

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2022**

District of Columbia



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

**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

The Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) is submitting this report in the middle of its 2023-25 strategic plan, which is designed to allocate resources and supports that accelerate progress in recovery of the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. The strategic plan provides a clear theory of action, resources and projects to directly address historical inequities for learners across DC.

The District is on the ascent, with rates of chronic absenteeism dropping, graduation rates increasing, rates of statewide assessment participation increasing and student performance on statewide assessments improving. While these metrics are not yet at pre-pandemic levels, they are trending in a positive direction. However, while performance is improving overall, OSSE observes struggles in specific areas. The District eliminated slippage in the two indicators reported in FFY21, but experienced slippage in four different indicators in FFY22. In this report, OSSE will explain why these indicators slipped and what the agency has planned to quickly address and mitigate these challenges.

Continued strong collaboration with the LEAs remains central to OSSE's work; seeking understanding of the specific circumstances, challenges, and successes at the school and LEA levels informs OSSE's strategic thinking on a daily basis. During the 2020-21 school year, OSSE required all LEAs to submit a Continuous Education and Recovery Plan Application 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 required LEAs to update their plans for the full return to in-person learning for the 2021-22 school year and the 2022-23 school year. OSSE monitored implementation of these plans as students returned to classrooms full time and continues to reference these plans as benchmarks. OSSE builds on these collaborative relationships in order to tailor supports and resources to address areas of greatest need and impact.

OSSE continues to dedicate significant resources to improving outcomes for students with disabilities by setting clear and high expectations, improving special education service delivery, providing LEAs with actionable data, and meaningfully engaging families. OSSE is hopeful that the additional recovery resources and initiatives in the 2023-25 strategic plan will enhance the impact of these efforts in the years to come.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

66

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

LEA Structure in the District of Columbia

As the SEA for the District of Columbia, OSSE ensures compliance with IDEA for children with disabilities who receive special education and related services from LEAs and other public agencies in the District.

In FFY 2022, the District of Columbia's student population included 15,126 children with disabilities served by 66 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

1. The District of Columbia's SPP/APR

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 IDEA and describes how the state will improve its implementation. The District's FFY 2022 SPP/APR establishes rigorous and measurable performance goals for IDEA Part B Indicators identified by USED for FFY20 - FFY25. The District of Columbia's SPP/APR serves to keep the District publicly accountable for improving results for children with disabilities and also acts as a roadmap for the District's continuous efforts to improve educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities.

2. Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation

The District of Columbia's special education policies and procedures align with and support the implementation of 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 IDEA and state policies and procedures is assured annually through the LEA IDEA grant application process.

OSSE has published guidance documents on compliant implementation of District policies and requirements. A link to the District's Special Education

Policies and Guidance can be found here: <https://osse.dc.gov/service/special-education-laws-and-regulations>

3. Integrated Monitoring Activities

OSSE works collaboratively with LEAs and public agencies to engage in shared accountability practices to maximize success for all children with disabilities. OSSE uses multiple data sources to monitor LEAs and 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 23-01. Findings of non-compliance are issued in writing through the District of Columbia's Corrective Action Tracking System (DC-CATS). This system allows OSSE and LEAs to electronically track each finding of noncompliance, the required corrective action(s), and documentation and timelines for correction.

4. Fiscal Management

OSSE's fiscal team also oversees the annual fiscal audit process. In FFY 2022, 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.

5. 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 utilizes data systems that are key to accomplishing the systemic review processes 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.

The District 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

In December 2022, OSSE entered its fifth 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://schoolreportcard.dc.gov/home>.

6. 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

7. 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 District's due process and mediation programs.

OSSE continues 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 OSSE's monitoring or technical assistance systems.

Technical Assistance System:

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

OSSE utilizes a range of mechanisms to ensure the timely delivery of high-quality, evidence-based technical assistance 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.

