

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2020**

District of Columbia



PART B DUE February 1, 2022

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

This report is provided during an extraordinary time as the District of Columbia, like the rest of the country, continues to address the ongoing effects of the global COVID-19 pandemic. This public health emergency necessitated the sudden closing of public schools in March 2020 with an unexpected shift to remote instruction and service delivery for students. The school year 2020-2021 proved equally challenging as students received instruction virtually beginning in August 2020 with a gradual return to partial in-person learning beginning the following February 2021 for specific subgroups of students, including students with disabilities. These circumstances have adversely affected the District of Columbia's ability to meet targets required by the Annual Performance Report (APR), which generally had been on an upward trajectory. Despite these events, during this reporting period - July 1, 2020, to June 30, 2021 (FFY20) - the District made notable progress in the area of parent involvement, significantly increasing its survey's response rate from 3.55% to 7.00%.

Since Spring 2020, the District has been working diligently to address the new realities of operating in a rapidly changing environment under unprecedented circumstances. As part of its ongoing recovery planning and implementation, OSSE continues to develop and deploy a virtual professional development series and data-informed decision-making toolkit to support LEA activities and put these expectations to practice. OSSE also continues to provide LEAs with technical assistance in utilizing these tools to develop and implement school-wide and student-specific recovery plans to address learning loss and regression for students with disabilities. These supports include professional development training series, one-to-one technical assistance, and State facilitated communities of practice. OSSE continues to explore new and creative means to connect with families about their needs, provide families support to navigate special education process, and to engage families in providing actionable feedback.

A link to D.C.'s guidance in response to COVID-19 can be found here: <https://osse.dc.gov/page/covid-19-guidance-and-resources>.

Additionally, OSSE required all LEAs to submit a Continuous Education and Recovery Plan Application for the school year 2020-21 that included specific information on LEA activities to ensure continued IDEA service delivery and procedures through distance learning. OSSE additionally required all LEAs to communicate plans for continuous student data collection to ensure progress monitoring. OSSE regularly monitored the implementation of these plans throughout the school year. OSSE also required LEAs to update their CEPs for the full return to in-person learning for the school year 2021-22 which OSSE continues to regularly monitor.

Finally, in August 2020, OSSE deployed the Special Education Resource Hub: What Families Need to Know this Year to communicate COVID-19 focused policy and guidance to LEAs and parents. This family-centered resource provides information to families on special education through the lens of the family experience, translating existing requirements and State policy into an accessible format for families while also addressing the implication of the public emergency. OSSE continues to maintain and update this resource as needed.

OSSE continues to dedicate significant resources to improving outcomes for students with disabilities by setting clear and high expectations improved special education service delivery, providing LEAs actionable data, and meaningfully engaging families.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

67

General Supervision System:

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

LEA Structure in the District of Columbia

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

In FFY 2020, the District of Columbia's student population included 14,925 children with disabilities who were served by 67 LEAs, including the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) and 65 public charter school LEAs.

OSSE's System of General Supervision

OSSE's general supervision system consists of eight general supervisory components identified by the US Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP):

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

The District of Columbia's SPP

At least every six years, states are required to develop a state performance plan/annual performance report (SPP/APR) that evaluates the state's efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of the IDEA and describes how the state will improve its implementation. The District's FFY 2020 SPP establishes rigorous and measurable performance goals for the IDEA Part B Indicators identified by the US Department of Education for FFY 20 -

FFY25. The District of Columbia's SPP serves to keep the State publicly accountable for improving results for children with disabilities and also acts as a roadmap for DC's continuous efforts to improve educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities.

Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation

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

OSSE has published a range of policy guidance documents on the compliant implementation of requirements described in various State policies. Link to District of Columbia Special Education Policies and Guidance can be found here: <https://osse.dc.gov/service/parent-community-and-stakeholder-special-education-information>.

Integrated Monitoring Activities

OSSE works collaboratively with LEAs/public agencies and engages in shared accountability practices to maximize success for all children with disabilities. OSSE uses multiple data sources to monitor LEAs/public agencies, including database reviews, on-site compliance monitoring, focused monitoring, review of dispute resolution activities, self-assessments, oversight of nonpublic special education schools, Phase I and Phase II IDEA Part B grant applications, and reviews of audit findings.

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

OSSE's fiscal team also oversees the annual fiscal audit process. In FFY 2020, LEAs that spent \$750,000 or more in federal funds were required to receive a Single audit and submit a copy of the management letter to OSSE within 30 days of receipt or nine months after the end of the audit period, whichever date comes first. Additionally, all public charter schools in the District receive an annual audit regardless of the level of expenditures.

Data on Processes and Results

OSSE's general supervision system is driven by ongoing, systemic data review processes including monitoring, dispute resolution, Section 618 data submissions, reviewing LEA data by indicator, and other regularly scheduled data reviews.

OSSE has several data systems that are key to accomplishing the systemic reviews described above. First, the Statewide Longitudinal Education Data System (SLED) houses student-level enrollment, attendance, graduation, and other data for all children in the District of Columbia. Second, the Special Education Data System (SEDS) houses Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and Part B special education-related documentation for the District of Columbia.

In December 2020, OSSE entered its third year of employing the School Transparency and Reporting (STAR) accountability system and the DC School Report Card to align with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requirements. The report card includes each school's rating on the STAR Framework and breadth of qualitative and quantitative information about each school. The DC School Report Card can be found here: <https://dcschoolreportcard.org/>.

Annual IDEA LEA Performance Determinations

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

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

Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions

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

OSSE also employs a range of corrections and sanctions during the annual LEA determinations process. As required by section 34 CFR sections 300.600(a) and 300.604, OSSE will apply the following enforcement actions to programs based on the program's Determination Level, which can include but are not limited to:

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

Effective Dispute Resolution

There are several dispute resolution options available to the community in the District of Columbia, including due process hearings, mediation, and administrative state complaints. OSSE's Office of Dispute Resolution (ODR) oversees the District of Columbia's independent hearing office, which manages the state's due process and mediation programs.

In FFY 2020, OSSE continued to administer the state complaint process within the Division of Systems and Support, K-12. OSSE reviews dispute resolution data collected from complaints, hearing officer determinations, letters of decision, and settlement agreements to determine whether there are District-wide or LEA level issues that can be addressed through the OSSE's monitoring system or technical assistance systems.

Technical Assistance System:

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

OSSE utilizes a range of mechanisms to ensure the timely delivery of high-quality, evidence-based technical assessment and support to LEAs. As noted above, data collected from monitoring activities, dispute resolution, state and federal data submissions, grant applications and assurances, and fiscal audits are used to determine the state, LEA, and school-level needs for technical assistance, which is customized to address particular practice challenges or implementation questions that arise.

Also, OSSE publishes resource documents on regulations, policies, and best practices in special education and provides webinar training modules on all state-level special education policies.

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

Also, to ensure that LEA/public agency staff are proficient in using state data systems, OSSE offers regular training on the various State data systems.

Below is an overview of the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance related to the results for which the State received a score of zero on Part B Results Driven Accountability Matrix-2020:

4th and 8th grade National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results (reading/math), Graduation and Dropout:
OSSE continues to take advantage of technical assistance opportunities as members of the NCSI Results-Based Accountability Cross-State Learning Collaborative. OSSE joined the Results-Based Accountability Collaborative to thought-partner ways in which monitoring activities can further support LEAs with improving academic outcomes while they maintain compliance with IDEA regulations.

During the 2020-2021 school year, OSSE participated in the virtual Results-Based Accountability (RBA) Cross-State Learning Collaborative (CSLC) monthly series hosted by the NCSI. OSSE collaborated with other states to learn and develop effective strategies to shift its focus from compliance-driven to results-driven accountability, specifically focusing on the better use of data to support root cause analysis and drive technical assistance. OSSE will continue to receive additional support and resources from technical assistance centers to ensure the improvements in desired outcomes for students with disabilities.

Longstanding Noncompliance:

OSSE continues to work directly with OSEP to address challenges related to closing out longstanding non-compliance in an appropriate manner and meets requirements pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.

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

The State also provides multiple professional development opportunities to service providers in the District of Columbia. Professional development is geared toward ensuring that District of Columbia teachers and service providers can implement evidence-based strategies for improving student outcomes. The State provides both introductory-level professional development opportunities and advanced skill-building opportunities to encourage growth regardless of the individual practitioner's current skill level. OSSE's technical assistance team also works closely with its assessment team to ensure alignment and coherence between instruction and assessment.

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

In addition to the provision of ongoing professional development opportunities, OSSE also supports the continued skill-building of service providers in partnership with other child-serving agencies such as the Child and Family Services Administration (CFSA), the Department of Behavioral Health (DBH), and the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (DYRS).

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

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

1. OSSE convened an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted data analysis related to students with disabilities. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts identified appropriate baseline data for each APR indicator, proposed targets, and a rationale for each.
3. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) and local advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and strategies and evaluation for improvement.
4. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise baselines and targets as appropriate.
5. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide was distributed to its SAPSE, local advocacy groups, and its LEAs with requests for feedback.
6. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SiMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SiMR.
7. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

10

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

OSSE engaged parent member stakeholders by facilitating a parent advocacy-specific feedback session as outlined below:

1. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) and local parent advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and strategies and evaluation for improvement.
2. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise baselines and targets as appropriate.
3. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide was distributed to its SAPSE, local parent advocacy groups with requests for feedback.
4. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.
5. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SiMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SiMR.

