbia
2008 (2008-2009)	0% of LEAs will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2009 (2009-2010)	0% of LEAs will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

2010 (2010-2011)	0% of LEAs will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2011 (2011-2012)	0% of LEAs will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
2012 (2012-2013)	0% of LEAs will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

See attached response setting forth under Indicator describing the action plan developed by the State Education Agency for reviewing the policies, procedures, and practices of LEAs and DC Public Schools necessary to eliminate identified disproportionality that is the result of inappropriate identification and placement.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2008 (SY 2008-2009):

Please note: The state views the effort necessary to demonstrate progress on indicators 9 and 10 to be intertwined. Therefore, the training activities noted below will also assist with the improvement activities of Indicator 9.

When OSSE was created as the District's SEA in October, 2007, it reviewed the SPP's existing definitions for Indicators 9 and 10 and determined that the current definitions would not produce valid data to ensure equitable practices.

During the SY 2008-2009 (FFY 2008), OSSE examined other states' practices and consulted with its federally provided technical assistance providers. After substantial review, OSSE decided on the adoption of a weighted risk ratio definition as a more representative formula for addressing these indicators. On June 18, 2009, the OSSE introduced the new proposed definition to the SAP, seeking stakeholder input as required under IDEA. The SAP voted in favor of adopting the revised definition.

While OSSE is unable to determine progress or slippage since data were not reported in FFY2007 and OSSE is reporting 0% of LEAs having disproportionate representation resulting from inappropriate identification in FFY2008, OSSE is committed to being proactive to reduce any disproportionality. The proposed activities for 2009-2010 are part of proactive work to reduce disproportionality.

The OSSE made no findings of noncompliance for this indicator in FFY 2007.

Completed Data Improvement Activities:

To ensure accurate data collection and analyses, OSSE is no longer using the ENCORE legacy database and transitioned to SEDS and supplemental spreadsheets for reporting on these indicators in FFY 2008. Further data improvement activities completed in FFY 2008 included:

- Receipt of technical assistance from DAC and Mid South to determine how best to calculate disproportionality consistent with the required measurement formula. (DATA)
- Use of a weighted risk ratio to identify LEAs at risk of potential disproportionate representation (under-representation and over-representation) due to inappropriate identification. (DATA)

Completed Training and Technical Assistance Improvement Activities:

TTA provided core training on areas designed to decrease school and LEA-based policies, practices, and procedures likely to result in disproportionate identification, including: (TTA)

- SST Training
- Best Practices Related to the IEP Process
- Data Wise- Data Based Decision Making
- Elementary, Middle, and Secondary Reading Interventions
- Response to Intervention- Overview

OSSE also initiated a state pilot of a RTI model in March 2009. Through this model, four selected LEAs receive targeted and regular professional development, training and technical assistance to effectively implement the RTI model. This model incorporates research and evidence based practices which support the appropriate referral and identification of students with special needs to prevent disproportionality among racial and ethnic groups. (TTA)

Completed Quality Assurance and Monitoring Activities:

While QAM did not execute monitoring activities related to disproportionate representation during the SY 2008-2009, DSE did examine other states' practices to develop a draft a LEA Disproportionality Self Assessment over the summer and fall of 2009. The LEA Disproportionality Self Assessment was finalized after being reviewed by OSEP staff in the fall of 2009. (QAM)

Upon adoption of the .25 to 2.5 weighted risk ratio range for under-representation and over-representation, OSSE applied this formula to both 07-08 and 08-09 LEA data. Ten LEAs were identified as being at risk for potential disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification. These LEAs received the Disproportionality Self-Assessment for completion and return to DSE by January, 2010. (QAM)

Data received from LEAs will be reviewed, including the review of LEA policies, practices and procedures that could account for their identification using the .25 to 2.5 weighted risk ratio calculation. If this review reveals unsatisfactory or noncompliant policies, practices, and procedures at any of the 10 LEAs, OSSE will issue letters of findings requiring the development of corresponding corrective action plans. (QAM)

Proposed Improvement Activities for FFY 2009:

Data Improvement Activities:

Resources: Data Unit

- Continue to refine the data collection process to ensure that SEDS collects all data required for federal reporting purposes. (DATA)
- OSSE will continue to provide user training on all modifications/improvements to SEDS. (DATA)

Training and Technical Assistance Improvement Activities:

Resources: Training and Technical Assistance Unit

- TTA continues to expand its training modules to ensure that LEAs build capacity to reduce disproportionate representation. Core trainings offered in SY 2009-2010 include, but are not limited to: (TTA)
 - LRE for LEAs
 - Understanding Early Intervening Services
 - UDL
 - Data Collection 101
 - Positive Behavior Support
 - Response to Intervention

- FBAs and BIPs
- IEP Goal Writing
- TTA also developed a specific LEA training to address LEA policies, procedures, and practices related to disproportionate representation, entitled “Addressing Disproportionality and Over-Representation in the District of Columbia.” This training will occur in spring, 2010. (TTA)
- Under the RTI pilot program, OSSE will:
 - Use the first year of the project to focus upon core instruction in kindergarten, first and second grade in elementary schools.
 - Work with each project school on improving student behavior through participation in the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program, since there is a strong link between appropriate behavior and student achievement.
 - Collaborate with the Policy Unit to issue RTI guidance to all LEAs in summer 2010, prior to the beginning of the SY 2010-2011. (TTA)

Quality Assurance and Monitoring Activities:

Resources: Monitoring Unit and Training and Technical Assistance Unit

- The Disproportionality Self-Assessment will be incorporated into the 2009-2010 LEA self assessment process introduced in March, 2010. (QAM)
- Moving forward, this component of the self-assessment will be included in OSSE’s review to determine whether an LEA qualifies for focused monitoring in SY 2009-2010. (QAM)
- The self-assessment tool includes: data verification, a review of compliance indicators related to identification, referral, evaluation, and eligibility determinations. In addition, the tool includes general education instructional delivery, school-wide interventions, assessment practices, discipline, co-planning and co-teaching, and professional development. (QAM)
TTA will continue to provide technical assistance to facilitate the self-review and provide on-site technical assistance to LEAs to address identified inappropriate policies, procedures and practices. (QAM/ TTA)

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets and Improvement Activities for FFY 2008

OSSE established a new definition for indicator 10 and it has revised its State Performance Plan accordingly.

QAM did not execute monitoring activities related to disproportionate representation during SY 2008-2009. OSSE did examine other states’ practices to develop a draft LEA Disproportionality Self Assessment over the summer and fall 2009. The LEA Disproportionality Self Assessment was finalized after being reviewed by OSEP staff in the fall of 2009 and was sent to and completed by LEAs with disproportionate representation in specific disability categories in fall 2009.

CONTINUING ACTIVIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Continue to refine the data collection process to ensure that SEDS collects all data required for federal reporting purposes.	Ongoing	OSSE Data Team and contractors
Continue to provide user training on all modifications/improvements to the SEDS.	Ongoing	OSSE Data Team and contractors
Provide technical assistance to facilitate the self-review and provide on-site technical assistance to LEAs to address identified inappropriate policies, procedures and practices.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	OSSE Training & Technical Assistance staff and contractors

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: 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.³ (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

A. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

B. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 120 days .

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.

Clarification of Definitions for Indicator 11: The State established timeline for evaluations is 120 days from referral to eligibility determination.

³ The District of Columbia uses 120 days, as opposed to 60 days, as the established timeline.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:



CHILD FIND ADVERTISEMENT ON THE DC METRO BUS

The District of Columbia Public Schools has an affirmative obligation to ensure that all children who reside within the District of Columbia or who are wards of the District of Columbia and who are suspected of having a disability, are identified, evaluated, and determined eligible for special education and related services. The timeframe imposed on this school district by the District of Columbia Board of Education is 120 days. Timely assessments and appropriate special education services are well-defined priorities in the Strategic Plan of the District of Columbia Public Schools and shall serve as the cornerstone of achieving compliance with federal requirements.

The method by which the District of Columbia will strive to achieve this goal will include, but not be limited to, a comprehensive and collaborative effort by various stakeholders within the District of Columbia community. These stakeholders will work collectively to identify potentially eligible children and/or students. Efforts have begun and will continue to focus on early intervention and identification to properly assess and determine eligibility for special education.