In FFY 2021, OSSE released a report intended to help schools in the District of Columbia better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities in the upcoming school year and beyond. The Special Education Performance Report (SEPR) evaluates the performance of special education programs in District public schools and suggests targeted supports to improve teaching practices, ensure understanding of requirements and

best practices for addressing key areas of special education programming, and establish transparent and meaningful engagement with parents and caregivers. The SEPR outlines the steps the District is taking to accelerate outcomes for students with disabilities and pinpoints supports OSSE can provide LEAs, such as teacher training on classroom practices, school leader training on requirements and best practices for addressing key areas of special education programming, and LEA supports for transparent and meaningful parent engagement. In 2023 OSSE began issuing annual LEA-level SEPR reports. Additional information on the SEPR can be found on OSSE's website: <https://osse.dc.gov/page/osse%E2%80%99s-special-education-performance-report-sepr>

District LEAs can access a calendar of training and technical assistance opportunities via Power School LMS at: osse.pl.powerschool.com. Please note, however, that this link is only accessible for LEAs.

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

Longstanding Noncompliance

OSSE continues to work directly with OSEP to address challenges related to closing out longstanding non-compliance in an appropriate manner and meet requirements pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 23-01.

OSSE continues to take advantage of technical assistance opportunities as members of the NCSI Results-Based Accountability (RBA) Cross-State Learning Collaborative (CSLC). 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 2022-2023 school year, OSSE participated in the virtual RBA CSLC monthly series hosted by the NCSI as well as IDC's SPP/APR Summit. 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.

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 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.

OSSE 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. OSSE 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 include a joint special education training offered each spring to opening charter schools as well as coordinated support to LEAs. OSSE uses data collected from participant surveys, focus groups, and other SEA activities to determine the need for additional areas of training, and to determine whether professional development offerings are effective in building expert knowledge and skill.

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

When soliciting stakeholder feedback on the District's targets for FFY 2020-25:

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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.
4. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

OSSE received extensive stakeholder feedback supporting the baselines and targets reported in its FFY 2020 APR. As a result, the District did not

modify any targets during the reporting period. However, in FFY 2021, OSSE conducted broad stakeholder engagement on all SPP/APR indicators and LEA special education performance. As OSSE undergoes its transition to a results-based accountability system for LEAs, the agency conducted extensive stakeholder engagement activities to review areas of measurement, including all APR indicators; support stakeholder understanding of baselines and targets; and receive feedback. OSSE engaged parent groups, DC's special education advocacy and legal community, its SAPSE, LEAs, a cross-Divisional OSSE working group, and DC's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Additionally, in August 2022, OSSE collaborated with the District of Columbia Office of the Ombudsman for Education to jointly launch a family resource center for students with disabilities, known as the DC Special Education Hub. The DC Special Education Hub is an extension of the resource hub developed by OSSE in 2020, and provides families with the one-to-one support, training, resources, and peer-to-peer engagement to navigate the District's complex special education landscape. As part of this partnership, OSSE and the DC Special Education Hub identify opportunities to support building parent capacity to understand and provide feedback on the District's APR data and implementation. OSSE continues to support engagement with families through partnership with the DC Special Education Hub by supporting the development of family-centered resources, translating existing requirements and District policy into accessible formats for families, ensuring the availability of landscape navigation tools for families, and connecting LEAs and schools with the DC Special Education Hub for training.

With the goal of updating OSSE's framework for general supervision for special education, OSSE created the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a results-based accountability framework of each LEA's special education program in the District. Developed from a theory of action to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, SEPR is designed to engage stakeholders to better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities. During FFY 2022, OSSE convened stakeholders using a variety of mechanisms to solicit feedback on a proposed framework for the report. OSSE convened with parents, the District's State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE), LEAs, technical advisory committee (TAC), and special education advocacy groups. During these convenings, OSSE reviewed newly proposed metrics, data trends, scoring protocols and guidance to ensure a valid and reliable framework for evaluating each LEA's special education program. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback in a variety of ways. OSSE reviewed all feedback and made revisions as appropriate.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

8

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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.
2. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District 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.

During FFY 2022, OSSE engaged parent-member stakeholders through ongoing engagement and feedback sessions around SEPR.

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 "office hours" which provided an open question-and-answer forum. Participants were also encouraged to provide written feedback on a 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 learn from the feedback process and plans to increase engagement by building 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.

Public input for data analysis, developing improvement strategies and evaluation of progress were solicited through stakeholder engagement sessions including but not limited to: SAPSE meetings, LEA engagement sessions and TAC engagement sessions. These convenings were scheduled throughout the school year with ongoing engagement and opportunities for stakeholder feedback around SEPR.