OSSE facilitated stakeholder sessions with the following parent organizations and advocacy groups:

District's State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE)
Parent Training and Information Center (PTI)
Parents Amplifying Voices in Education (PAVE)
Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

OSSE facilitated multiple activities for parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. OSSE sought feedback from parents via virtual presentations that included an "office hours" session providing an open question-and-answer forum. Participants were also encouraged to provide feedback using a written form that could be completed and submitted via email to OSSE. In addition, OSSE provided a draft of its SPP/APR Resource Guide to all stakeholders with a corresponding online feedback form. Information in both modalities was made accessible and included simplified information and data modeling visuals. OSSE will continue to take lessons learned from the feedback process to increase engagement moving forward and build participation and capacity.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

OSSE sought public input targeting advocacy organizations, parent community groups, and LEAs. These activities took place beginning in the spring of 2021 and concluded in the fall of 2021.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

OSSE made its SPP/APR Resource Guide publicly available by publishing the resource on its website prior to the State's submission of its SPP/APR to the U.S. Department of Ed.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

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

The District of Columbia's public reporting documents are posted to OSSE's website and can be found here:

<https://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/FFY%202018%20IDEA%20Part%20B%20Report%20to%20the%20Public.pdf>

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The District of Columbia's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised the District of Columbia of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the District of Columbia to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the District of Columbia to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The District of Columbia must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance

sources from which the District of Columbia received assistance; and (2) the actions the District of Columbia took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

DC's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed DC that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. DC provided the required information.

OSEP imposed Specific Conditions on DC's IDEA Part B grant awards for the last three or more years.

Intro - Required Actions

DC's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In DC's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised DC of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required DC to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed DC to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. DC must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which DC received assistance; and (2) the actions DC took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	61.60%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	49.80%	54.80%	60.00%	60.00%	52.70%
Data	46.28%	49.51%	53.12%	46.89%	51.18%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	52.00%	54.00%	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%	63.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- OSSE convened an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted data analysis related to students with disabilities. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
- Subject matter experts identified appropriate baseline data for each APR indicator, proposed targets, and a rationale for each.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) and local advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and strategies and evaluation for improvement.
- OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise baselines and targets as appropriate.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide was distributed to its SAPSE, local advocacy groups, and its LEAs with requests for feedback.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SiMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SiMR.
- OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	555

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	52
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	294

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
555	901	51.18%	52.00%	61.60%	N/A	N/A

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

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

TITLE 5-A, OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION CHAPTER 22, GRADUATION 2203 ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS

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

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

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

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

COURSES UNIT(S)

English 4.0

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

Science; must include three (3) lab sciences 4.0

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

States Government, and District of Columbia History

World Language 2.0

Art 0.5

Music 0.5

Physical Education/Health 1.5

Electives 3.5

TOTAL 24.0

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2203.7 Beginning with School Year 2016-2017:

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

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

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

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

(b) [RESERVED]

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

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

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State revised its baseline data to align with the newly required data source. States must report the same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education under section 618 of IDEA for this indicator. The data source for this indicator is now FS009.

The State acknowledges the impact COVID-19 may have had on graduation rates for students with disabilities. As schools were in a virtual learning posture the majority of the 2020-2021 school year, the State recognizes that modifications to attendance requirements may have impacted the overall graduation rate for students with disabilities. The State will monitor data for this indicator and revise targets in upcoming years as necessary and appropriate.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

DC has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

DC provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	32.63%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	5.30%	5.10%	4.80%	4.60%	4.60%
Data	23.79%	19.84%	19.96%	18.45%	15.59%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	42.00%	40.00%	38.00%	36.00%	34.00%	32.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- OSSE convened an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted data analysis related to students with disabilities. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
- Subject matter experts identified appropriate baseline data for each APR indicator, proposed targets, and a rationale for each.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on

Special Education (SAPSE) and local advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and strategies and evaluation for improvement.

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

5. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide was distributed to its SAPSE, local advocacy groups, and its LEAs with requests for feedback.

6. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SiMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SiMR.

7. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	555
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	52
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	294

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
294	901	15.59%	42.00%	32.63%	N/A	N/A

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

Dropping out is considered any students of the Adjusted Cohort who were non-graduates as of August 31, 2019, and who did not enroll during SY 2019-20. Students who received a GED or IEP certificate by August 31, 2019, were not considered to have dropped-out.

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

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State revised its baseline data to align with the newly required data source. States must report the same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education under section 618 of IDEA for this indicator. The data source for this indicator is now FS009.

The State acknowledges the impact COVID-19 may have had on dropout rates for students with disabilities. As schools were in a virtual learning posture the majority of the 2020-2021 school year, the State recognizes that students with disabilities may have become disengaged from school and dropped out, especially those students 18 and older due to being non-compulsory school age. The State will monitor data for this indicator and revise targets in upcoming years as necessary and appropriate.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

DC has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

DC provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	96.70%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	91.40%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	84.80%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	96.20%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	91.10%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	85.90%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

1. OSSE convened an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted data analysis related to students with disabilities. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts identified appropriate baseline data for each APR indicator, proposed targets, and a rationale for each.
3. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) and local advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and strategies and evaluation for improvement.
4. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise baselines and targets as appropriate.
5. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide was distributed to its SAPSE, local advocacy groups, and its LEAs with requests for feedback.
6. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SiMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SiMR.
7. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*			
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations			
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards			

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*			
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations			
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards			

*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4				98.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8				95.00%		N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS				95.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4				97.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8				95.00%		N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS				95.00%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State revised its baseline data to align with the new requirements for this indicator.

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2020 data for this indicator.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

DC has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

DC provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

DC was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, DC received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2020 data for this indicator.

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	7.70%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	8.60%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	7.40%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	10.20%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	4.50%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	1.30%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	11.00%	13.00%	16.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	13.00%	16.00%	18.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	10.00%	12.00%	14.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	14.00%	17.00%	20.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	7.00%	8.00%	10.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	3.00%	4.00%	5.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- OSSE convened an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted data analysis related to students with disabilities. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
- Subject matter experts identified appropriate baseline data for each APR indicator, proposed targets, and a rationale for each.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) and local advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and strategies and evaluation for improvement.
- OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise baselines and targets as appropriate.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide

was distributed to its SAPSE, local advocacy groups, and its LEAs with requests for feedback.

6. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SiMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SiMR.

7. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment			
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment			
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4				8.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8				9.00%		N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS				7.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4				10.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8				5.00%		N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS				1.00%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State revised its baseline data to align with the new requirements for this indicator.

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2020 data for this indicator.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

DC has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

DC provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

DC was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, DC received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2020 data for this indicator.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = $[(\# \text{ of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment})]$. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	42.40%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	41.10%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	38.80%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	48.30%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	50.70%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	46.90%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	42.00%	42.00%	42.00%	43.00%	43.00%	44.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	41.00%	41.00%	41.00%	42.00%	42.00%	43.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	39.00%	39.00%	39.00%	40.00%	40.00%	41.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	48.00%	48.00%	48.00%	49.00%	49.00%	50.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	51.00%	51.00%	51.00%	52.00%	52.00%	53.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	47.00%	47.00%	47.00%	48.00%	48.00%	49.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

1. OSSE convened an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted data analysis related to students with disabilities. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts identified appropriate baseline data for each APR indicator, proposed targets, and a rationale for each.
3. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) and local advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and strategies and evaluation for improvement.
4. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise baselines and targets as appropriate.
5. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide was distributed to its SAPSE, local advocacy groups, and its LEAs with requests for feedback.
6. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SiMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SiMR.
7. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment			
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient			

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment			
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient			

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4				42.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8				41.00%		N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C	Grade HS				39.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4				48.00%		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8				51.00%		N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS				47.00%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State revised its baseline data to align with the new requirements for this indicator.

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2020 data for this indicator.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

DC has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

DC provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

DC was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, DC received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2020 data for this indicator.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	30.60
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	30.90
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	26.10
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	28.20
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	20.10
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	16.80

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	31.00	31.00	31.00	30.00	29.00	28.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	31.00	31.00	31.00	30.00	29.00	28.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	26.00	26.00	26.00	25.00	24.00	23.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	28.00	28.00	28.00	27.00	26.00	25.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.00	18.00	17.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	17.00	17.00	17.00	16.00	15.00	14.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- OSSE convened an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted data analysis related to students with disabilities. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
- Subject matter experts identified appropriate baseline data for each APR indicator, proposed targets, and a rationale for each.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) and local advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and

strategies and evaluation for improvement.

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

5. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide was distributed to its SAPSE, local advocacy groups, and its LEAs with requests for feedback.

6. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SiMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SiMR.

7. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment			
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level			

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4				31.00		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8				31.00		N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS				26.00		N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4				28.00		N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8				20.00		N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS				17.00		N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State revised its baseline data to align with the new requirements for this indicator.

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2020 data for this indicator.

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

DC has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

DC provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

DC was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, DC received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2020 data for this indicator.