A review of existing data for SY 2003-2004 reveal that DCPS completed 35% of all assessments within prescribed timeframes. By June 2005, DCPS completed 46% of all assessments within prescribed timeframes. While the trend appears to be moving in the right direction, significant room for improvement exists. To that end, DCPS will employ an intervention related strategy that includes assigning related service staff to schools that have been identified as having a high number of overdue assessments. The intervention teams will support all programs – public and nonpublic (private through an MOA) – that serve children of the District of Columbia. These intervention teams will consist of the following service providers/staff:

- one psychologist
- one speech/language pathologist
- one social worker
- one occupational therapist
- one physical therapist
- one special education team leader

The focus of said teams will be to ensure that all assessments are performed in a timely manner, all assessments are current, and, in instances where assessments are out of date, that such assessments are completed thoroughly and as expeditiously as practicable. Moreover, summer assessment teams will be deployed to address assessment requests that arise during the summer months. Together, the intervention teams and the summer assessment teams will work to support the local schools and serve on the multi-disciplinary teams at meetings.

Presently, the District of Columbia Public Schools has established the Centralized Assessment Referral and Evaluation (C.A.R.E.) Center. The primary focus of the C.A.R.E. Center is to identify, locate, and provide assessments to children who attend private and religious institutions in the District, as well as bilingual students with disabilities in the District of Columbia. Parents are directed to the C.A.R.E. Center in order to sign a consent for evaluation form. Once signed, the evaluation process begins and the status of the assessments is tracked through the ENCORE data management and tracking system. ENCORE is discussed more fully below. The C.A.R.E. Center works closely with city wide agencies such as the District of Columbia Department of Human Services, Office of Early Childhood Development, Early Intervention Program to support its mission.

In order to increase awareness, the District of Columbia Public Schools, through its Office of Special Education, developed a brochure about the concept of Child Find that has been widely disseminated throughout the District. The brochure provides a definition of Child Find, lists those who may be eligible for specialized instruction and/or related services, and areas of suspected disability where children may be found eligible. Additionally, the brochure provides guidance on who may provide referrals and examples of related services that may be provided to students with disabilities.

The District of Columbia Public Schools offers reinforcement in the form of a Parent Service Center. The Parent Service Center, among other things, notifies the Office of Special Education of instances where a parent is requesting evaluations on behalf of their child for consideration of special education. The Parent Service Center is actively engaged in the activity of identifying potentially eligible children.

In order to bolster the utilization of the Parent Service Center as a resource, there are a potential of six (6) scheduled Parent Service Centers that will readily provide technical assistance, literature, and other helpful information to parents whose children are enrolled in the District of Columbia Public Schools and other local educational agencies who provide instruction to District of Columbia students. Emphasis will be placed on obtaining cooperation and consent from parents early and often. The aim of the Parent Service Centers is to be as parent friendly as possible. The support that the Parent Service Centers will provide to both the

local schools and the central administrative offices of the District of Columbia Public Schools will enable the school district to measure positive results.

The District of Columbia has made strides in increasing its accuracy with data as it has implemented a new data management and tracking system – ENCORE. The previous data system, SETS, was able to provide various reports that included data regarding the number or evaluations requested and conducted within the prescribed timeframes. ENCORE builds and improves on the existing system. The overall goal is to ensure that the most accurate and comprehensive data is readily available to all interested stakeholders of District of Columbia Public Schools.

District of Columbia Initiatives that Address Child Find

Sampling

Given the population of the District of Columbia Public Schools (including charter schools, non-public programs and residential programs), the District of Columbia will use all existing institutions within its purview for the purpose of quantifying data on the issue of Child Find. No representative samples will be utilized.

Changes in Policies and Procedures:

DC must revisit existing policies and procedures to ensure that its efforts to address Child Find in the school district are being implemented effectively. A greater emphasis has been placed on parental consent and parental involvement. Parental consent is the catalyst to all evaluation and implementation efforts. To this end, school personnel must be prepared to work collectively with parents in order to keep them well informed and to obtain parental consent to initiate the evaluation process. More focus will be on developing relationships with parents from the outset of the school year.

Staff Development and Technical Assistance

DC will continue with its efforts to provide staff development and technical assistance to school based teaching personnel, related service providers, and the greater DC community. The goal remains simple – parental inclusion and involvement in the process. To achieve this goal, staff must remain cognizant of the need to gain input and buy-in from the parent. To the extent that parents and staff work collectively to bring about early identification, the school district will be better equipped to increase its percentage of students who are identified, evaluated, and determined eligible for special education and related services within the 120 day timeframe.

DC must stand ready to offer technical assistance to help school personnel meet this lofty goal. Representatives from the Office of Special Education intervention teams and the C.A.R.E. Center must be prepared to launch a mass promotional campaign in order to emphasize the importance of early identification. Information sessions, brochures, and fliers should be part and parcel of all promotional efforts. Select communities and the schools that are domiciled within those communities should be targeted for outreach.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Since this is a new indicator, the 2005-06, baseline data will be provided and reported in the 2007 Annual Performance Report (APR).

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% compliance with timelines
2006 (2006-2007)	100% compliance with timelines
2007 (2007-2008)	100% compliance with timelines
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of children will be 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. The State established timeline for evaluations is 120 days from referral to eligibility determination.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of children will be 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. The State established timeline for evaluations is 120 days from referral to eligibility determination.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of children will be 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. The State established timeline for evaluations is 120 days from referral to eligibility determination.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of children will be 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. The State established timeline for evaluations is 120 days from referral to eligibility determination.
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of children will be 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. The State established timeline for evaluations is 120 days from referral to eligibility determination.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Activity	Timeline	Resources
(a) Review records provided by the C.A.R.E. Center and maintained in ENCORE database; (b) Identify schools with children who have not been evaluated and determined eligible/ineligible within 120 days; (c) Provide Technical Assistance (TA) and Professional Development (PD) to schools who have been unable to meet said timeline.	January 2006 and ongoing	C.A.R.E. Center; ENCORE Office; Early Childhood Intervention Office; SEID Office

Publicize data regarding the percentage of students who were identified and determined eligible within 120 days and those who were not. Establish a Child Find Quality Assurance Committee (CFQAC) comprised of various stakeholders to review data and make recommendations to improve the process.	January 2006 and ongoing	C.A.R.E. Center; ENCORE Office; Early Childhood Intervention Office; Parent Service Centers
Establish intervention teams to provide technical assistance to schools who do not meet the timeline requirements imposed by Child Find laws.	January 2006 and ongoing	C.A.R.E Center; Parent Service Centers
Deploy intervention teams to provide technical assistance to schools who do not meet the timeline requirements imposed by Child Find laws.	September 2006 and ongoing	C.A.R.E. Center; Parent Service Centers
Review existing methods of delivery of services and revise policies and procedures as necessary.	2006 – 2011	C.A.R.E. Center; ENCORE Office; Early Childhood Intervention Office; SEID Office

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Continue to provide training, technical assistance, and professional development to LEAs found noncompliant with Indicator 11 requirements.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff
Continue to evaluate LEAs compliance to this indicator through data collection and focused monitoring and impose corrective action plans on LEAs found out of compliance.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, QAM Unit; QAM staff; Director, Data Unit; Data staff

ADDED ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Initiate quarterly LEA meetings to review obligations and performance data related to timely evaluation, reevaluation, and IEP development	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Assistant Superintendent
Initiate issuance of LEA Planning and Performance Reports to assist LEAs	Ongoing through June	Director, Data Unit; Data staff

with accessing their data related to evaluations and reevaluations to enhance overall management of special education processes.	30, 2013	
Issue evaluation/reevaluation findings for MOA reports	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, QAM Unit; QAM staff
Issue evaluation/reevaluation findings for quarterly database reviews	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, QAM Unit; QAM staff
Require LEAs that must complete a self-assessment to examine practices in initial evaluations and reevaluations and, if appropriate, develop an action plan.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, QAM Unit

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: 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))

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.**
- E. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.**

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c, d or e. 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)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In 2005, the District of Columbia Department of Human Resources carried out responsibilities for identifying, locating and evaluating children with disabilities under the age of three years. The Department of Human Resources held responsibility for referring identified children with disabilities to the District of Columbia's LEA's by inviting representatives of the LEAs to transition planning meetings at least 90 days before the child's third birthday. The LEAs then took responsibility for determining whether the children were eligible for services under Part B of IDEA 2004 and ensuring that services were implemented no later than the child's third birthday. In 2008, the Lead Agency responsibilities transferred from the Department of Human Resources to the Office of the State Superintendent for Education. Additionally, OSSE also functions as a direct service provider for Part C services.