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 this resource on its website prior to submission to the U.S. Department of Education. Additionally, OSSE makes all LEA SEPR reports as well as data analysis available to the public on its website.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 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 revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

As required by 34 CFR Section 300.602(b)(1)(i)(A), OSSE reports to the public annually on each LEA's performance on the District's SPP/APR targets. To ensure compliance with Section 300.602(b)(1)(i)(A), OSSE posts the annual public reporting document to its website no later than 120 days following 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/service/specialized-education-data-and-reports>

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

DC's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In DC's 2023 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which DC received assistance; and (2) the actions DC took as a result of that technical assistance.

OSEP has imposed Specific Conditions on DC's IDEA Part B grant award each year from FFY 2009 through FFY 2022 and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the Department's 2023 determination. Under the FFY 2022 Specific Conditions, DC was required to submit data demonstrating compliance with the IDEA Part B requirements related to timely reevaluations and secondary transition. OSEP will respond separately to DC's Specific Conditions submissions in its FFY 2023 IDEA Part B grant award letter to DC.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

During the 2022-2023 school year, OSSE participated in the virtual Results-Based Accountability (RBA) Cross-State Learning Collaborative (CSLC) monthly series hosted by the NCSI as well as IDC's SPP/APR Summit. OSSE collaborated with other states to learn and develop effective strategies as it shifted its focus from compliance-driven to results-driven accountability, as evidenced in SEPR. Specifically, OSSE sought to understand better how to use data to create a valid and reliable accountability framework to accurately measure an LEA's special education program. OSSE will continue to receive additional support and resources from technical assistance centers to ensure improvements in desired outcomes for students with disabilities.

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

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 ED*Facts* 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	60.00%	60.00%	52.70%	52.00%	54.00%
Data	53.12%	46.89%	51.18%	61.60%	72.61%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%	63.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

When soliciting stakeholder feedback on the District's targets for FFY 2020-25:

- 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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.
- OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

OSSE received extensive stakeholder feedback supporting the baselines and targets reported in its FFY 2020 APR. As a result, the District did not modify any targets during the reporting period. However, in FFY 2021, OSSE conducted broad stakeholder engagement on all SPP/APR indicators and LEA special education performance. As OSSE undergoes its transition to a results-based accountability system for LEAs, the agency conducted extensive stakeholder engagement activities to review areas of measurement, including all APR indicators; support stakeholder understanding of baselines and targets; and receive feedback. OSSE engaged parent groups, DC's special education advocacy and legal community, its SAPSE, LEAs, a cross-Divisional OSSE working group, and DC's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Additionally, in August 2022, OSSE collaborated with the District of Columbia Office of the Ombudsman for Education to jointly launch a family resource center for students with disabilities, known as the DC Special Education Hub. The DC Special Education Hub is an extension of the resource hub developed by OSSE in 2020, and provides families with the one-to-one support, training, resources, and peer-to-peer engagement to navigate the District's complex special education landscape. As part of this partnership, OSSE and the DC Special Education Hub identify opportunities to support building parent capacity to understand and provide feedback on the District's APR data and implementation. OSSE continues to support engagement with families through partnership with the DC Special Education Hub by supporting the development of family-centered resources, translating existing requirements and District policy into accessible formats for families, ensuring the availability of landscape navigation tools for families, and connecting LEAs and schools with the DC Special Education Hub for training.

With the goal of updating OSSE's framework for general supervision for special education, OSSE created the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a results-based accountability framework of each LEA's special education program in the District. Developed from a theory of action to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, SEPR is designed to engage stakeholders to better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities. During FFY 2022, OSSE convened stakeholders using a variety of mechanisms to solicit feedback on a proposed framework for the report. OSSE convened with parents, the District's State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE), LEAs, technical advisory committee (TAC), and special education advocacy groups. During these convenings, OSSE reviewed newly proposed metrics, data trends, scoring protocols and guidance to ensure a valid and reliable framework for evaluating each LEA's special education program. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback in a variety of ways. OSSE reviewed all feedback and made revisions as appropriate.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	629
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	45
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	124

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
629	798	72.61%	56.00%	78.82%	Met target	No Slippage

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 States Government, and District of Columbia History 4.0
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)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

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

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED Facts 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 dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (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 section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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 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.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	32.63%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	4.80%	4.60%	4.60%	42.00%	40.00%
Data	19.96%	18.45%	15.59%	32.63%	22.68%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	38.00%	36.00%	34.00%	32.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