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	12.90%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	12.24%	12.90%	11.76%	2.27%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

1. OSSE convened an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted data analysis related to students with disabilities. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts identified appropriate baseline data for each APR indicator, proposed targets, and a rationale for each.
3. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) and local advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and strategies and evaluation for improvement.
4. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise baselines and targets as appropriate.
5. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide was distributed to its SAPSE, local advocacy groups, and its LEAs with requests for feedback.
6. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SiMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SiMR.
7. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

64

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0.00%	0.00%		N/A	N/A

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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

OSSE is moving towards utilizing multi-year data in the calculation for indicator 4a. As indicator 4 utilizes lag data, for the FFY 20 review, OSSE identified LEAs that were identified as having a significant discrepancy based on data from the 2019-2020 school year. For the review of 2020-2021 school year data, OSSE will identify LEAs that were identified as having a significant discrepancy for two (2) consecutive years in the same analysis category. Beginning with the review of 2021-2022 school year data, OSSE will only flag LEAs that are identified in the same analysis category for three (3) consecutive years.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)**

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

For FFY 2020 there were zero (0) LEAs that met the state's definition of significant discrepancy as it relates to indicator 4A.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

DC provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	2.94%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	4.08%	2.94%	11.76%	4.55%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

61

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3	0	3	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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

OSSE is moving towards utilizing multi-year data in the calculation for indicator 4b. As indicator 4b utilizes lag data, for the FFY 20 review, OSSE identified LEAs that were identified as having a significant discrepancy based on data from the 2019-2020 school year. For the review of 2020-2021 school year data, OSSE will identify LEAs that were identified as having a significant discrepancy for two (2) consecutive years in the same analysis category. Beginning with the review of 2021-2022 school year data, OSSE will only flag LEAs that are identified in the same analysis category for three (3) consecutive years.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

For the three (3) LEAs that the State identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs in FFY 2020 (using SY 2019-20 data), the State required completion of self-study activities and reviewed the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

OSSE reviewed the results of the self-studies submitted by the LEAs, and the policies, procedures, and practices. OSSE determined that the three (3) LEAs' policies, procedures, and practices did not contribute to their identified significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity.

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	56.00%	59.00%	61.00%	64.00%	64.00%
A	58.19%	Data	55.61%	56.47%	56.63%	56.97%	57.19%
B	2020	Target <=	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	14.00%	14.00%
B	16.80%	Data	17.38%	15.23%	15.31%	15.61%	15.27%
C	2020	Target <=	13.00%	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%	10.00%
C	7.73%	Data	10.04%	9.41%	9.03%	8.54%	8.10%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	58.19%	60.00%	62.00%	62.00%	65.00%	65.00%
Target B <=	16.80%	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%
Target C <=	7.73%	9.00%	9.00%	8.00%	7.00%	7.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- OSSE convened an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted data analysis related to students with disabilities. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
- Subject matter experts identified appropriate baseline data for each APR indicator, proposed targets, and a rationale for each.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) and local advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and strategies and evaluation for improvement.
- OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise baselines and targets as appropriate.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide was distributed to its SAPSE, local advocacy groups, and its LEAs with requests for feedback.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SIMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SIMR.

7. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	13,766
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	8,011
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,313
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	1,013
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	42
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	9

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

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	8,011	13,766	57.19%	58.19%	58.19%	N/A	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,313	13,766	15.27%	16.80%	16.80%	N/A	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,064	13,766	8.10%	7.73%	7.73%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State revised its baseline data due to the change in reporting of five-year-old children in kindergarten for this indicator.

The State recognizes the impact COVID-19 may have had on performance rates for this indicator. As schools moved from virtual to in-person learning during the 2020-2021 school year, OSSE acknowledges that student placements may have been affected due to an increase of referrals for evaluation and placements for students into more restrictive settings as students demonstrate significant learning loss and regression. The State will monitor data for this indicator and revise targets in upcoming years as necessary and appropriate.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

DC has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

DC provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	57.00%	58.00%	59.00%	60.00%	60.00%
A	Data	43.17%	45.37%	51.70%	48.92%	55.45%
B	Target <=	14.00%	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%	10.00%
B	Data	7.75%	16.66%	16.21%	17.26%	15.28%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- OSSE convened an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted data analysis related to students with disabilities. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
- Subject matter experts identified appropriate baseline data for each APR indicator, proposed targets, and a rationale for each.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) and local advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and strategies and evaluation for improvement.
- OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise baselines and targets as appropriate.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide was distributed to its SAPSE, local advocacy groups, and its LEAs with requests for feedback.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SiMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SiMR.
- OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	55.99%
B	2020	18.41%
C	N/A	

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	55.99%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%
Target B <=	18.41%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=						

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	340	830	41	1,211
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	179	480	19	678
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	79	128	7	214
b2. Number of children attending separate school	1	8	0	9
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	0	1	0	1

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

NO

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	678	1,211	55.45%	55.99%	55.99%	N/A	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	223	1,211	15.28%	18.41%	18.41%	N/A	N/A
C. Home	1	1,211			0.08%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State revised its baseline data due to the change in reporting of only five-year-old children in preschool for this indicator.

The State recognizes the impact COVID-19 may have had on performance rates for this indicator. OSSE acknowledges a decrease in preschool enrollment for students with disabilities which may have affected preschool environments. The State will monitor data for this indicator and revise targets in upcoming years as necessary and appropriate.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

DC has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

DC provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

DC reported fewer than ten children receiving special education and related services in the home in FFY 2020. DC is not required to provide baseline or targets for Indicator 6C until any fiscal year in which ten or more children receive special education and related services in the home.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

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

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2019	Target >=	76.00%	77.00%	78.00%	80.00%	80.00%
A1	74.59%	Data	85.71%	90.62%	84.62%	87.50%	74.59%
A2	2019	Target >=	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%	68.00%	68.00%

A2	61.47%	Data	73.62%	73.38%	65.45%	68.99%	61.47%
B1	2019	Target >=	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%	87.00%	87.00%
B1	76.43%	Data	87.42%	90.38%	85.56%	88.35%	76.43%
B2	2019	Target >=	64.00%	65.00%	66.00%	68.00%	68.00%
B2	64.90%	Data	74.77%	76.10%	69.70%	68.81%	64.90%
C1	2019	Target >=	80.00%	81.00%	82.00%	84.00%	84.00%
C1	56.95%	Data	86.15%	90.32%	92.03%	67.22%	56.95%
C2	2019	Target >=	76.00%	77.00%	78.00%	80.00%	80.00%
C2	60.10%	Data	82.11%	84.70%	86.26%	70.83%	60.10%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
Target A2 >=	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%
Target B1 >=	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Target B2 >=	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%
Target C1 >=	84.00%	84.00%	84.00%	84.00%	84.00%	84.00%
Target C2 >=	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

1. OSSE convened an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted data analysis related to students with disabilities. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts identified appropriate baseline data for each APR indicator, proposed targets, and a rationale for each.
3. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) and local advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and strategies and evaluation for improvement.
4. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise baselines and targets as appropriate.
5. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide was distributed to its SAPSE, local advocacy groups, and its LEAs with requests for feedback.
6. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SiMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SiMR.
7. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

261

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	12	4.60%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	36	13.79%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	73	27.97%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	82	31.42%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	58	22.22%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	155	203	74.59%	80.00%	76.35%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	140	261	61.47%	68.00%	53.64%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	14	5.36%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	50	19.16%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	83	31.80%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	64	24.52%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	50	19.16%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	147	211	76.43%	87.00%	69.67%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	114	261	64.90%	68.00%	43.68%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	11	4.21%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	34	13.03%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	73	27.97%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	71	27.20%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	72	27.59%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	144	189	56.95%	84.00%	76.19%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	143	261	60.10%	80.00%	54.79%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	<p>Reason</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OSSE attributes slippage to the existing data collection practice. OSSE's review of LEA practice in submitting this data to the SEA indicate inconsistent implementation of assessment tools within and amongst LEAs. Also contributing to this inconsistency of implementation is the high rate of staff turnover in early childhood education experienced both locally and nationally. <p>Agency Initiatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OSSE identified APR Indicator 7B (preschool outcomes; acquisition of knowledge and use of knowledge and skill (including early language/communication and early literacy) as it's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) to leverage existing initiatives to address identified gaps in student performance within this indicator, and to address LEA capacity to consistently implement assessment tools.
B1	<p>Reason</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OSSE attributes slippage to the existing data collection practice. OSSE's review of LEA practice in submitting this data to the SEA indicate inconsistent implementation of assessment tools within and amongst LEAs. Also contributing to this inconsistency of implementation is the high rate of staff turnover in early childhood education experienced both locally and nationally. <p>Agency Initiatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OSSE identified APR Indicator 7B (preschool outcomes; acquisition of knowledge and use of knowledge and skill (including early language/communication and early literacy) as it's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) to leverage existing initiatives to address identified gaps in student performance within this indicator, and to address LEA capacity to consistently implement assessment tools.
B2	<p>Reason</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OSSE attributes slippage to the existing data collection practice. OSSE's review of LEA practice in submitting this data to the SEA indicate inconsistent implementation of assessment tools within and amongst LEAs. Also contributing to this inconsistency of implementation is the high rate of staff turnover in early childhood education experienced both locally and nationally. <p>Agency Initiatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OSSE identified APR Indicator 7B (preschool outcomes; acquisition of knowledge and use of knowledge and skill (including early language/communication and early literacy) as it's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) to leverage existing initiatives to address identified gaps in student performance within this indicator, and to address LEA capacity to consistently implement assessment tools.
C2	<p>Reason</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OSSE attributes slippage to the existing data collection practice. OSSE's review of LEA practice in submitting this data to the SEA indicate inconsistent implementation of assessment tools within and amongst LEAs. Also contributing to this inconsistency of implementation is the high rate of staff turnover in early childhood education experienced both locally and nationally. <p>Agency Initiatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OSSE identified APR Indicator 7B (preschool outcomes; acquisition of knowledge and use of knowledge and skill (including early language/communication and early literacy) as it's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) to leverage existing initiatives to address identified gaps in student performance within this indicator, and to address LEA capacity to consistently implement assessment tools.