While baseline data continued to be reported for the 2004-2005 school year. OSSE's process for collecting Part C to Part B transition data has evolved since 2004. Specifically, OSSE implemented a two phase plan to collect and report data for this indicator. The first phase includes completing a direct pull from existing data systems and conducting a manual confirmation from Part C files. The second phase includes a record review for the each of the students who did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays, in order to determine the reason for delay. The State's business processes for Part C to B transition

currently includes aligning data from three data systems: the Part C data system (Early Steps and Stages), the Special Education Data System (SEDS) and the DCPS Early Stages database.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Report Period July 1, 2004 through June 2005		
a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.	35	
b. # of those referred determined to be not eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthday.	1	
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	6	
d. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed beyond the third birthday.	23	# IEP developed beyond: 30 days beyond third birthday= 2 60 days beyond third birthday=2 90 days beyond third birthday=5 120 days beyond third birthday=4 150 days beyond third birthday=4 180 days beyond third birthday=6
e. # of those referred determined to be not eligible and whose eligibilities were determined beyond their third birthday	3	# eligibility determined : 30 days beyond third birthday= 60 days beyond third birthday= 90 days beyond third birthday=1 120 days beyond third birthday= 150 days beyond third birthday= 2
f. # of children not included in b or c.	2	Parents rescinded permission to evaluate
Percent = 6 divided by 35 – 1 times 100	17 %	

Discussion of Baseline Data:

A review of the baseline data reveals what appears to be a low number of children who were served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination during the 2004-2005 school years. The low numbers may be in part due to inaccuracies in reported data from Part C. Children may have received services in Part C but the information was not reported to the District of Columbia SEA. The District of Columbia is working with the Department of Human Services in securing a database linkage which would significantly reduce errors in the exchange

of data. Other possible contributing factors may be that parents elected not to proceed with determining eligibility under Part B. The District of Columbia's local laws allows for third party payments beyond a child's third birthday for some special education and related services by an agency other than the SEA or LEAs. Many parents choose to keep their children in programs that provide specialized services and do not initiate referrals to the LEA's. It should also be noted that there are a number of parents who lack confidence in the District of Columbia Public Schools' (which is the LEA that services 95% of preschool aged children with disabilities) ability to provide for a Free and Appropriate Public Education. As a result many parents elect not to proceed with determining eligibility.

The baseline data reveals that 17% of children who received services in Part C and were referred to Part B for eligibility determination and found eligible, had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. Of the 26 children referred, 9 of the children's IEP's were delayed because referrals were made less than 30 days prior to the child's third birthday. The remaining 15 referrals were delayed due to timeline violations due to assessment not being completed within 90 days.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100 % of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B and found eligible will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.
2006 (2006-2007)	100 % of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B and found eligible will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.
2007 (2007-2008)	100 % of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B and found eligible will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.
2008 (2008-2009)	100 % of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2009 (2009-2010)	100 % of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2010 (2010-2011)	100 % of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2011 (2011-2012)	100 % of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
2012 (2012-2013)	100 % of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Part B in conjunction with Part C's will secure a linkage of their databases for the transferring of information on children served in Part C.	March 2006	OSEP funding for linkage.
The District of Columbia SEA will initiate a Public Relation campaign with the goal of highlighting the benefits of referring children who have received Part C services to the LEA's for eligibility determinations, as well as highlighting the quality early childhood programs that are available among the LEA's.	February 2006 and ongoing	619 and 618 funding
Provide opportunities for parents to register their children and initiate the referral process at the transition meeting.	January, 2006 and ongoing	619 funding
Increase the number of LEA's that attend transition meetings.	February 2006 and ongoing	Additional resources not required
The District of Columbia SEA will work with the Department of Human Services to develop a comprehensive, current and compliant memorandum of understanding that addresses ensuring that Part C children's transition meetings are held no less than 90 days prior the child's third birthday .	March 2006 and ongoing	Additional resources not required
The District of Columbia will hire an intervention team to complete overdue assessments. The team will focus on completing out of date assessments and ensuring that all assessments are current.	April 2006	Blackman/Jones proposed settlement agreement
The District of Columbia will hire additional speech therapists and occupational therapists to reduce the caseload and enable staff to maintain current assessments.	2006 – 2011	Blackman/Jones proposed settlement agreement

CONTINUING ACTIVIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
OSSE will continue to work with local agencies to ensure early childhood transition meetings are held no less than 90 days prior to the child's third birthday.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, DCEIP

OSSE will continue to provide training opportunities to LEAs and other public agencies to encourage parents to register their children and initiate the referral process at the early childhood transition meeting. These training sessions will take place annually during the summer months.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, DCEIP; Director, Training and Technical Assistance Unit
OSSE will continue to examine ways to more effectively integrate Part C and Part B data systems.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, DCEIP; Director, Data Unit; Chief of Staff
The Early Childhood Specialist will meet with local preschool early intervention programs on a monthly basis to review data and discuss areas where targets are not being met and request appropriate action to move towards improvement on this indicator.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, DCEIP

ADDED ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Develop LEA training series on ECT aligned with needs identified through internal workgroup and stakeholder summit, including additional guidance to LEAs to timely initiate process of providing PWN and, as appropriate, obtaining parental consent	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Chief of Staff; Director, DCEIP
Hold parent transition orientation sessions to assist parents with effectively navigate the transition process	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, DCEIP
Develop ECT focused monitoring tools	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	OSSE Quality Assurance & Monitoring staff
Train LEAs on focused monitoring process and tools	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	OSSE Quality Assurance & Monitoring staff
Conduct focused monitoring related to Part C to Part B transition	Ongoing through June 30, 2012	OSSE Quality Assurance & Monitoring staff

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition**

Indicator 13: 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))

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

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

On March 3, 2010, OSSE outlined the secondary transition monitoring process in the context of the MOA at its second quarterly LEA Meeting, providing LEAs with an overview of the process and related timeframes and tools. These materials were then posted on OSSE's web page: <http://www.osse.dc.gov/seo/cwp/view,a,1222,Q,564126,PM,1.asp>

On March 4, 2010, OSSE sent all affected LEAs individualized reminders regarding the upcoming secondary transition monitoring activities. This notification provided LEAs with:

- an overview of the monitoring selection process;
- the number of student records that would be reviewed; and
- additional resources for the LEA to review, including the monitoring tools and related OSSE policy.

Monitoring of the IEPs for secondary transition content began on Wednesday, March 10, 2010. OSSE completed the monitoring process and notified LEAs of findings of noncompliance on March 19, 2010. Monitoring reports issued on March 19, 2010 provided written notification to LEAs to correct identified noncompliance as soon as possible and in no case later than one year from identification. The secondary transition section of the comprehensive monitoring tool was utilized to complete the MOA required review of a random sample of 100 IEPs of youth aged 16 and above for IEP secondary transition content.

OSSE conducted its second round of secondary transition monitoring of 100 randomly selected IEPs on June 4, 2010 and issued monitoring reports with findings of noncompliance on June 15, 2010.

Baseline Data from FFY 2009: $6 / 200 \times 100 = 3\%$

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Of the 200 IEPs reviewed in FFY 2009 for secondary transition content, three percent of IEPs reviewed included the required secondary transition content.

Identified patterns of noncompliance related to the secondary transition review in March 2010 and June 2010 included:

Secondary Transition Compliance Item	% Compliant for Second Reporting Period (March 2010)	% Compliant for Third Reporting Period (June 2010)
STR 1: There is an appropriate measureable postsecondary goal that addresses education OR training after high school.	31%	37%
STR 2: There is an appropriate	37%	37%

measurable postsecondary goal that addresses employment after high school.		
STR 3: If needed, there is an appropriate measurable postsecondary goal that addresses independent living.	58%	68%
STR 4: Postsecondary goal(s) are updated annually.	62%	65%
STR 5: Postsecondary goal(s) are based on age appropriate transition assessments.	16%	27%
STR 6: There are transition services in the IEP that will assist the student to meet postsecondary goal(s).	61%	58%
STR 7: Transition services include courses of study that will enable the student to meet postsecondary goal(s).	60%	61%
STR 8: There is evidence that the student was invited to the IEP meeting.	24%	15%
STR 9: If appropriate, there is evidence that 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.	24%	81%
Total Number of Files with ALL Items Compliant	0%	6%

	Second Reporting Period (March 2010)	Third Reporting Period (June 2010)
Number of LEAs Reviewed	11	7
Number of LEAs in Compliance	0	0
Item with Lowest Level of Compliance	STR 5: Postsecondary goal(s) are based on age appropriate transition assessments.	STR 8: There is evidence that the student was invited to the IEP meeting.
Item with Highest Level of Compliance	STR 4: Postsecondary goal(s) are updated annually.	STR 9: If appropriate, there is evidence that 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.
--	--	--

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	States not required to report on Indicator 13 in FFY 2008.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% 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.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% 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.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% 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.
2012 (2012-2013)	100% 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.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources (through 2012):

COMPLETED ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Issue secondary transition policy	January 2010	OSSE superintendent and policy committee
Develop monitoring tool	February 2010	OSSE Quality Assurance & Monitoring staff and technical assistance providers
Convene first Community of Practice for secondary transition meeting	July 2010	OSSE staff and community stakeholders

COMPLETED ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Provide LEAs with guidance to support correction of noncompliance identified in March 2010	April 2010	OSSE Quality Assurance & Monitoring staff & OSSE Training & Technical Assistance staff

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Provide ongoing technical assistance and support	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	OSSE Training & Technical Assistance staff and contractors
Conduct professional development and training activities	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	OSSE Training & Technical Assistance staff and contractors
Collect monitoring data quarterly	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	OSSE Quality Assurance and Monitoring staff
Convene Community of Practice for secondary transition meetings	Ongoing	OSSE staff and community stakeholders

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

Measurement:

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $\left[\left(\frac{\text{\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school}}{\text{\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school}} \right) \right] \text{ times } 100.$

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $\left[\left(\frac{\text{\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school}}{\text{\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school}} \right) \right] \text{ times } 100.$

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $\left[\left(\frac{\text{\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment}}{\text{\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school}} \right) \right] \text{ times } 100.$

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Definitions

The following definitions are specific to OSSE's Part B Indicator 14:

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.