When soliciting stakeholder feedback on the District’s targets for FFY 2020-25:

- 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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.
- OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

OSSE received extensive stakeholder feedback supporting the baselines and targets reported in its FFY 2020 APR. As a result, the District did not modify any targets during the reporting period. However, in FFY 2021, OSSE conducted broad stakeholder engagement on all SPP/APR indicators and LEA special education performance. As OSSE undergoes its transition to a results-based accountability system for LEAs, the agency conducted extensive stakeholder engagement activities to review areas of measurement, including all APR indicators; support stakeholder understanding of baselines and targets; and receive feedback. OSSE engaged parent groups, DC’s special education advocacy and legal community, its SAPSE, LEAs, a cross-Divisional OSSE working group, and DC’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Additionally, in August 2022, OSSE collaborated with the District of Columbia Office of the Ombudsman for Education to jointly launch a family resource center for students with disabilities, known as the DC Special Education Hub. The DC Special Education Hub is an extension of the resource hub

developed by OSSE in 2020, and provides families with the one-to-one support, training, resources, and peer-to-peer engagement to navigate the District's complex special education landscape. As part of this partnership, OSSE and the DC Special Education Hub identify opportunities to support building parent capacity to understand and provide feedback on the District's APR data and implementation. OSSE continues to support engagement with families through partnership with the DC Special Education Hub by supporting the development of family-centered resources, translating existing requirements and District policy into accessible formats for families, ensuring the availability of landscape navigation tools for families, and connecting LEAs and schools with the DC Special Education Hub for training.

With the goal of updating OSSE's framework for general supervision for special education, OSSE created the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a results-based accountability framework of each LEA's special education program in the District. Developed from a theory of action to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, SEPR is designed to engage stakeholders to better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities. During FFY 2022, OSSE convened stakeholders using a variety of mechanisms to solicit feedback on a proposed framework for the report. OSSE convened with parents, the District's State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE), LEAs, technical advisory committee (TAC), and special education advocacy groups. During these convenings, OSSE reviewed newly proposed metrics, data trends, scoring protocols and guidance to ensure a valid and reliable framework for evaluating each LEA's special education program. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback in a variety of ways. OSSE reviewed all feedback and made revisions as appropriate.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	629
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	45
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	124

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
124	798	22.68%	38.00%	15.54%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Consistent with EDFacts specifications for file FS009, students who have dropped out were enrolled at the start of the reporting period but were not enrolled at the end of the reporting period and did not exit special education through any of the other means. This includes dropouts, runaways, GED and IEP certificate recipients who did not have another valid exit reason, expulsions, status unknown, students who moved but are not known to be continuing in another educational program, and other exiters from special education.

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)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

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		2018	96.70%
Reading	B		2018	91.40%
Reading	C		2018	84.80%
Math	A		2018	96.20%
Math	B		2018	91.10%
Math	C		2018	85.90%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=		98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
Reading	B >=		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=		97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%
Math	B >=		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=		95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

When soliciting stakeholder feedback on the District's targets for FFY 2020-25:

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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.
4. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

OSSE received extensive stakeholder feedback supporting the baselines and targets reported in its FFY 2020 APR. As a result, the District did not modify any targets during the reporting period. However, in FFY 2021, OSSE conducted broad stakeholder engagement on all SPP/APR indicators and LEA special education performance. As OSSE undergoes its transition to a results-based accountability system for LEAs, the agency conducted extensive stakeholder engagement activities to review areas of measurement, including all APR indicators; support stakeholder understanding of baselines and targets; and receive feedback. OSSE engaged parent groups, DC's special education advocacy and legal community, its SAPSE, LEAs, a cross-Divisional OSSE working group, and DC's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Additionally, in August 2022, OSSE collaborated with the District of Columbia Office of the Ombudsman for Education to jointly launch a family resource center for students with disabilities, known as the DC Special Education Hub. The DC Special Education Hub is an extension of the resource hub developed by OSSE in 2020, and provides families with the one-to-one support, training, resources, and peer-to-peer engagement to navigate the District's complex special education landscape. As part of this partnership, OSSE and the DC Special Education Hub identify opportunities to support building parent capacity to understand and provide feedback on the District's APR data and implementation. OSSE continues to support engagement with families through partnership with the DC Special Education Hub by supporting the development of family-centered resources, translating existing requirements and District policy into accessible formats for families, ensuring the availability of landscape navigation tools for families, and connecting LEAs and schools with the DC Special Education Hub for training.