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

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The District redesigned its State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) in FY20 to align with Indicator 7, specifically outcome B: acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including language/ communication and early literacy). The District's SSIP also contemplates systemic improvements to increase LEA capacity to make data-driven decisions regarding the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process, the mechanism used to collect data for Indicator 7 in the District. Due to the specific SSIP focus on improving preschool outcomes, data capacity, and early literacy, the District anticipates accelerated increases in statewide performance on Indicator 7. To best inform this work with current data and provide a clearer picture of growth during the implementation of the SSIP, the District reset the baseline for this indicator. Internal and external stakeholders provided input both on the decision to reset the baseline, and on the baseline and targets established as part of that process.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

DC has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

DC provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

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

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

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

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- OSSE convened an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted data analysis related to students with disabilities. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
- Subject matter experts identified appropriate baseline data for each APR indicator, proposed targets, and a rationale for each.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) and local advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and strategies and evaluation for improvement.
- OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise baselines and targets as appropriate.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide was distributed to its SAPSE, local advocacy groups, and its LEAs with requests for feedback.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SiMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SiMR.
- OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	88.49%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	80.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data	83.60%	86.44%	88.87%	86.56%	88.49%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	89.00%	89.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
814	1,045	88.49%	89.00%	77.89%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Reason

- OSSE made two changes to the FFY20 parent survey to increase parental participation and actionable data. OSSE implemented strategies for virtual parent engagement in the FFY20 parent survey, resulting in a higher than ever response rate and more data indicating parental dissatisfaction. OSSE additionally implemented a revised FFY20 parent survey that collected data on a 6-point Likert scale rather than a 7-point Likert scale, increasing the agency's ability to quantify parental feedback as satisfied or dissatisfied.

Agency Initiatives

- OSSE continues to enhance parent engagement through tools designed to access all families, including SMS messaging to deploy survey requests; an on-line Parent Hub to convey important and accessible information to families on the shifting environments during the ongoing public emergency, and the support of LEAs and trusted community partners to support increased parent responsiveness.

- OSSE, in partnership with the District's Ombudsman for Education, is dedicating significant resources to the alignment of State-level resources for families navigating special education. After conducting a landscape analysis, the District identified that the complex District system requires a single-entry point for beginning dispute resolution process, learning more about navigating the special education process, and seeking support for receipt of services. This work continues to be informed by the meaningful results of our revised parent survey.

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

In the District of Columbia, a single survey is made available to parents of both preschool and school-aged students with IEPs. All questions apply to both parents of preschool and school-aged children. For FY20, OSSE distributed an online survey through public advertisements, LEA notices to parents, advocacy and community organizations, and direct Short Message Service (SMS) text messages to parents. The online survey was translated into the top six languages spoken by parents in the District of Columbia (Spanish, Amharic, Chinese, French, Korean, and Vietnamese). Survey participants could select their preferred language within the online system, and paper and translated versions were made available on OSSE's website and upon request. OSSE sent direct SMS text messages including a link to the online survey to the cellular telephone numbers of parents as provided by LEAs in the Statewide Longitudinal Education Data (SLED) system, after comparing the school year 2020-21 enrollment data with the school year 2021-22 parent demographic data to ensure the most current data and contact information.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

14,925

Percentage of respondent parents

7.00%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	3.55%	7.00%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

In FY20, OSSE experienced significant success in increasing participation in the parent survey through the use of direct SMS text messages and will expand on this activity in future years. OSSE will consider the feasibility of text messaging in the parent's identified native language, gathering additional

parent phone numbers, and other ways to expand this form of outreach. OSSE also will engage with LEAs to determine how it can better support LEAs in communicating with parents about the parent survey and encouraging participation.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

OSSE doubled the response rate from prior years by sending direct SMS text messaging to 5269 parent cell phone numbers. OSSE sent SMS text messages four times, and each time experienced a significant influx in responses. OSSE especially saw an increase in participation by parents residing in Ward 8 after sending text messages, which suggests prior methods of outreach were less successful in accessing that geographical population.

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

Overall, survey data are largely representative of the District's special education population. However, OSSE identified trends across grade band and race/ ethnicity, and will continue to explore ways to improve outreach for populations for which participation gaps are identified, based on the following analyses:

- Parents of high school students were less likely to respond to the survey (15.1% of total participants compared to comprising 27% of the enrolled population), while responsiveness within other grade bands were representative of student enrollments.
- By comparison, parents of black students were slightly less likely to participate (69.7% of total participants compared to 75.6% of the enrollment population), while Hispanic or Latino families (17.8% vs. 15.9%) and white families (8.1% vs. 5.8%) were slightly more likely.
- Parents of students enrolled in public charter schools were more likely to respond than parents of students enrolled in traditional public schools. In the District, public charter school LEAs enroll nearly half of all students.

For FY21-25 reporting, the District's chosen metric related to representativeness is geographic location, which was selected through a rigorous stakeholder engagement process. In the District of Columbia, geographic location is delineated by "ward", of which the city is divided into eight wards. 21.3% (N=223) of participants did not respond or indicated their ward was "unknown". Of the participants who identified a ward, survey participation was representative of enrollment rates of District students with disabilities.

1. Participation by Ward

Ward of Residence	Percentage of Total Participants	Enrollment Rate
Ward 1	5.4%	8.3%
Ward 2	1.5%	1.3%
Ward 3	4.1%	3.3%
Ward 4	14.8%	13.9%
Ward 5	16.5%	14.9%
Ward 6	10.3%	9.8%
Ward 7	21.9%	20.9%
Ward 8	25.4%	27.6%

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

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

Representativeness across demographics seems to be affected by the percentage of participants who did not provide a response to demographic questions. For example, 14.1% (N= of participants did not respond to demographic questions regarding race while 21.3% either did not know or did not respond regarding their ward of residence. OSSE is considering strategies for improving overall responsiveness on those questions to ensure a more complete data set, including strategies to address potential privacy concerns, communications around how the data will be used, and considering making demographic questions mandatory for survey completion.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The District determines representativeness by determining if the percent of respondents is within 15% of the percent of enrolled students with disabilities in each ward.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	OSSE DC 2020-2021 Special Education Parent Survey

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSSE revised the baseline for this indicator as the previous baseline (2005) did not accurately reflect the work and subsequent progress the District has made in the area of parent participation.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the District of Columbia must report whether its FFY 2020 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the District of Columbia is taking to address this issue. The District of Columbia must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

DC has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

DC provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, DC must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions DC is taking to address this issue. DC must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	3.23%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

13

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	54	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

This year (2020), OSSE changed its definition of disproportionate representation to the following:

1) OSSE changed its calculation method from a weighted risk ratio to a risk ratio or alternate state risk ratio for indicator 9 using its SY 2020-2021 Enrollment Audit and Child Count data to determine disproportionate representation. The risk ratio compares the chance, or risk, of children of a particular racial/ethnic group being identified for special education with the chance, or risk, of children of all other racial/ethnic groups being identified for special education.

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

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

2) The District of Columbia's adopted a risk ratio threshold of five (5) which means that the OSSE will investigate an LEA if a particular racial/ethnic group is more than 5 times as likely as all other racial/ethnic groups to be identified for special education.

3) OSSE is moving towards utilizing multi-year data in the calculation for disproportionate representation. For the 2020-21 school year review, OSSE identified LEAs that were identified as having disproportionate representation for the 2020-2021 school year only. For the 2021-22 school year review, OSSE will identify LEAs that were identified as having significant discrepancy and/or disproportionate representation for two (2) consecutive years in the same analysis category. Beginning in the 2022-23 school year, OSSE will only flag LEAs that are identified in the same analysis category for three (3) consecutive years.

4) An LEA must have at least 10 children from a racial/ethnic group with a disability and 30 enrolled children from a racial/ethnic group to have a calculation created. LEAs with fewer than 10 children in a disability category and/or 30 in all other enrolled children will have the state denominator used in place of their own data, noted as using the alternate risk ratio.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Using the criteria established in the section above, OSSE determined that zero (0) LEAs met the minimum n size and/or cell size in order to be included in the state's calculation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State set a new baseline for this indicator to account for the State's new definition of disproportionate representation. OSSE solicited stakeholder feedback on the State's new definition during the stakeholder feedback process as described in the introduction.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

DC has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2020, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	2.33%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	3.33%	5.88%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

24

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
6	1	43	0.00%	0%	2.33%	N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

This year (2020), OSSE changed its definition of disproportionate representation to the following:

1) OSSE changed its calculation method from a weighted risk ratio to a risk ratio or alternate risk ratio for indicator 10 using its SY 2020-2021 Enrollment Audit and Child Count data to determine disproportionate representation. The risk ratio compares the chance, or risk, of children of a particular racial/ethnic group being identified for special education with the chance, or risk, of children of all other racial/ethnic groups being identified for special education in a specific disability category.

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

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

2) The District of Columbia's adopted a risk ratio threshold of seven (7) which means that the OSSE will investigate an LEA if a particular racial/ethnic group is more than 7 times as likely as all other racial/ethnic groups to be identified for special education in a specific disability category.

3) OSSE is moving towards utilizing multi-year data in the calculation for disproportionate representation. For the 2020-21 school year review, OSSE identified LEAs that were identified as having disproportionate representation for the 2020-2021 school year only. For the 2021-22 school year review, OSSE will identify LEAs that were identified as having significant discrepancy and/or disproportionate representation for two (2) consecutive years in the same analysis category. Beginning in the 2022-23 school year, OSSE will only flag LEAs that are identified in the same analysis category for three (3) consecutive years.