Higher Education means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (2-year program), or college/university (4- or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Some Other Employment 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.).

Other postsecondary education or training means youth enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least one 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, or vocational technical school which is less than a 2-year program).

Respondents are youth or their designated family member who answer the survey or interview questions.

Leavers are youth who left school by graduating with a regular or modified diploma, aging out, left school early (i.e., dropped out), or who were expected to return and did not.

Sample Selection

OSSE used census data for this indicator. OSSE collected exiting information for all students who graduated or left school in FFY 2008 and provided this information to its contractor to complete the survey.

OSSE contracted with Potsdam Institute for Applied Research (PIAR) at the State University of New York (SUNY) Potsdam to conduct phone interviews with former students or their designated family member (i.e., parent or grandparent). Youth were contacted after being out of school for at least one year.

Response Rate and Representativeness

As seen in Table 1, Response Rate Calculation, 973 youth left the state during the 2008-09 school year. Interviews were conducted with 227 youth or their family members. The response rate was $227/914 = 25\%$. OSSE notes that while 914 students were contacted, 15 of the 914 declined to participate in the survey. Therefore, OSSE evaluated certain data (e.g. the NPSO Response Calculator) based on 899 respondents rather than 914.

Table 1 Response Rate Calculation

Number of leavers in the state	973
- subtract the number of youth ineligible (those who had returned to school or were deceased)	-59
Number of youth contacted	914
Number of completed surveys	227
Response rate: $227 / 914 \times 100$	25%

OSSE calculated representativeness of the respondent group on the characteristics of disability type, ethnicity and gender in order to determine whether the youth who responded to the interviews were similar to, or different from, the total population of youth with an IEP who exited school in 2008-09.

Differences between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver Group of $\pm 3\%$ are important. Negative differences indicate an under-representativeness of the group and positive differences indicate over-representativeness. In the Response Calculator, red is used to indicate a difference exceeding the $\pm 3\%$ interval.

Representativeness									
	Overall	LD	ED	MR	All Other	Female	Male	Minority	ELL
Target Leaver Totals	899	528	154	96	121	308	591	880	461
Response Totals	227	143	23	25	36	85	142	221	0
Target Leaver Representation		59%	17%	11%	13%	34%	66%	98%	0%
Respondent Representation		63%	10%	11%	16%	37%	63%	97%	0%
Difference		4%	-7%	0.3%	2.4%	3%	-3%	-0.5%	0%
Note: positive difference indicates over-representation, negative difference indicates under-representation. A difference of greater than $\pm 3\%$ is highlighted in red. We encourage users to also read the Westat/NPSO paper Post-School Outcomes: Response Rates and Non-response Bias, found on the NPSO website at http://www.psocenter.org/collecting.html .									

Selection Bias

The under-representativeness could be attributed the fact that these groups of youth (youth with emotional disabilities and youth who have dropped out), in general, are difficult populations to reach. Since the State was overrepresented in other categories OSSE will identify different strategies to encourage survey responses from youth in these categories.

Missing Data

Our overall response rate was 25%, which means out of 973 students who left school in 2008-2009, OSSE is missing post-school outcome information for 75% of former students in the sample. OSSE found that LEAs did not typically update contact information for students after initial entry into the program unless the student moved from one LEA to another. OSSE will continue to inform LEAs of the responsibility to collect contact information annual and specifically prior to students exiting. Additionally, OSSE will continue to provide parent and student fliers for distribution.

Baseline Data from FFY 2009:

There were a total of 227 respondents.

- 1 = 52 respondent leavers were enrolled in “higher education”.
- 2 = 50 respondent leavers were engaged in “competitive employment” (and not counted in 1).
- 3 = 18 of respondent leavers were enrolled in “some other postsecondary education or training” (and not counted in 1 or 2).
- 4 = 5 of respondent leavers were engaged in “some other employment” (and not counted in 1, 2, or 3).

Thus,

$$A = 52 / 227 = 23\%$$

$$B = 52 + 50 / 227 = 45\%$$

$$C = 52 + 50 + 18 + 5 / 227 = 55\%$$

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Based on the reported data, 23% of respondents indicated that they are enrolled in higher education; 45% are enrolled in higher education or competitively employed; and 55% are enrolled in higher education, competitively employed, enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training or engaged in some other employment. OSSE further analyzed these data and found that while a greater percentage of students who graduated with a diploma are engaged in some form of higher education or some other postsecondary education or training, for both youth who graduated with a diploma and youth who graduated with a certificate of completion the percentage of youth who are engaged in some activity is identical (68%). Conversely, only 24% of students who dropped out are engaged in some postsecondary activity.

OSSE also notes that youth with emotional disabilities, only 35% of youth are engaged in some postsecondary activity, while 42% of youth with multiple disabilities are engaged, 48% of youth with intellectual disabilities (formerly mental retardation) are engaged, 50% for both youth with autism and hearing impairments are engaged in some postsecondary activity, 57% for both youth with speech/language impairments and other health impairments are engaged, 60% of youth with specific learning disabilities are engaged and 100% of youth with visual impairments are engaged in some postsecondary activity.

OSSE recognizes very large discrepancies in youth engaged in postsecondary activities by race/ethnicity. Eighty-three percent of white youth were engaged in some postsecondary activity and 73% of Hispanic/Latino youth were engaged in some postsecondary activity, while only 53% of Black/non-Hispanic youth were engaged in some postsecondary activity.

Finally, OSSE found that more female youth are engaged in postsecondary education (37%) as opposed to male youth (27%); and male youth are more engaged in employment (26%) as opposed to female employment (22%).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	56%
2006 (2006-2007)	60%
2007 (2007-2008)	64%
2008 (2008-2009)	States were not required to report on Indicator 14 in FFY 2008.
2009 (2009-2010)	New baseline data were established in FFY 2009.
2010 (2010-2011)	14A: 25% of youth who are no longer in secondary school enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school. 14B: 47% of youth who are no longer in secondary school enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving

	<p>high school.</p> <p>14C: 58% of youth who are no longer in secondary 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.</p>
<p>2011 (2011-2012)</p>	<p>14A: 26% of youth who are no longer in secondary school enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>14B: 49% of youth who are no longer in secondary school enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>14C: 61% of youth who are no longer in secondary 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.</p>
<p>2012 (2012-2013)</p>	<p>14A: 27% of youth who are no longer in secondary school enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>14B: 51% of youth who are no longer in secondary school enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>14C: 64% of youth who are no longer in secondary 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.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources (through 2012):

In FFY 2009, OSSE began to focus on the proper development and implementation of secondary transition plans, engaged a group of community stakeholders to form a Community of Practice around secondary transition and conducted numerous professional development and training sessions for LEAs to increase knowledge and skills related to increased secondary teaching and learning and preparing students for graduation and postsecondary options. Specifically, OSSE hosted trainings on developing measurable annual goals and objectives for transition services utilizing SEDS; integrating best practices for addressing the needs of students with disabilities into professional learning and teaching activities; determining student progress at the secondary level; implementing an effective Response to Intervention (RTI) framework in secondary schools; developing and implementing research-based secondary school reading interventions; identifying programs and activities that will help students reach their post secondary school goals by linking graduation, dropout, secondary transition,

and post-school outcomes to drive student improvement; and providing technical assistance on the 15 Strategies for Dropout Prevention from the National Dropout Center.