With the goal of updating OSSE's framework for general supervision for special education, OSSE created the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a results-based accountability framework of each LEA's special education program in the District. Developed from a theory of action to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, SEPR is designed to engage stakeholders to better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities. During FFY 2022, OSSE convened stakeholders using a variety of mechanisms to solicit feedback on a proposed framework for the report. OSSE convened with parents, the District's State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE), LEAs, technical advisory committee (TAC), and special education advocacy groups. During these convenings, OSSE reviewed newly proposed metrics, data trends, scoring protocols and guidance to ensure a valid and reliable framework for evaluating each LEA's special education program. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback in a variety of ways. OSSE reviewed all feedback and made revisions as appropriate.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

###ESSDG589CFFY###

Date:

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group			
a. Children with IEPs (2)			
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)			
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards			

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group			
a. Children with IEPs (2)			
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)			
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)			
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards			

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) 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.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A				94.72%	98.00%		N/A	N/A
B				92.11%	95.00%		N/A	N/A
C				81.31%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A				94.23%	97.00%		N/A	N/A
B				90.87%	95.00%		N/A	N/A
C				79.97%	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.

OSSE hosts all of its statewide assessment results for SY2022-2023, including the public presentation with a summary of the data, on this page: <https://osse.dc.gov/assessmentresults2023>

The results for students with disabilities are available within the state-, LEA-, and school-level Excel files on this page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the District asked for and received waivers from the US Department of Education of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA for both SY2019-20 and SY2020-21. In SY2021-22, the District returned to administering statewide assessments. The COVID-19 pandemic had a negative impact on both daily attendance and assessment participation as students fully returned to in-person instruction during the 2021-22 school year. While daily attendance rates increased during the 2022-2023 school year, they have not returned to pre-pandemic levels. The District has been and will continue to engage stakeholders and District staff to innovate and implement strategies for increasing student attendance, participation and performance on statewide assessments.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

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		2018	7.70%
Reading	B		2018	8.60%
Reading	C		2018	7.40%
Math	A		2018	10.20%
Math	B		2018	4.50%
Math	C		2018	1.30%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

When soliciting stakeholder feedback on the District's targets for FFY 2020-25:

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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.
4. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

OSSE received extensive stakeholder feedback supporting the baselines and targets reported in its FFY 2020 APR. As a result, the District did not modify any targets during the reporting period. However, in FFY 2021, OSSE conducted broad stakeholder engagement on all SPP/APR indicators and LEA special education performance. As OSSE undergoes its transition to a results-based accountability system for LEAs, the agency conducted extensive stakeholder engagement activities to review areas of measurement, including all APR indicators; support stakeholder understanding of baselines and targets; and receive feedback. OSSE engaged parent groups, DC's special education advocacy and legal community, its SAPSE, LEAs, a cross-Divisional OSSE working group, and DC's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Additionally, in August 2022, OSSE collaborated with the District of Columbia Office of the Ombudsman for Education to jointly launch a family resource center for students with disabilities, known as the DC Special Education Hub. The DC Special Education Hub is an extension of the resource hub developed by OSSE in 2020, and provides families with the one-to-one support, training, resources, and peer-to-peer engagement to navigate the District's complex special education landscape. As part of this partnership, OSSE and the DC Special Education Hub identify opportunities to support building parent capacity to understand and provide feedback on the District's APR data and implementation. OSSE continues to support engagement with families through partnership with the DC Special Education Hub by supporting the development of family-centered resources, translating existing requirements and District policy into accessible formats for families, ensuring the availability of landscape navigation tools for families, and connecting LEAs and schools with the DC Special Education Hub for training.