4) An LEA must have at least 10 children from a racial/ethnic group in a disability category and 30 enrolled children from a racial/ethnic group to have a calculation created. LEAs with fewer than 10 children in a disability category and/or 30 in all other enrolled children will have the state denominator used in place of their own data, noted as using the alternate risk ratio.

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

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

Using the criteria established in the section above, OSSE determined that six (6) of 43 LEAs that met the "n" size and cell size were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation in a specific disability category.

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

For each of the six (6) LEAs that the State identified as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in a specific disability category, OSSE required completion of a self-study to determine if the disproportionate representation was a result of inappropriate identification.

As part of this self-study, LEAs are required to review a number of student records (depending on the overall number of students with IEPs at the LEA); and provide existing policies, procedures, and practices documentation to OSSE for comparison with child find, evaluation, and eligibility requirements.

All six (6) LEAs submitted their completed self-studies. OSSE reviewed the results of the self-studies, including reviewing each LEA's child find, evaluation, and eligibility policies and practices, and found that one (1) LEA had disproportionate representation as a result of policies, procedures, and practices that did not comply with IDEA requirements.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State set a new baseline for this indicator to account for the State's new definition of disproportionate representation. OSSE solicited stakeholder feedback on the State's new definition during the stakeholder feedback process as described in the introduction.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

DC has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

10 - Required Actions

Because DC reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), DC must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. DC must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the district identified in FFY 2020 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that DC verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, DC must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If DC did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why DC did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	22.30%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	92.51%	91.07%	92.37%	86.03%	70.71%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1,983	1,251	70.71%	100%	63.09%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

Reason

- The District's Child Find efforts were adversely affected by events resulting from the COVID-19 public health emergency. The District has conducted a data review and determined that Child Find was specifically impacted by increased referral rates and reduced capacity to conduct timely assessments.

Agency Initiatives

- OSSE implemented focused child find monitoring activities implemented in August 2020, to include targeted tiered supports designed to improve District practices to identify, locate, and evaluate students suspected of having a disability. Targeted supports included a review of LEA data with special education points of contact, identification of root causes for initial evaluation shortfalls, and strategies for student and system-level improvement.
- OSSE continues to review LEA data to improve initial evaluation practices.
- OSSE is exploring sector-level supports to increase the capacity of existing District assessment providers, and increase the availability of providers to District LEAs.

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

732

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

The days beyond the 60-day timeline from evaluation ranged from one (1) day to 351 days.

There were 87 evaluations delayed due to parental delay. There were 645 evaluations delayed due to the LEA, including delayed action taken related to initial referral and delays in scheduling meetings. Of those 645 evaluations, 139 were delayed due circumstances resulting from COVID-19.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

OSSE uses its statewide Special Education Data Systems (SEDS) to collect data for this indicator. Data is collected for the entire reporting year (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2021) on all children referred for initial evaluation. OSSE reviews data from all LEAs. Following the review of data, OSSE issues findings of noncompliance to each LEA that did not achieve 100% compliance for evaluation timelines.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State acknowledges the impact COVID-19 may have had on initial eligibility timeliness as schools continue to address challenges i.e. staffing shortages and absences due to COVID-19 and initial eligibility backlogs.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
55	55		0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OSSE has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through the State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

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

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

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

OSSE verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance by verifying the documentation provided by the LEA that an evaluation had been provided for each student unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

After the state verified that every individual instance of noncompliance was corrected, the state pulled subsequent data to determine whether the LEA

was correctly implementing the regulatory requirement to provide a timely evaluation. After correcting each instance of student-level noncompliance, if the LEA demonstrated 100% compliance on the subsequent data pulls, the state closed the findings of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the District of Columbia reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the District of Columbia must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the District of Columbia must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the District of Columbia must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the District of Columbia did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the District of Columbia did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because DC reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, DC must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, DC must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, DC must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If DC did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why DC did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	37.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.44%	94.00%	95.33%	98.56%	84.34%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	545
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	39

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	95
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	119
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	44
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	174

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	95	169	84.34%	100%	56.21%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Reason

The District's C to B transition efforts were adversely affected by events resulting from the COVID-19 public emergency. OSSE has conducted a data review and determined that C to B transition was specifically affected by reduced capacity to conduct timely assessments and to convene timely transition meetings.

Agency Initiatives

- OSSE continues its focused C to B Transition monitoring and targeted tiered supports to assist LEAs in timely IEP development and transition students from IDEA Part C to IDEA Part B. Targeted supports included review of LEA data to identify root causes for slippage, and resulting identification of student level correction and system level practice improvements.
- OSSE continues to review LEA data to ensure initial evaluations are completed and students determined eligible receive services.

Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f
74

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

Seventy-four children who were served in Part C and referred in Part B for a Part B eligibility determination did not have an IEP developed and implemented by the child's third birthday. The State attributes this decrease in timeliness to events resulting from the public emergency.

The number of days beyond the child's third birthday was 3 to 354 days, and reasons for delay included delay in evaluations and delay in scheduling meetings.

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State acknowledges the impact COVID-19 may have had on C to B transition timeliness as schools continue to address challenges i.e. staffing shortages and absences due to COVID-19 and initial eligibility backlogs.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In all instances in which OSSE identifies non-compliance, OSSE verifies that the LEA:

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

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

In FFY 2019, OSSE verified three (3) instances of noncompliance for this indicator. OSSE verified in the Special Education Data System (SEDS) that the LEA had developed and implemented IEPs for each student. Each student-level finding was corrected, and OSSE confirmed that 100% compliance was achieved on a subsequent review of data.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the District of Columbia reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the District of Columbia must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the District of Columbia must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the District of Columbia must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the District of Columbia did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the District of Columbia did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**12 - OSEP Response****12 - Required Actions**

Because DC reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, DC must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, DC must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, DC must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If DC did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why DC did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority)}}{\text{(\# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)}} \right] \times 100$.

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	3.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	63.00%	71.00%	76.00%	76.00%	70.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
130	200	70.00%	100%	65.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Reason

- Data affected by closures due to national emergency, including reduced availability of secondary transition activities through schools and third-party organizations.

Agency Initiatives

- In response to a recommendation from OSEP's 2020 monitoring visit, OSSE revised its methodology for secondary transition monitoring of LEAs through a weighted sampling approach. In addition, OSSE will provide tiered TA to support LEAs in developing and implementing secondary transition plans that meet compliance requirements.

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

State monitoring

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

OSSE has shifted to a weighted data pull approach which reviews secondary transition data for all LEAs serving students 16 years of age and older. This weighted data pull will be based on the number of students ages 16 years and older at each LEA, divided by the total number of students ages 16 and up in DC. The minimum 'n' size for each LEA will be five (5) student files.

OSSE is conducting monitoring annually, reviewing a total of 200 selected student transition plans as a sample of all LEAs serving students ages 16 and up for each reporting period. Student file review sampling using this methodology will result in a simultaneous review of 200 total files across Q2 and Q3 (100 per quarter). The revised methodology allows for more frequent touchpoints with LEAs in the area of secondary transition.

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

If no, please explain

Currently, the District is under specific conditions for secondary transition and reviews transition plans for students age 16 and up from all LEAs. In order to maintain consistent data comparisons and appropriately demonstrate progress, OSSE will continue to monitor for students age 16 and up. Additionally, OSSE will continue to provide ongoing training and technical assistance for middle school staff on the secondary transition requirements to prepare LEAs for the changes in OSSE's monitoring of secondary transition to include 14 and 15-year-olds.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

There are no (0) FFY 2019 findings of noncompliance remaining open.

The State has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019:

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

OSSE requires submission of documentation showing the correction of noncompliance as soon as possible and in no case longer than one year from the notification.

OSSE issues findings of noncompliance using the District of Columbia Corrective Action Tracking System (DC CATS). DC CATS allows SEA and LEA staff members to view findings issued, as well as deadlines for correction. LEA staff submit evidence of correction of noncompliance to the DC CATS system. If the LEA's first submission does not correct noncompliance, OSSE compliance monitors follow-up with the LEA to provide additional technical assistance on the requirements for correction.

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

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

For correction of individual student-level noncompliance, OSSE ensured that the LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, by ensuring each LEA had completed the required action (e.g., develop an appropriate measurable post-secondary goal that addresses education or training).

After OSSE verified the correction of individual student-level findings of noncompliance for a specific regulatory requirement, OSSE reviewed subsequent LEA data. Specifically, OSSE verified the correction of the findings of noncompliance when the LEA demonstrated, in a subsequent record sample, that it had achieved 100% compliance for the regulatory requirement.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the District of Columbia reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the District of Columbia must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the District of Columbia must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the District of Columbia must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the District of Columbia did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the District of Columbia did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that DC adjusted its method of collecting and reporting data for this indicator. OSEP accepts DC's revised methodology for the purposes of reporting SPP/APR data for this indicator. OSEP further notes that DC proposed a similar methodology change for the purposes of DC's reporting under the specific conditions on its FFY 2021 IDEA Part B grant, and OSEP will address that proposal under separate cover.

13 - Required Actions

Because DC reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, DC must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, DC must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, DC must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If DC did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why DC did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Collect data by September 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

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

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

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

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

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

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

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

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

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2012	Target ≥	29.00%	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%	32.00%
A	23.00%	Data	12.13%	20.59%	24.37%	23.78%	21.95%
B	2012	Target ≥	44.00%	49.00%	54.00%	59.00%	59.00%
B	25.62%	Data	18.62%	29.99%	34.22%	29.08%	22.51%
C	2012	Target ≥	50.00%	56.00%	63.00%	74.00%	74.00%
C	30.81%	Data	32.96%	36.11%	54.86%	44.16%	27.60%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	22.00%	24.00%	26.00%	28.00%	30.00%	32.00%
Target B ≥	23.00%	25.00%	27.00%	29.00%	31.00%	33.00%
Target C ≥	28.00%	30.00%	32.00%	34.00%	36.00%	38.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- OSSE convened an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted data analysis related to students with disabilities. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
- Subject matter experts identified appropriate baseline data for each APR indicator, proposed targets, and a rationale for each.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) and local advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and

strategies and evaluation for improvement.