OSSE believes that its dedication to the allocation of resources in this area and its diligence in engaging community stakeholders contributed to the progress in graduation, dropout and postsecondary outcomes. While OSSE acknowledges that the State must continue to support LEAs in achieving excellence in teaching and learning at the classroom level in order to provide every student with increased opportunities to succeed after high school, OSSE is encouraged by the upward trend in graduation, dropout and postsecondary outcomes results.

ADDED ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Completion of Secondary Transition Monitoring Pursuant to OSSE's Memorandum of Agreement with OSEP: Pursuant to OSSE's MOA with OSEP, the Quality Assurance and Monitoring (QAM) unit began regular monitoring of 100 IEPs of students with disabilities aged 16 or older to ensure compliance with requirements related to secondary transition content.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, QAM Unit; QAM staff
Implementation of a Training Series to Support Secondary Success: The DSE's Training and Technical Assistance (TTA) Unit facilitated a robust training series in SY 2009-2010 which will continue annually through 2013. This LEA training series includes trainings specifically designed to ensure the success of students in secondary grades. Specifically, the training series includes the following training content: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing measurable annual goals and objectives for transition services utilizing SEDS • Integrating best practices for addressing the needs of students with disabilities into 	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, TTA Unit; TTA staff; contractors

<p>professional learning and teaching activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determining student progress at the secondary level • Implementing an effective Response to Intervention (RTI) framework in secondary schools • Developing and implementing research-based secondary school reading interventions • Identifying programs and activities that will help students reach their post secondary school goals by linking graduation, dropout, secondary transition, and post-school outcomes to drive student improvement • Providing technical assistance on the 15 Strategies for Dropout Prevention from the National Dropout Center 		
<p>Completion and Implementation of a State Action Plan: This Community of Practice has met 3 times to continue the work related to ensuring that student's with opportunities can access a regular or alternate diploma and are well-prepared for transition to life beyond high school. The team is also in the process of developing a State Action Plan and will implement the plan upon completion.</p>	<p>Ongoing through June 30, 2013</p>	<p>Director, TTA Unit; DSE Leadership team</p>
<p>Provide parent and student fliers for distribution.</p>	<p>Ongoing through June 30, 2013</p>	<p>Director, TTA Unit; Chief of Staff</p>
<p>Remind LEAs of obligation to update contact information prior to end of school year.</p>	<p>Ongoing through June 30, 2013</p>	<p>Director, TTA Unit; Assistant Superintendent</p>

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

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

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in case later than one year from identification.

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Office of Monitoring & Program Certification performs the state level monitoring of the special education programs in the District of Columbia. DCPS created a system for reviewing both IDEA and local special education policy included in chapters 25, 30, & 38 of the Board of Education Rules, District of Columbia Municipal Regulations. During the period, DCPS sought to ensure the identification and timely correction of all IDEA-related noncompliance. During the reporting period, DCPS continued to implement a comprehensive monitoring system that included: a review of data from the Special Education Tracking System (SETS); a review of hearing decisions, local-level policies and procedures, and student files; building-level staff interviews; and a cyclical process for monitoring all DCPS buildings (including charter schools that are DCPS schools for special education purposes), charter schools functioning as their own local education agencies (LEAs), nonpublic schools in which DCPS children with disabilities are placed by DCPS, and DC Department of Health and Human Services programs in which DCPS provides the educational component. Further, DCPS took steps with technical assistance from OSEP to create a Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) that included state level monitoring. DCPS recognized that all public, public charter, nonpublic day and residential schools/programs providing services to children with disabilities must be in compliance with local special education policy Chapter 30 and IDEA. The Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) is built around a number of critical themes that include: continuity, partnership with stakeholders, state accountability, self-assessments, data driven processes, and the provision of technical assistance.

In order to complete the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (CIMP) for all Local Education Agencies in the District of Columbia, training was conducted with all the LEAs in the form of the Monitoring Academy. The academies began in October of 2003 and were a mechanism to provide technical assistance, develop peer monitors, and review data collection

and reporting requirements of the Annual Performance Report. During the period June 30, 2003 to July 1, 2004, District of Columbia charter, middle, junior, and high school special education staff completed the monitoring academies. This represents a significant number of personnel (97 total) that have received the compliance training that specifically addresses noncompliance issues in all the cluster areas to include General Supervision, Early Childhood Transition, Parental Involvement, Free Appropriate Public Education, and Secondary Transition.

Declaration of Education: Keeping Our Promise to the District's Children

Dr. Clifford B. Janey became Superintendent & Chief State School Officer of the District of Columbia Public Schools in September 2004. His leadership has provided an opportunity for volunteers, parents, youth, business leaders, teachers, principals, public officials, university leaders and many others to meet and plan for the academic achievement of children in the District of Columbia Public Schools. The monitoring activities were identified and discussed in this collaboration known as the DC Education Compact and was issued in May 2005. The Declaration of Education included children with special needs. Although progress has been made, continued improvement in the delivery of instruction is necessary. Research has proven that students with disabilities when challenged will demonstrate progress and achievement. Special education teachers must be trained with their general education peers and held to the same standards. General educators also must become skilled in differentiated instruction to serve all students.

Monitoring Activities

The State Education Agency continues to coordinate with other areas of the State Education Agency to finalize the monitoring activities, obtain input from various stakeholder groups, and ensure that the systems have been refined. For the purposes of special education system development, stakeholder groups will include parents and advocates as well as community members. Our goal is to move toward a Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring Process so that the District of Columbia can focus on specific areas of noncompliance and correct the deficiencies that have been longstanding. The future proposal for the special education monitoring system includes the analysis of data to determine risk related to program non-compliance or ineffectiveness. The potential sources of data include the ENCORE System. The ENCORE System is used to move forward on data driven analysis of services and programs and to focus on continuous improvement, and both self-assessment reports and continuous improvement plans will be submitted by the LEAs.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

- A. Indicators 11, 13, , and 18 are new indicators. Baseline data will be collected for those indicators during 2005-2006.
- B. The State Education Agency monitors the District of Columbia Public Schools by Division. The DCPS High School Division and Middle/Junior High Division were monitored during this period. The schools were not completed until after the period which was August 2005. There were a total of 40 schools monitored. The noncompliant areas included the following:
 - Implementation of Hearing Officer Decisions

- Timely completion of Initial and Revaluations
 - Completion of Functional Behavioral Assessments
 - Failure to involve a sufficient number of other agencies in the student's secondary transition plan by age 16
 - LEA representatives do not attend the IEP meetings
 - ESY is not being considered nor addressed adequately
 - IEP Report Cards are not provided to parents
- C. The District of Columbia Public Schools had 14 findings of noncompliance from the State Complaint Office.

Discussion of Baseline Data

While the intent of the monitoring process is to identify and correct deficiencies, the review revealed some challenges as well as some of the successes in providing services to children with disabilities. The State Education Agency expects the DCPS LEA to develop a corrective action plan that incorporates the special education goals outlined in the declaration of education.

In order to keep our promise to the children of District of Columbia Public Schools, to provide a free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment, the corrective action plan will include how the DCPS will:

- Address all areas of noncompliance
- Implement research-based instructional strategies to address the needs of special education students, and provide mentoring and coaching for staff serving students with disabilities.
- Increase by 20 percent annually the number of students who are assessed and receive appropriate special education services in a timely way. Of course, all students with disabilities will have current IEPs.
- Use school support teams to provide early intervention to students who demonstrate academic and social needs.
- Reduce by 25 percent annually the number of complaints and requests for due process related to special education services and placements.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of noncompliance is identified and corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of noncompliance is identified and corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of noncompliance is identified and corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of noncompliance is identified and corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

2009 (2009-2010)	100% of noncompliance is identified and corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of noncompliance is identified and corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of noncompliance is identified and corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of noncompliance is identified and corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Improvement Activities

Activity: During 2005-2006 in a series training modules will be revised to align with the IDEA 2004 Reauthorization and the No Child Left Behind law. Technical assistance will be provided to the LEAs, Charter Schools and private programs where District of Columbia is placed.

Resources: Training and Technical Assistance Unit

Activity: During 2006 DCPS will continue to implement the Positive Behavior Supports and school support Teams in all schools and programs. The requirements for the use of positive behavioral support strategies to address problem behavior have particular significance for school psychologists. Positive behavioral support refers to a set of methodologies that focuses on providing environmental modifications that reduce the probability of problem behavior and educational supports that result in the acquisition, maintenance and generalization of functional behaviors. The net result is the increase in social behavior and the decrease/elimination of problem behavior.

Resources: Training and Technical Assistance Unit

Activity: During the 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2009-2011, the SEA will continue to conduct onsite reviews to complete the monitoring of DC. In addition, the 56 LEAs (charter schools) will be monitored. Further 89 Residential schools and programs will receive desk audits, as well as the 67 nonpublic day programs will be completed.