With the goal of updating OSSE's framework for general supervision for special education, OSSE created the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a results-based accountability framework of each LEA's special education program in the District. Developed from a theory of action to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, SEPR is designed to engage stakeholders to better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities. During FFY 2022, OSSE convened stakeholders using a variety of mechanisms to solicit feedback on a proposed framework for the report. OSSE convened with parents, the District's State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE), LEAs, technical advisory committee (TAC), and special education advocacy groups. During these convenings, OSSE reviewed newly proposed metrics, data trends, scoring protocols and guidance to ensure a valid and reliable framework for evaluating each LEA's special education program. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback in a variety of ways. OSSE reviewed all feedback and made revisions as appropriate.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

###ESSDG584CFFY###

Date:

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group			
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:

###ESSDG583CFFY###

Date:

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group			
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			

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A				8.86%	8.00%		N/A	N/A
B				5.21%	9.00%		N/A	N/A
C				6.34%	7.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A				6.57%	10.00%		N/A	N/A
B				2.12%	5.00%		N/A	N/A
C				1.66%	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.

OSSE hosts all of its statewide assessment results for SY2022-2023, including the public presentation with a summary of the data, on this page: <https://osse.dc.gov/assessmentresults2023>

The results for students with disabilities are available within the state-, LEA-, and school-level Excel files on this page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the District asked for and received waivers from the US Department of Education of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA for both SY2019-20 and SY2020-21. In SY2021-22, the District returned to administering statewide assessments. As national and local trends suggested prior to assessment administration, the District's SY2022-23 results show students already farthest from opportunity before the pandemic also experienced the largest setbacks in proficiency. The data reinforced the District's recovery and restoration efforts that were already underway, including, but not limited to providing high-impact tutoring, launching a family resource center for students with disabilities, leading comprehensive trainings for educators, and creating incentives for general education teachers to complete special education coursework.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

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 ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned 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		2018	42.40%
Reading	B		2018	41.10%
Reading	C		2018	38.80%
Math	A		2018	48.30%
Math	B		2018	50.70%
Math	C		2018	46.90%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

When soliciting stakeholder feedback on the District's targets for FFY 2020-25:

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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.
4. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

OSSE received extensive stakeholder feedback supporting the baselines and targets reported in its FFY 2020 APR. As a result, the District did not modify any targets during the reporting period. However, in FFY 2021, OSSE conducted broad stakeholder engagement on all SPP/APR indicators and LEA special education performance. As OSSE undergoes its transition to a results-based accountability system for LEAs, the agency conducted extensive stakeholder engagement activities to review areas of measurement, including all APR indicators; support stakeholder understanding of baselines and targets; and receive feedback. OSSE engaged parent groups, DC's special education advocacy and legal community, its SAPSE, LEAs, a cross-Divisional OSSE working group, and DC's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Additionally, in August 2022, OSSE collaborated with the District of Columbia Office of the Ombudsman for Education to jointly launch a family resource center for students with disabilities, known as the DC Special Education Hub. The DC Special Education Hub is an extension of the resource hub developed by OSSE in 2020, and provides families with the one-to-one support, training, resources, and peer-to-peer engagement to navigate the District's complex special education landscape. As part of this partnership, OSSE and the DC Special Education Hub identify opportunities to support building parent capacity to understand and provide feedback on the District's APR data and implementation. OSSE continues to support engagement with families through partnership with the DC Special Education Hub by supporting the development of family-centered resources, translating existing requirements and District policy into accessible formats for families, ensuring the availability of landscape navigation tools for families, and connecting LEAs and schools with the DC Special Education Hub for training.

With the goal of updating OSSE's framework for general supervision for special education, OSSE created the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a results-based accountability framework of each LEA's special education program in the District. Developed from a theory of action to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, SEPR is designed to engage stakeholders to better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities. During FFY 2022, OSSE convened stakeholders using a variety of mechanisms to solicit feedback on a proposed framework for the report. OSSE convened with parents, the District's State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE), LEAs, technical advisory committee (TAC), and special education advocacy groups. During these convenings, OSSE reviewed newly proposed metrics, data trends, scoring protocols and guidance to ensure a valid and reliable framework for evaluating each LEA's special education program. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback in a variety of ways. OSSE reviewed all feedback and made revisions as appropriate.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group			
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 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (ED Facts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group			

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 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A				26.53%	42.00%		N/A	N/A
B				43.08%	41.00%		N/A	N/A
C				49.12%	39.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A				42.86%	48.00%		N/A	N/A
B				50.00%	51.00%		N/A	N/A
C				49.12%	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.