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

5. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide was distributed to its SAPSE, local advocacy groups, and its LEAs with requests for feedback.

6. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SiMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SiMR.

7. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	895
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	895
Response Rate	100.00%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	157
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	23
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	4
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	299

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	157	895	21.95%	22.00%	17.54%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	180	895	22.51%	23.00%	20.11%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	483	895	27.60%	28.00%	53.97%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Reason - OSSE attributes slippage to a decrease in postsecondary enrollment, experienced both locally and nationally, due to loss of income and health and safety concerns resulting from the COVID health emergency. OSSE additionally attributes slippage on this indicator to the unavailability of employment at local businesses because hospitality, dining, and other industries in the District and surrounding States are negatively impacted by the COVID health emergency.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	Agency Initiatives - OSSE is convening a cross-agency working group, including participation from OSSE's division of Postsecondary and Career Education, to design and implement strategies to address performance metrics and strategize program improvements both within the SEA and across LEAs. This includes program improvements related to post-school outcomes.
B	Reason - OSSE attributes slippage to a decrease in postsecondary enrollment, experienced both locally and nationally, due to loss of income and health and safety concerns resulting from the COVID health emergency. OSSE additionally attributes slippage on this indicator to the unavailability of employment at local businesses because hospitality, dining, and other industries in the District and surrounding States are negatively impacted by the COVID health emergency. Agency Initiatives - OSSE is convening a cross-agency working group, including participation from OSSE's division of Postsecondary and Career Education, to design and implement strategies to address performance metrics and strategize program improvements both within the SEA and across LEAs. This includes program improvements related to post-school outcomes.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	100.00%	100.00%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State has a 100% response rate therefore our data are representative of all leavers.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The State has a 100% response rate therefore our data are representative of all leavers.

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

The State has a 100% response rate therefore our data are representative of all leavers.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

YES

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

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The State has a 100% response rate therefore our data are representative of all leavers.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

OSEP notes that the District of Columbia changed the methodology it uses to report data under "competitive employment" from Option 1 to Option 2 in FFY 2018 and from Option 2 to Option 1 in FFY 2019. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the District of Columbia must clarify which methodology it is using to report data under "competitive employment" and revise its baseline if the District of Columbia is changing methodology.

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the District of Columbia must report whether the FFY 2020 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the District of Columbia is taking to address this issue. The District of Columbia must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

DC provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	148
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	4

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- OSSE convened an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted data analysis related to students with disabilities. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
- Subject matter experts identified appropriate baseline data for each APR indicator, proposed targets, and a rationale for each.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) and local advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and strategies and evaluation for improvement.
- OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise baselines and targets as appropriate.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide was distributed to its SAPSE, local advocacy groups, and its LEAs with requests for feedback.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SiMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SiMR.
- OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	3.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
-----	------	------	------	------	------

Target >=	25.00% - 40.00%	27.00% - 42.00%	29.00% - 44.00%	31.00% - 46.00%	31.00%-46.00%
Data	13.90%	17.57%	14.29%	17.65%	12.44%

Targets

FFY	2020 (low)	2020 (high)	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	12.00%	15.00%	12.00%	15.00%	12.00%	15.00%	12.00%	15.00%	12.00%	15.00%	12.00%	15.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target (low)	FFY 2020 Target (high)	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
4	148	12.44%	12.00%	15.00%	2.70%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Reason

- The District experiences a high rate of settlements resolving complaints prior to going to hearing. The slippage continues to be accounted for by the vast majority of settlements being reached outside of the measurement period. The existing measurement period excludes settlement agreements reached prior to hearing, but not at a resolution session.

Agency Initiatives

- OSSE is convening a cross-agency working group, including participation from OSSE's Office of Dispute Resolution, to design and implement strategies to address performance metrics and strategize program improvements. This includes program improvements related to dispute resolution activities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

DC provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range is used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	12
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	4
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	7

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

- OSSE convened an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted data analysis related to students with disabilities. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
- Subject matter experts identified appropriate baseline data for each APR indicator, proposed targets, and a rationale for each.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) and local advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and strategies and evaluation for improvement.
- OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise baselines and targets as appropriate.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide was distributed to its SAPSE, local advocacy groups, and its LEAs with requests for feedback.
- External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SiMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SiMR.
- OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	23.10%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
-----	------	------	------	------	------

Target >=	64.00% - 79.00%	66.00% - 81.00%	68.00% - 83.00%	70.00% - 85.00%	70.00%-85.00%
Data	66.67%	68.42%	75.00%	52.17%	57.14%

Targets

FFY	2020 (low)	2020 (high)	2021 (low)	2021 (high)	2022 (low)	2022 (high)	2023 (low)	2023 (high)	2024 (low)	2024 (high)	2025 (low)	2025 (high)
Target >=	57.00%	60.00%	57.00%	60.00%	57.00%	60.00%	57.00%	60.00%	57.00%	60.00%	57.00%	60.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target (low)	FFY 2020 Target (high)	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
4	7	12	57.14%	57.00%	60.00%	91.67%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

DC provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

The District of Columbia will improve early literacy outcomes for preschool students with disabilities.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.

In spring 2019, the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) launched an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted a deep dive of data related to students with disabilities to identify key levers and make recommendations for strategies to effect District-wide change to improve performance and outcomes for students with disabilities. OSSE's Division of Data, Analysis, and Research (DAR) completed four rounds of data analysis across the multiple special education data sets collected by OSSE, looking back as far as two decades. The working group conducted in-depth data analysis of a wide variety of topics and indicators, including performance on statewide assessments (PARCC), graduation outcomes, disability identification data, student mobility, placement and least restrictive environment data, IEP service prescription and delivery, and teacher and staff data. Through the working group and external stakeholder engagement, OSSE also considered root causes of disparities and identified key authorities and programs within OSSE that could be leveraged to drive improvements across the various indicators. In October 2019, OSSE released the Students with Disabilities in the District of Columbia Landscape Analysis (available at: <https://osse.dc.gov/page/students-disabilities-district-columbia-landscape-analysis>) including initial recommendations for actions to address barriers for students with disabilities. As a result of this work, OSSE developed a special education roadmap and established special education as a cross-agency priority. The goal of the priority work is to implement the roadmap and strengthen state-level infrastructure to sustain collaboration and continuous improvement long-term. More information on OSSE's special education roadmap is available here:

https://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/page_content/attachments/Roadmap%20to%20Accelerating%20Outcomes%20for%20SWDs%2010.14.20.pdf.

Building on this work and, in recognition of the state systemic improvement plan (SSIP) as a lever for change, OSSE reviewed and reconsidered the SSIP and its goals to ensure alignment with the strategic priorities established through the special education landscape and roadmap. The District's FFY2015-2020 state-identified measurable result (SiMR) focused on improving graduation rates for students with disabilities, while the District's special education roadmap contemplated intervention earlier in a student's education to best support improved student outcomes, including increased graduation rates. To ensure consistency with state initiatives, OSSE engaged in data analysis and stakeholder engagement to identify a new SiMR and design a new SSIP plan for the FFY2020-2025 State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).

OSSE first reviewed historical annual performance report (APR) data to consider gaps in student performance and identified existing state improvement and reform initiatives that could address such gaps. OSSE engaged leaders across divisions to assess the feasibility and applicability of existing initiatives to each available indicator. OSSE then reviewed the FFY2015-2020 SSIP to distill lessons learned to help inform the design of a new SSIP, including acknowledging the limitations of graduation-related evidence-based practices; concerns with intervention and initiative overload, and burdens on school-based staff in implementing improvement strategies and evidence-based practices; and data collection challenges and the difficulties the District experienced in collecting and analyzing implementation and fidelity data.

Additionally, through the system analysis and parallel LEA stakeholder engagement, OSSE identified the Child Outcomes Summary data collection process as a particular challenge for LEAs. The District uses the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center Child Outcomes Summary process to collect APR Indicator 7 data. Historical APR data shows significant inconsistencies in APR Indicator 7 data from FFY2013 to FFY2020, suggesting that such fluctuations may not be attributable only to changes in student performance but rather could be indicative of data quality or reliability issues. LEAs also provided feedback that staff was challenged by the subjective nature of the Child Outcomes Summary process, and requested additional clarity and training to assist staff in making appropriate student-level decisions.

As a result of this system analysis, OSSE identified APR Indicator 7B (preschool outcomes; acquisition of knowledge and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy) as the most appropriate SiMR to leverage existing initiatives to address identified gaps in student performance within this indicator. Basing SSIP on preschool outcomes is consistent with the District's continued focus on early childhood education, including the implementation of universal pre-kindergarten, significant efforts to improve the transition of students from IDEA Part C early intervention services to IDEA Part B preschool services, the District's locally-funded Early Literacy grant and federally-funded Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) grant.

Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR.

As part of systems and data analysis conducted to reconsider the District's SiMR, OSSE reviewed the following data: Historical APR data (FY2013-FY2020), LEA performance and compliance data, disability identification data, and IEP service prescription and delivery data, as well as qualitative data including LEA, parent, and stakeholder input provided through surveys, focus groups, and interviews.

Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.