Resources: Monitoring Unit

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Provide ongoing technical assistance and support	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	OSSE Quality Assurance & Monitoring staff & OSSE Training & Technical Assistance staff
Conduct professional development and training activities	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	OSSE Quality Assurance & Monitoring staff & OSSE Training & Technical Assistance staff

ADDED ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Collect monitoring data	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	OSSE Quality Assurance & Monitoring staff
Monitor and update Indicator 15 tracking system	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	OSSE Quality Assurance & Monitoring staff and technical assistance providers

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

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

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

((Number of written, signed complaints with reports issued within timeline + number of written, signed complaints with reports issued within extended timelines) divided by total number of written, signed complaints filed] times 100.)

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The State Complaint Office within the State Enforcement & Investigation Division – Special Education Programs is charged with administrative responsibility for receiving formal written complaints of violations of FAPE and other laws and regulations consistent with the requirements of the IDEA. The State Complaint Office (SCO) investigates complaints of individual and systemic violations of the law. Investigators with SCO issue formal Letters of Findings within sixty (60) days of the date that a complaint is filed, except when an appropriate extension of time has been granted, and required corrective action plans to the LEA as needed to remedy identified violations. The LEA must submit an Implementation Plan to SCO describing the specific steps or actions that the LEA will take to correct and/or remedy the violation. To insure appropriate follow-up and enforcement of corrective action plans, SEID has established guidelines for monitoring the correction of identified deficiencies. A monitoring team from the SEID Office of Monitoring and Program Certification is assigned to monitor compliance with corrective action plans. Focused monitoring visits will be instituted in any case in which systemic violations are discovered. The goal is the prompt, or otherwise timely correction of all identified program deficiencies through the collaboration and integration of the work of these offices.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

See Attachment I at the end of Indicator 17.

Formula: $20 \div 20 \times 100 = 100\%$

Percentage of written, signed complaints resolved within 60 days, including a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances = 100%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

During FFY 2004 – 2005, a total of 23 formal written complaints were filed with the S.E.I.D. State Complaint Office for the time period July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005. Thereafter, 3 complaints were withdrawn or dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Of the 20 formal complaint investigations initiated, 14 resulted in complaints with findings and 6 complaints with no findings of violations of the IDEA. 17 complaint decisions were issued within the statutory 60 day deadline, and the remaining 3 were issued after 60 days, but within deadlines set after documented extensions were granted.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

2009 (2009-2010)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

1. Promulgate a new State Complaint Policy to adopt written procedures for the investigation and resolution of any complaint alleging that a public agency has violated a requirement of IDEA. (This activity was completed in November, 2009).
2. Creation and dissemination of a new model State Complaint Form to assist in filing a State Complaint. The use of the actual form is encouraged but not required. (This activity was completed in November 2009).
3. Provide ongoing training and technical assistance to the State Complaint Office personnel in the following areas:

Timeline: 2006 – 2011

Resources: Training and Technical Assistance Unit

- Identification of IDEA violations
- Referral of other identified violations to the appropriate agency or office
- Procedures for valid and timely notice of findings from OSSE to the LEA or other public agency
- Implementation of procedures to effectively manage FERPA considerations
- Implementation of process to notify LEAs and complainant of any exceptional circumstances that may create extended timelines
- Procedures to obtain parental consent forms designating an advocate's right to file on behalf of the child
- Procedures to address additional allegations that arise during a complaint investigation

4. Develop a State Complaint Tracking System that will:

Timeline: 2009 – 2011

Resources: State Complaint Office

- Implement a reminder system with benchmarks for critical due dates;
- Implement timely written notification of the status of the initial complaint which will trigger an investigation or referral to another office; and
- Notify designee at the LEA of issuance of a letter of complaint, investigation, resolution and letter of decision for all state complaints.

5. The OSSE is in the final stages of recruitment for a State Complaint Officer to direct and manage the functions of the State Complaint Office.

Timeline: 2010 – 2011

Resources: Director of Monitoring

6. Recruit and hire a highly qualified candidate to serve as Director of Quality Assurance and Monitoring to direct and manage all general supervision functions, including monitoring and complaint resolution activities. (This position has been filled and the candidate will start work on February 1, 2010).

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Provide ongoing training and technical assistance to the State Complaint Office personnel.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	OSSE Quality Assurance & Monitoring staff and technical assistance providers

ADDED ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Monitor and update State Complaint tracking system.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	OSSE Quality Assurance & Monitoring staff

Correction of Discrepancies in DCPS State Complaint Office Data Submitted in 2003 – 2004 APR

In its most recent APR submission to OSEP covering the July 1, 2003 – June 30, 2004 reporting period, the DCPS State Complaint Office reported a total of 19 complaints from July 1, 2004 to February 28, 2005. Specifically, the DCPS State Complaint Office reported that it issued 10 complaint letters with findings and 4 complaint letters with no findings, respectively, as indicated in cells 3 and 4 of Attachment 1. After further review, it appears that a computational error existed and was not cured prior to the submission of the APR. The result of the error was an inadvertent omission of data regarding 3 complaints.

The corrected data reflects that DCPS issued 12 complaint letters with findings and issued 5 letters with no findings during the period of review. Moreover, the State Complaint Office issued 15 complaint decisions within 60 calendar days, not 17 as previously reported in Cell 7 of Attachment No. 1 in the FFY 2003 – 2004 Annual Performance Report. Thus, there were a total of only 17, and not 19, complaint decisions issued during FFY 2005.

Overall, the data reveals that significant progress has been made from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005 in the number of complaints received and investigated by the DCPS State Complaint Office. In an effort to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the data collected and prevent future discrepancies, the DCPS State Complaint Office shall employ the following strategies:

- Establish and maintain a system for data collection. Specifically, the DCPS State Complaint Office will submit its data directly to the ENCORE office upon the issuance of decisions. The information submitted will be captured by ENCORE database. Once the data are included in ENCORE, the data made available for review in the form of reports.
- Refine the DCPS State Complaint Office internal data collection method. By doing so, the revised method will serve as a quality assurance tool that can easily be cross-checked against the data contained in the ENCORE database. Then discrepancies, if they exist, can be easily cured.
- Engage in periodic consultations with the ENCORE office, the DCPS Office of Information Technology, and representatives from OSEP to report on data collection methods and activities and discuss ways to improve on them.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

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

Measurement: Total # of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45 day timeline (or by properly extended timeline as applicable) divided by total number of adjudicated hearing x 100.

Data Source to measure performance under this indicator:

The State Enforcement & Investigation Division for Special Education Programs (S.E.I.D.) oversees the adjudication of special education due process hearings for the State Education Agency. S.E.I.D. collects, analyzes, and distributes statistical data on all due process complaints requesting a due process hearing filed in the District of Columbia. The primary data source is ENCORE a web-based integrated special education data collection and student tracking system used by the State Education Agency to report LEA and campus-based performance on all compliance indicators in the Annual Performance Reports.

Measurement:

Percent = $(3.2(a) + 3.2(b))$ divided by (3.2) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The District of Columbia has adopted a one-tier system for adjudicating special education due process hearings. All due process complaints seeking a due process hearing to resolve special education disputes on behalf of any student who resides within the District of Columbia are submitted to the S.E.I.D. within the SEA for adjudication. S.E.I.D. has jurisdiction to administer the due process hearings involving all LEAs and public agencies within the District. This includes charter schools chartered by both the DC Board of Education and by the independent DC Charter School Board, non-public day schools and residential treatment programs that deliver special education and related services to students in the District of Columbia.

The District of Columbia has the highest per capita filings of due process hearing requests of any state in the country. During the 2003 – 2004 federal APR reporting period, 3,270 due process hearing requests were filed with the State Education Agency which resulted in 2,571 formal dispositions or case resolutions. As a result of the District's failure to insure that final hearing officer decisions were issued within federally mandated timelines, in 1997 a federal class action law suit was filed against the District of Columbia. In part as a result of settlement negotiations

and subsequent court decisions entered in that case, over the last several years DC Public Schools has instituted substantial and significant reforms to improve the rate of timely disposition of hearing requests. Thus, while the number and volume of due process hearings have continued to increase, the number of reported cases of untimely hearing decisions has fallen dramatically during the same time period.

The 2004 amendments to the IDEA have resulted in significant modification to the policies and procedures governing due process hearings.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Formula: $3,714 \div 3,837 = .967 \times 100 = 96.7\%$

96.7% of all fully adjudicated due process hearings were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that was extended by the hearing officer at the request of one of the parties to the hearing.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The baseline data was compiled from monthly statistical reports required by the Court in the Blackman Jones class action litigation. Monthly data reports report the performance of DC Public Schools in achieving compliance with the 45 day requirement for issuance of final Hearing Officer Determinations rendered after a due process hearing. This information was compiled from the SETS data base which has now been replaced by ENCORE a new, more sophisticated special education data collection and reporting system.

The data show that 123 hearing requests resulted in the issuance of untimely final hearing officer determinations during the base year. A statistical analysis of the data further show that of the reported late hearing decisions, 105 occurred during the four month period of July through October. These are also four of the peak months for the filing of hearing requests and the late decisions reflect pressures on the dispute resolution system that resulted from the increase in the volume of hearing requests filed during the spring and summer months. The strategy of increasing the number of hearing rooms which will allow more hearings to be scheduled should eliminate the problem.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100 % of adjudicated due process hearing requests will be adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.
2006 (2006-2007)	100 % of adjudicated due process hearing requests will be adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

2007 (2007-2008)	100 % of adjudicated due process hearing requests will be adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.
2008 (2008-2009)	100 % of adjudicated due process hearing requests will be adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.
2009 (2009-2010)	100 % of adjudicated due process hearing requests will be adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.
2010 (2010-2011)	100 % of adjudicated due process hearing requests will be adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.
2011 (2011-2012)	100 % of adjudicated due process hearing requests will be adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.
2012 (2012-2013)	100 % of adjudicated due process hearing requests will be adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

During Phase II of the development of the docketing system, OSSE will implement enhancements to support the maintenance of the system. These enhancements will:

Timeline: 2009 – 2011

Resources: Student Hearing Office

1. Improve and realize efficiencies in the performance of tasks for both the SHO staff and Hearing Officers by auto populating demographic and contact info of due process

- hearing parties and streamlining the process by which due process complaint issues and “relief” requests are entered and refined;
2. Include the implementation of an electronic filing capability to allow parties to directly file data, documents, and/or actions into a case; and
 3. Include limited “read-only” access to case and scheduling data for parties to a particular case consistent with the requirements of FERPA and the IDEA.

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Include the implementation of an electronic filing capability to allow parties to directly file data, documents, and/or actions into a case.	January 2012	Student Hearing Office personnel and contractors

ADDED ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Utilize electronic tools to manage timelines.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Student Hearing Office personnel and contractors
Evaluate and train hearing officers.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Student Hearing Office personnel and contractors

Attachment I

Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Complaints, Mediations, Resolution Sessions, and Due Process Hearings

SECTION A: Signed, written complaints	
(1) Signed, written complaints total	23
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	20
(a) Reports with findings	14
(b) Reports within timeline	17
(c) Reports within extended timelines	3
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	3
(1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	0

SECTION B: Mediation requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	58
(2.1) Mediations	
(a) Mediations related to due process	51
(i) Mediation agreements	8
(b) Mediations not related to due process	7
(i) Mediation agreements	1
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	0

SECTION C: Hearing requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	4,239
(3.1) Resolution sessions	0
(a) Settlement agreements	0
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	3,837
(a) Decisions within timeline	2,722
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	992
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	402

SECTION D: Expedited hearing requests (related to disciplinary decision)	
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	*
(4.1) Resolution sessions	0
(a) Settlement agreements	0
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	*
(a) Change of placement ordered	*

* Reporting on expedited hearings is a new reporting requirement. During the 2004 – 2005 school year, the District of Columbia did not collect data on expedited hearing requests. A system will be developed to collect and report data on expedited hearing requests.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: 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))

Measurement:

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

(Number of resolution meetings with written settlement agreements divided by number of resolution meetings times 100.)

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The new requirement under the IDEA imposing a duty upon each LEA to hold a resolution session meeting with the parent whenever a due process hearing is filed has provided the District of Columbia with improved opportunity to divert cases out of adversarial due process proceedings and into alternative dispute resolution. DCPS has adopted a campus-based process for timely scheduling resolution sessions. All hearing requests are first forwarded to the newly established Complaint Intake Unit (CIU) within the S.E.I.D. Office of Mediation and Early Dispute Resolution. The CIU issues formal notice of the filing of the due process complaint to the applicable LEA, along with a copy to the specific DCPS or LEA charter school that is the subject of the complaint, that a due process hearing request has been filed with S.E.I.D. Several new forms, including the "Due Process Complaint Notice", "Scheduling Memorandum", and the "Resolution Session Disposition Form", have been created to monitor the outcomes for every resolution session for data collection and reporting purposes. After a resolution session has occurred, or after 15 days have lapsed after the filing of the Due Process Complaint Notice, S.E.I.D. the disposition form, describing the results of the session, is submitted to the Student Hearing Office in S.E.I.D. Thus, through the use of ENCORE and the disposition form, DC Public Schools will capture and report the percentage of hearing requests that are resolved through settlement agreements obtained as a result of a resolution session.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

This is a new indicator. Baseline data will be described in the FFY 2005 APR due in April 2007.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	3% of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions resolved through resolution settlement agreements.
2006 (2006-2007)	5% of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions resolved through resolution settlement agreements.
2007 (2007-2008)	7% of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions resolved through resolution settlement agreements.
2008 (2008-2009)	9% of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions resolved through resolution settlement agreements.
2009 (2009-2010)	11% of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions resolved through resolution settlement agreements.
2010 (2010-2011)	50-65% of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
2011 (2011-2012)	55-70% of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
2012 (2012-2013)	55-70% of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

OSSE has instituted a number of practices and procedures to ensure compliance with IDEA law and regulations governing the resolution period. These practices and procedures apply to the SHO and to its hearing officers, examples include:

Timeline: 2009 – 2011

Resources: Student Hearing Office

1. Requiring hearing officers to manage each assigned due process complaint consistent with standard and best legal practices, including the conduct of status and pre-hearing conferences;
2. Requiring hearing officers, upon assignment to a due process hearing request, to issue a memorandum to all parties requesting information on resolution session activities and immediate notification of any action that results in an adjustment to the 30-day resolution period;

3. Requiring hearing officers, upon assignment to a due process hearing request, to inform all parties that they are required to notify the assigned hearing officer of the outcome of the resolution process;
4. Mandating that an order closing a case that was resolved during the resolution session and/or the resolution session “period” must clearly state whether the case was resolved due to a settlement agreement; and
5. Enhancing cooperation and communication between LEAs and the SHO to ensure that the SHO receives timely notice and consistent data on the resolution of due process hearing requests that occur during the resolution period.

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Requiring hearing officers, upon assignment to a due process hearing request, to issue a memorandum to all parties requesting information on resolution session activities and immediate notification of any action that results in an adjustment to the 30-day resolution period.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, SHO Unit
Enhancing cooperation and communication between LEAs and the SHO to ensure that the SHO receives timely notice and consistent data on the resolution of due process hearing requests that occur during the resolution period.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, SHO Unit; Director, QAM Unit

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Measurement:

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

(Number of mediation agreements related to due process complaints + number of mediation agreements not related to due process complaints divided by number of mediations held times 100.)

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

It is the policy of the State Education Agency to encourage and assist LEAs in developing programs and strategies for early dispute resolution in special education. The Office of Mediation and Early Dispute Resolution (MEDRO), is responsible for ensuring that a voluntary mediation process is available to Local Education Agencies and parents whenever there is a dispute related to the provision of special education and related services for students with special needs. Mediation can be requested at any time whether there has been a filing of a complaint or not. Upon receipt of a request for mediation, this office communicates with all parties to determine their interest in mediation since it is a voluntary process. Once it has been determined that both the LEA and the parent are interested in a mediation conference then a mediator is assigned and a location, time and date for the mediation is determined and confirmed by way of a Notice of Mediation Letter. This office is also involved in providing training to LEAs on alternative dispute resolution options and IDEA. Technical support in reference to special education law and problem solving is given on an individual school basis whenever requested. Additionally, presentations are made to parents and parent advocacy groups to inform them of the mediation process and how it may assist them in resolving special education disputes.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The Special Education Tracking System now transformed into ENCORE is the data source used to establish the base line for successful mediations. From July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005, a total of 58 mediation requests were received by the SEA Office of Mediation and Early Dispute Resolution. A total of 7 requests out of the 51 were not related to a due process hearing request. A total of 9 of the total requests resulted in mediation agreements. Thus, for the base year of FFY 2004 – 2005, 15.5% of the mediations that were held resulted in a successful mediation agreement. (See Attachment I in Indicator 17)

Discussion of Baseline Data:

While there were a total of 9 mediation agreements, it is important to note that all but (2) two were the result of LEA and parents and/or their representatives negotiated settlements. The two

settlements were done with the assistance of a third-party mediator. This office assisted both parties in either way (with or without a third-party) to resolve their issues through a mediated agreement. All parties requesting mediation were amenable to handling the mediation request in this manner. The percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements was 15.5 percent whether with the assistance of a third-party or without. The percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements with a third-party was 100 percent.