As previously discussed, the District analyzed a wealth of data through the landscape analysis process. In reviewing the District's SiMR, OSSE reviewed the landscape analysis data within the context of the APR and relevant SSIP indicators and reviewed historical APR data. In considering the substantial challenges encountered in implementing the District's prior SSIP related to improving graduation rates, OSSE determined that SSIP activities were not logically tied to graduation rates, as the activities aimed at changing practice around 8th to 9th-grade transition which could not drive change in graduation rates for four to five years. Further, in examining historical APR data, OSSE identified significant fluctuations in APR Indicator 7 data across both state-wide and LEA-specific data. Given the District's existing focus on early childhood education and improving data collection regarding early

childhood special education, OSSE determined it was appropriate to propose changing the SiMR to address the data issues identified during the review of APR Indicator 7 data.

Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.

OSSE gathered LEA input through the monthly LEA Special Education Points of Contact webinar, where OSSE provided an overview of the state infrastructure and data analyses used as the foundation for proposing the SiMR shift and sought feedback on the proposed shift from graduation to preschool outcomes, LEA challenges related to the Child Outcomes Summary data collection, and LEA needs related to early childhood literacy. OSSE also sought parent input through the State Advisory Panel for Special Education using the same engagement framework.

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

The District designed a new theory of action consistent with the change in the District's SiMR to describe the activities and intended outcomes associated with the new SiMR and new improvement strategies. The District's updated theory of action aims to leverage activities within four main domains to effectuate change in LEA and preschool educator practice: Data Collection and Use, Training and Technical Assistance, Accountability, and Educator Practice and Instruction. The District is focusing efforts at the state level on providing guidance, training, technical assistance, and data systems to support LEAs and educators in building capacity to make data-driven decisions during the Child Outcomes Summary process. Improvement strategies at the LEA level are focused on using grant funds to implement LEA-selected evidence-based practices to improve early literacy.

Data Collection and Use: If the District refines the Child Outcomes Summary data collection process by updating guidance and integrating the data collection within aligned data systems, then LEAs will improve capacity to make data-driven decisions in the Child Outcomes Summary data collection process.

Accountability: If the District designs a new results-based accountability system by designing and implementing a Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), then LEAs will implement corrective actions, improvement plans, technical assistance, and professional development to improve systems and practice related to support data collection and implementation of evidence-based practices.

Training and Technical Assistance: If the District provides broad training and targeted technical assistance regarding the Child Outcomes Summary data collection process through accessible trainings, written guidance, and the District's general system of supervision, then LEAs will establish effective processes for collecting and analyzing Child Outcomes Summary data.

Educator Practice and Instruction: If the District supports LEAs in implementing early literacy evidence-based practices through effective use of Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) grant funds and broad technical assistance and educator resources, then LEAs will implement with fidelity evidence-based practices and interventions designed to improve early literacy skills.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

https://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/service_content/attachments/DC%20SSIP%20Theory%20of%20Action%20-%20FFY20-25.pdf

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

Consistent with the District's new SiMR and theory of action, OSSE also designed new improvement strategies intended to improve LEA practice and student early literacy metrics as measured by APR Indicator 7B. Improvement activities center around data collection and use, accountability systems, training and technical assistance, and LEA implementation of evidence-based practices. Accordingly, OSSE developed a new evaluation plan to measure progress based on the new SiMR, theory of action, and improvement strategies.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

YES

Historical Data

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	FFY19/ SY 19-20	76.43%
B	FFY19/ SY 19-20	64.90%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%

Target B >=	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%
-------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Part	Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 who demonstrated improved literacy consistent with Indicator 7B	Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	147	211	76.43%	87.00%	69.67%	N/A	N/A
B	114	261	64.90%	68.00%	43.68%	N/A	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

District of Columbia Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Process

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

To assess progress toward the SiMR, OSSE uses statewide data from APR Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes; Outcome B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy). Student-level data are collected through the Child Outcomes Summary process and analyzed to determine:

Indicator 7B-1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program; and
Indicator 7B-2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

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

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

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

Due to the change in SiMR, improvement activities, and evaluation plan, the District has not yet collected additional data that assesses progress. In the future, consistent with the evaluation plan, the District will also collect beginning of year and end of year assessment data related to the Every Child Ready curriculum as implemented as part of the District's Comprehensive Literacy State Development grant, and gather feedback on progress and activities through participant and LEA focus groups and surveys, and examine IDEA monitoring data to assess LEA practice improvements.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.

As part of its infrastructure and data analysis, the District identified significant fluctuations in student performance data reported in the Child Outcomes Summary data collection for APR Indicator 7. LEA staff confirmed during stakeholder engagement that the subjective nature of the Child Outcomes Summary standards is a challenge for educators to apply. The District considers this to be a data reliability concern and, as part of SSIP improvement activities, has undertaken a review of the Child Outcomes Summary process, resources, and training to improve LEA and educator decision-making capacity.

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

https://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/service_content/attachments/DC%20SSIP%20Evaluation%20Plan%20-%20FFY20-25.pdf

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

The evaluation plan was updated consistent with the newly selected SiMR and new theory of action. OSSE will collect data to assess impacts of infrastructure improvements through participant and stakeholder surveys and focus groups, and by examining IDEA monitoring data and LEA policies and systems. OSSE will also evaluate the effectiveness of evidence-based practices implemented through the Comprehensive Literacy State Development grant by measuring growth in literacy skills using beginning and end of year assessment data.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

The District designed a new evaluation plan aligned with the new SiMR and theory of action and informed by the District's experiences with its first iteration of SSIP that was implemented during FY15-FY19.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

OSSE began work on updating guidance related to the Child Outcomes Summary process, including an internal review of LEA APR and performance data and initial revisions of guidance documents. To better inform this work, OSSE has reconvened an early childhood LEA working group to provide input on revised Child Outcomes Summary guidance, problem-solve barriers experienced during the early childhood transition process, advise on unique challenges faced by early childhood LEAs, and make recommendations regarding early literacy supports and resources.

OSSE also launched the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR) initiative, which is determining the metrics for a new accountability system for LEA performance specific to students with disabilities with an emphasis on results-based measures. OSSE's existing risk-based accountability framework includes special education data but does not identify LEAs for monitoring that are known to require support to achieve improved results for students with disabilities.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

Because the District is in the early stages of implementing improvement strategies, specific outcomes were not yet achieved during the current reporting period but progress was made toward some of the short-term outcomes. OSSE engaged in pre-work to design and plan the early childhood LEA working group that will launch in Winter/ Spring 2022, and drafted initial updates to the existing Child Outcomes Summary guidance. Both of these activities support system-level goals related to data collection and use, and are necessary for sustainability. The early childhood LEA working group will initially address Child Outcomes Summary challenges, but is imagined to scale up and scale out to tackle challenges related to early childhood transition and early literacy. Updating Child Outcomes Summary guidance is intended to increase the validity and reliability of Indicator 7 data by building LEA and educator capacity to assess student performance.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

Data Collection and Use: The District will refine the Child Outcomes Summary data collection process through two activities: updating the Child Outcomes Summary data collection process guidance, and integrating the Child Outcomes Summary process within aligned data systems. This entails convening a working group comprised of LEAs serving early childhood populations to review and make recommendations for improving the existing Child Outcomes Summary process guide. The District also plans to engage with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTAC), the creator of the Child Outcomes Summary, to ensure alignment with existing standards and resources. Additionally, the District has procured and is in the process of designing a new centralized, statewide special education data system that will also house APR data and IDEA monitoring data, including the Child Outcomes Summary process. Through the business process requirements and design process, OSSE is exploring potential connections and intersections between data housed in the new system and the Child Outcomes Summary to establish meaningful connections between data sets. While these will be ongoing activities informed by stakeholder input, OSSE anticipates revising the Child Outcomes Summary guidance and launching the new special education data system prior to the 2023-2024 school year.

Accountability: The SEPR work is intended to revolutionize special education accountability and monitoring frameworks in the District to shift the focus to results-based assessments of LEA performance. As part of this work, an internal special education working group was established comprised of relevant subject matter experts who have decision-making authority and are connected to OSSE levers for change. The working group is intended to support cross-division collaboration, resolve roadblocks to improved outcomes for students, and drive accountability efforts. Over the last year, a proposed framework was developed to measure LEA performance and deliver LEA supports to improve student progress. The new framework incorporates both federal and local requirements and is designed to focus on student results, provide transparent and actionable data to LEAs and families, and set clear and high expectations for special education programs. To support this work, OSSE's IDEA grant monitoring framework will be updated to include all metric outcomes related to special education to allow OSSE to better leverage funding assurances for LEA accountability. The SEPR framework is designed to proactively engage LEAs in systemic improvement activities and establishes a continuous improvement model based on live APR data, rather than reactive data review and correction.

Training and Technical Assistance: To support changes and clarifications to the Child Outcomes Summary process, the District will also provide broad training and targeted technical assistance. This includes designing and making available accessible trainings to assist LEAs and educators in understanding the Child Outcomes Summary process and relevant decisions and to increase educator capacity to apply Child Outcomes Summary standards to make data-driven decisions about student performance. Additionally, OSSE will identify and engage LEAs performing below expectations through the general system of supervision, including OSSE's IDEA monitoring processes. This includes providing technical assistance to support LEAs in establishing effective data collection and analysis processes to ensure appropriate application of Child Outcomes Summary standards and criteria. OSSE anticipates providing trainings during the 2022-2023 school year and using FY21 APR and IDEA monitoring data to inform the first iteration of technical assistance.