Dissemination of the availability and benefits of mediation and alternative dispute resolution to the public is essential for building broad public support. Since mediation is a voluntary process this office spends a great deal of time educating the public regarding the existence of this process. Most of the requesting parties for mediation are LEAs and parents who are not represented by legal counsel.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	17% successful mediations
2006 (2006-2007)	20% successful mediations
2007 (2007-2008)	23% successful mediations
2008 (2008-2009)	25% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
2009 (2009-2010)	30% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
2010 (2010-2011)	40% 40-55% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
2011 (2011-2012)	45-60% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
2012 (2012-2013)	45-60% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.

Improvement Activities

- Increase the number of mediators to handle mediation conferences and future

anticipated requests for Facilitated IEP meetings.

- Implementation of a Facilitated IEP process that would allow LEAs and/or parents to request a mediator to assist them during difficult IEP meetings.
- Increase the number of staff by 3 in MEDRO in order to assist with technical support to Local Education Agencies and parents to provide early dispute assistance.
- Implement conflict management training for all LEAs and parents.
- Begin to develop a full compliment of MEDRO staff and independent mediators who will be able to work with specific LEAs to assist in early dispute resolution and/or facilitated IEPs when necessary.
- Have in place adequate MEDRO staff members in order to establish crisis intervention teams who will focus primarily on early dispute resolution options for LEAs and parents related to the provision of special education.
- Have in place a full operating internal staff in the MEDRO office including independent mediators and staff who can assist LEAs and parents in reference to training on the IDEIA law and alternative disputes processes to help them resolve their disputes or establish an independent external office to handle mediation.

Activities	Timelines	Resources
1. Provide training information to LEAs and parents on alternative dispute mechanisms for resolving special education matters.	2009 – 2011	Training and Technical Assistance Unit
2. Provide conflict resolution training for LEAs and parents.	06/07 On-going	MEDRO/SEID Staff
3. Provide training and resources for mediators in the area of special education law and facilitated IEPs.	06/07 On-going	MEDRO Staff

4. Provide technical assistance to LEAs and parents on IDEIA law and dispute resolution procedures.	05/06 On-going	MEDRO Staff
---	-----------------------	-------------

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
OSSE will take steps to ensure that the parents of students with disabilities are aware of the availability of mediation as a tool for the timely resolution of disputes.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Student Hearing Office staff and Quality Assurance & Monitoring staff
Conducting a multifaceted public relations campaign to inform parents, students and stakeholders of the processes and procedures of mediation.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Student Hearing Office staff and Quality Assurance & Monitoring staff
Publishing the resumes and qualifications of OSSE's mediators.	June 2011	Student Hearing Office staff
Providing parents, students and stakeholders with survey tools to provide OSSE with information that can be used to train and evaluate its mediators.	June 2012	Student Hearing Office staff

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

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

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring accuracy).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

DC is responsible for gathering data from all Local Education Agencies in the district. This includes data from charter schools as well as all of DC local schools. The data requested for state reporting is done through various offices within DC. The information is collected and calculated based upon reporting responses from all schools. The offices involved in the data collection include the Office of Academic Services, which the Office of Special Education is under, the State Enforcement and Investigation Division, the Charter School Board offices, the Office of Federal Grant Programs, which is an office under the Office of Accountability, and the Office of Information and Technology.

DCPS uses various database tracking systems and hard copy surveys in order to collect and determine the necessary information for state reporting purposes. The data base systems include the following: DC Stars, which includes enrollment information on all students, including charter schools; and ENCORE, which is the special education database for students with special needs. The information related to special education students is primarily obtained from the ENCORE data base tracking system. Information provided that compares special education percentages to regular education student percentages is through hard copy survey data and the DC Stars data base information.

The Office of Federal Grant Program collects data based upon a grant cycle by requiring all Local Education Agencies to submit an annual application that includes a survey that requires schools to report on truancy rates, dropout rates, expulsions, and suspensions. This information is then reviewed by the Federal Grants Office and populated into a chart. The data includes information obtained from all Local Education Agencies that completed a survey. The incentive to complete the survey is based on the LEA's desire to achieve final acceptance of their grant application.

Accuracy:

The accuracy of this data is ensured through the process of the all offices meeting to review and do a comparison of the documents and the database information. Additionally, an annual audit review of the documents and a student's file are reviewed by ENCORE staff to determine if the file is consistent with the information provided in the various data reporting forms. The audit is completed on a school to school basis. Another method of ensuring accuracy is through site visits to schools by performance officers. They review files and provide technical assistance to schools.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) in its state capacity has timely completed the state reported requested data according to the timelines specified in this indicator for 2004-2005. In the prior reporting year 2003-2004, DCPS submitted the requested data information 8 months beyond the required timeline.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State data is reported accurately and timely, 100%.
2006 (2006-2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State data is reported accurately and timely, 100%.
2007 (2007-2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State data is reported accurately and timely, 100%.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.
2011 (2011-2012)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.
2012 (2012-2013)	100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
<p>Implement a state data system that collects, aggregates and disaggregates information for state reports and monitoring.</p> <p>Develop procedures for all DCPS' offices to utilize the state data system to ensure accuracy of baseline data information and timely reporting.</p> <p>Establish timelines for data to be collected in order to timely file state reports.</p>	2005 - 2007	OAA

Develop criteria for all Local Education Agencies to adhere to in terms of data collection to be maintained at their school site.		
<p>Establish State Data Collection Center – develop and maintain a comprehensive information technology database.</p> <p>Hire center manager and coordinator, lead data analyst, and junior data analysts</p> <p>Develop policy and procedures regarding the data collection process, which should include provisions for accountability for timely and accurate data being provided by all Local Education Agencies.</p>	Fall 2006	OSE, OIT, ENCORE office, State Advisory Panel
<p>Generate periodic reports to provide detailed data and reporting regarding LEAs.</p> <p>Implement a process in which all LEAs can have access to the state data base tracking system in order to provide specific information regarding their students.</p>	2007	OSE, OIT, ENCORE Office
Review established policies and procedures regarding the data collection process; modify policies and procedures to ensure optimal efficiency and accuracy.	2007 and ongoing	OSE, OIT, ENCORE Office
Establish a data reports repository that houses all monthly, quarterly, and annual reports that have been submitted to OSEP.	2007 and ongoing	OSE, OIT, ENCORE Office
Provide training, guidance, and technical assistance to all prospective database users on how to access the database, and how to create and generate reports.	2007	OSE, OIT, ENCORE Office
Finalize process for all LEAs to have access to state data base tracking system so that they can use it for reporting purposes and case management.	2008	SEA
Establishment of a centralized state data collection office, which would be responsible for ensuring the collection and accuracy of data from all DC offices.	2009	SEA
Finalize the establishment of a state data collection office through which all data and reporting information flows for all state data reporting purposes.	2011	SEA

CONTINUING ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Data Management Committee identified Data Stewards, individuals with subject matter expertise in areas not only of IDEA reporting, but in areas where IDEA overlaps with other Federal reporting requirements. Questions from LEAs can be routed to the Data Steward specializing in any IDEA or related reporting requirement.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, Data Unit and Data staff
In addition, the Department of Monitoring and Compliance has assigned selected staff members each a limited number of LEAs. It is the responsibility of these individuals to proactively contact LEAs prior to upcoming data requests, to obtain answers to any questions from LEAs, and to follow up with LEAs who are having difficulties completing their data submissions in a timely manner.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, QAM Unit and QAM staff

ADDED ACTIVITIES		
Improvement Activities	Timelines	Resources
Develop and implement data collection communication and deployment process.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, Data Unit; DSE Leadership Team
Revise and implement OSSE data verification process.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, Data Unit
Develop and implement system to request data notes from LEAs.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, Data Unit
Develop and disseminate data calendar.	Ongoing through June 30, 2013	Director, Data Unit; Chief of Staff

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN RESOURCES

District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (DCMR)

“Declaration of Education” (Strategic Plan, District of Columbia Public Schools, May 2005)

DC STARS

SETS/ENCORE

DCPS Website (www.k12.dc.us)

Report Card

NCLB website

LEA School Plans

LEA APPLICATION

Results of LEA Monitoring

LEA Self Assessment

DC State Improvement Plan

NCREST Report

OSEP Website

APR

Monitoring Report

SEA Offices

Child Find Reference Guide

District of Columbia City Agencies

DCPS Parents

Chartering Authorities

Other Stakeholders

Parent Advisory Council

State Advisory Panel