Educator Practice and Instruction: To support LEAs in implementing early literacy evidence-based practices, the District has launched the Literacy DC initiative. Literacy DC puts action to the District's commitment to providing an inclusive approach to literacy, to ensure all students become successful readers. The vision for literacy in the District is that all learners ages birth through grade 12 will have access to high-quality literacy instruction and early literacy experiences. The foundation of Literacy DC is the DC state-wide Comprehensive Literacy Plan, which serves as a blueprint for LEAs, community-based organizations, and nonprofit organizations to utilize in the development of their own Local Literacy Plan. Literacy DC also includes the Comprehensive Literacy State Development Grant, awarded to OSSE by the US Department of Education in September 2020. This five-year, \$16 million grant will be leveraged to support early language and literacy skills through grants provided to prekindergarten programs.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

In FY22, the SEPR framework will be finalized through internal and external stakeholder engagement, and the special education working group will identify program levers to improve the District's performance on APR, and address critical special education issues facing the District to make meaningful decisions that can be operationalized. OSSE will share the revised framework with partners across the education sector and begin alignment of external monitoring efforts across sectors consistent with the framework.

OSSE will release updated Child Outcomes Summary guidance and supporting trainings and resources to assist LEAs in improving data collection and increasing capacity to make data-driven decisions regarding student performance.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

Under the Comprehensive Literacy State Development grant, one grantee receives funds to implement literacy evidence-based practices in 12 preschool programs located in 4 LEAs across the District. The AppleTree Institute for Education Innovation will lead the implementation of the Every Child Ready instructional model.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

The Every Child Ready instructional model is a comprehensive curriculum, professional learning, and measurement model designed to provide schools and teachers with the teaching and learning resources needed to grow children's early literacy skills before entering Kindergarten. The Every Child Ready instructional model is a two-year differentiated curriculum for three- and four-year-old preschool students that includes 11 thematic units, a flexible small group model, diverse print materials, and a balanced daily schedule. Every Child Ready includes three specialized curriculum options to address COVID-19 health and safety concerns and can be implemented through virtual instruction, in-person instruction, or a blended/ hybrid instructional model. Every Child Ready incorporates evidence-based practices in literacy instruction, emphasizing daily explicit and embedded instruction throughout the thematic curriculum as well as differentiated flexible small group instruction. The Every Child Ready instructional model also includes professional learning support for administrators and educators including differentiated classroom coaching, summer training, and quarterly instructional leader workshops. Every Child Ready provides measurement tools to support decision-making and ongoing progress monitoring using direct measurements for literacy and language growth, built-in checks for understanding, and classroom quality observation tools. Every Child Ready includes four direct assessments of children's early academic skills and one teacher report measure of social-emotional skills: Letters and Writing (ECR:LW), Language and Literacy (ECR:LL), Math (ECR:M), and Positive Behavior Rating Scale. Assessments cover select essential standards and are used to monitor progress throughout the year. The Language and Literacy (ECR:LL) assessment provides student-level data on phonological awareness, expressive language, narrative comprehension, and exposure to print. SSIP's implementation and evaluation focus will be on the Language and Literacy (ECR:LL) assessment, but the Every Child Ready model offers opportunities to scale up or scale out SSIP's activities as appropriate.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

The Every Child Ready instructional model is designed to increase LEA and educator capacity to deliver high-quality early literacy instruction and interventions, establish sustainable systems of supports, and enhance data analysis and program evaluation. Implementation of the Every Child Ready instructional model will impact the SiMR by changing educator practices to improve literacy outcomes for preschool students with disabilities.

The District will also provide targeted technical assistance and broad educator resources to support implementation of early literacy evidence-based practices, accessible to all District LEAs. Resources will be designed in collaboration with LEAs, parents, and other relevant stakeholders with the intention of improving systems of support, educator practices, and parent supports.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

The District has not yet collected fidelity data, as the SSIP and evidence-based practice implementation are in the early stages of implementation. However, as part of Comprehensive Literacy State Development grant activities, fidelity of implementation will be monitored by assessing teacher implementation of early literacy best practices through an observational quality checklist designed to assess teaching practices used throughout the instructional day and within specific components of the day, and by evaluating teacher implementation of Every Child Ready flexible small group literacy practices.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

The District is in the process of collecting initial data regarding implementation of evidence-based practices.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

As part of the Comprehensive Literacy State Development grant activities, OSSE is planning a 2022 Spring Literacy Convening for early childhood educators, K-12 educators, special education teachers, English language teachers, and literacy coaches and interventionists. The theme of the gathering is Reimagining Literacy, and the event will address building staff capacity in literacy instruction, including sessions dedicated to literacy instruction and intervention for students with disabilities.

Implementation of the Every Child Ready curriculum consistent with the AppleTree Institute's Local Literacy Plan will continue in partnership with AppleTree Public Charter School and three other District LEAs located at 12 schools. AppleTree Institute will also provide additional professional development opportunities for teachers, increase literacy-focused coaching, and enhance data analysis and program evaluation to track progress of fidelity implementation and student performance.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

1. OSSE convened an internal working group comprised of staff from each division that conducted data analysis related to students with disabilities. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed local and national data from prior years for each indicator, reviewed related research and practice documents, and considered the potential impact of newly developed and ongoing initiatives in each area.
2. Subject matter experts identified appropriate baseline data for each APR indicator, proposed targets, and a rationale for each.
3. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 1: OSSE delivered a presentation including information about the SPP/APR process, the meaning of each indicator, historical data, data modeling examples, and the proposed baselines and targets for each indicator to the D.C. State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) and local advocacy groups. OSSE solicited feedback in the areas of appropriate baselines, targets, data analysis, and strategies and evaluation for improvement.
4. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to revise baselines and targets as appropriate.
5. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 2: OSSE created a draft SPP/APR Resource Guide with proposed baselines and targets. The Resource Guide was distributed to its SAPSE, local advocacy groups, and its LEAs with requests for feedback.
6. External Stakeholder Feedback Round 3: OSSE presented proposals for changing the District's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including a new state-identified measurable result (SIMR), targets tied to Indicator 6, designing improvement strategies, and identifying evaluation measures to LEA stakeholders and SAPSE. OSSE solicited feedback on the proposed changes to the SSIP and SiMR.
7. OSSE Subject matter experts reviewed all additional stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with State leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

LEA and parent stakeholders were largely supportive of the SIMR shift to focus on preschool outcomes and its consistency with the existing District-wide emphasis on early childhood education. Both LEA staff and parents believed this to be a logical shift given the constraints in selecting an APR indicator, as parents were also interested in considering compliance-based indicators. LEA staff recommended addressing early childhood transition (that is, transition from IDEA Part C early intervention services to IDEA Part B preschool special education services) as part of LEA outreach and systems improvement efforts, including incorporating existing related initiatives to better streamline the work.

LEAs expressed concerns about the challenges faced in completing the Child Outcomes Summary data collection and requested professional development and technical assistance to improve LEA practice and increase IEP team and educator capacity to make decisions about student performance relative to the measures contemplated by the Child Outcomes Summary. Both LEAs and parents urged that the Child Outcomes Summary data should be made more meaningful for schools and parents by connecting the data and decisions to the IEP process or student progress monitoring and reporting, and by creating resources for parents to better understand the process and meaning of the data. The State Advisory Panel for Special Education urged OSSE to consider how parents of preschool students could be effectively engaged to develop such resources.

LEAs and parents supported the alignment of SSIP's evidence-based practice work with the District's larger early literacy efforts, including the Comprehensive Literacy State Development grant work and incorporating the Every Child Ready curriculum. LEAs requested additional resources for early childhood literacy and increased professional development opportunities for school-based staff. Both LEAs and parents suggested that educators could benefit from training on how to identify disabilities related to early literacy skills, as such disabilities may be hard to differentiate from typical delays due to lack of prior instruction.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

In addition to engagement efforts to gather stakeholder input on the APR and target-setting generally, OSSE also conducted outreach specific to the SSIP. OSSE gathered LEA input through the monthly LEA Special Education Points of Contact webinar, where OSSE provided an overview of the state infrastructure and data analyses used as the foundation for proposing the SIMR shift and sought feedback on the proposed shift from graduation to preschool outcomes, LEA challenges related to the Child Outcomes Summary data collection, and LEA needs related to early childhood literacy. OSSE also sought parent input through the State Advisory Panel for Special Education using the same engagement framework. Finally, OSSE relaunched the Early Childhood Special Education Working Group to establish a direct communication pipeline with LEAs serving early childhood populations and gather targeted input on the Child Outcomes Summary process to inform process improvement efforts.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Parent stakeholders expressed concern that early childhood populations are already subject to significant state resources, and that the District would be redirecting resources away from older student populations. OSSE addressed this concern by explaining that improvement activities launched under the previous SSIP plan were now incorporated into state infrastructure and would continue independent of SSIP. This includes the Early Access to Students with Disabilities Data Application, High School Transition Data Application, and the Kid Talks program, as well as substantial shifts made in the provision of professional development such as the restructuring of OSSE's Division of Teaching and Learning and the provision of professional development opportunities in schoolwide systems of support.

LEAs and parents expressed concern that focusing efforts on the implementation of the Every Child Ready instructional model under the Comprehensive Literacy State Development grant would exclude other LEAs from benefitting from expanded resources and supports. As a result, OSSE will further engage LEAs to identify, design, and provide broader resources and supports related to early literacy that will be available to all LEAs.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

N/A

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

N/A

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

N/A

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

DC has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

DC provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

17 - Required Actions

cleared

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

Name:

Nikki Stewart

Title:

Assistant Superintendent of Systems and Supports, K-12

Email:

nikki.stewart@dc.gov

Phone:

2029577748

Submitted on:

04/28/22 2:48:23 PM