OSSE hosts all of its statewide assessment results for SY2022-2023, including the public presentation with a summary of the data, on this page: <https://osse.dc.gov/assessmentresults2023>

The results for students with disabilities are available within the state-, LEA-, and school-level Excel files on this page.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the District asked for and received waivers from the US Department of Education of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA for both SY2019-20 and SY2020-21. In SY2021-22, the District returned to administering statewide assessments. As national and local trends suggested prior to assessment administration, the District's SY2022-23 results show students already farthest from opportunity before the pandemic also experienced the largest setbacks in proficiency. The data reinforced the District's recovery and restoration efforts that were already underway, including, but not limited to providing high-impact tutoring, launching a family resource center for students with disabilities, leading comprehensive trainings for educators, and creating incentives for general education teachers to complete special education coursework.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

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 ED*Facts* 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 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 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 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 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		2018	30.60
Reading	B		2018	30.90
Reading	C		2018	26.10
Math	A		2018	28.20
Math	B		2018	20.10
Math	C		2018	16.80

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

When soliciting stakeholder feedback on the District's targets for FFY 2020-25:

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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.

4. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

OSSE received extensive stakeholder feedback supporting the baselines and targets reported in its FFY 2020 APR. As a result, the District did not modify any targets during the reporting period. However, in FFY 2021, OSSE conducted broad stakeholder engagement on all SPP/APR indicators and LEA special education performance. As OSSE undergoes its transition to a results-based accountability system for LEAs, the agency conducted extensive stakeholder engagement activities to review areas of measurement, including all APR indicators; support stakeholder understanding of baselines and targets; and receive feedback. OSSE engaged parent groups, DC’s special education advocacy and legal community, its SAPSE, LEAs, a cross-Divisional OSSE working group, and DC’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Additionally, in August 2022, OSSE collaborated with the District of Columbia Office of the Ombudsman for Education to jointly launch a family resource center for students with disabilities, known as the DC Special Education Hub. The DC Special Education Hub is an extension of the resource hub developed by OSSE in 2020, and provides families with the one-to-one support, training, resources, and peer-to-peer engagement to navigate the District’s complex special education landscape. As part of this partnership, OSSE and the DC Special Education Hub identify opportunities to support building parent capacity to understand and provide feedback on the District’s APR data and implementation. OSSE continues to support engagement with families through partnership with the DC Special Education Hub by supporting the development of family-centered resources, translating existing requirements and District policy into accessible formats for families, ensuring the availability of landscape navigation tools for families, and connecting LEAs and schools with the DC Special Education Hub for training.

With the goal of updating OSSE’s framework for general supervision for special education, OSSE created the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a results-based accountability framework of each LEA’s special education program in the District. Developed from a theory of action to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, SEPR is designed to engage stakeholders to better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities. During FFY 2022, OSSE convened stakeholders using a variety of mechanisms to solicit feedback on a proposed framework for the report. OSSE convened with parents, the District’s State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE), LEAs, technical advisory committee (TAC), and special education advocacy groups. During these convenings, OSSE reviewed newly proposed metrics, data trends, scoring protocols and guidance to ensure a valid and reliable framework for evaluating each LEA’s special education program. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback in a variety of ways. OSSE reviewed all feedback and made revisions as appropriate.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED*FACTS*

Data Source:

###ESSDG584CFFY###

Date:

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group			
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:

###ESSDG583CFFY###

Date:

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group			
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			

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A				21.41	31.00		N/A	N/A
B				26.09	31.00		N/A	N/A
C				26.57	26.00		N/A	N/A

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A				15.99	28.00		N/A	N/A
B				13.62	20.00		N/A	N/A
C				8.61	17.00		N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the District asked for and received waivers from the US Department of Education of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA for both SY2019-20 and SY2020-21. In SY2021-22, the District returned to administering statewide assessments. As national and local trends suggested prior to assessment administration, the District's SY2022-23 results show students already farthest from opportunity before the pandemic also experienced the largest setbacks in proficiency. The data reinforced the District's recovery and restoration efforts that were already underway, including, but not limited to providing high-impact tutoring, launching a family resource center for students with disabilities, leading comprehensive trainings for educators, and creating incentives for general education teachers to complete special education coursework.

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

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 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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 rates of suspensions and expulsions for 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 section 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 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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
2022	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	11.76%	2.27%	0.00%		

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

When soliciting stakeholder feedback on the District's targets for FFY 2020-25:

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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.
4. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

OSSE received extensive stakeholder feedback supporting the baselines and targets reported in its FFY 2020 APR. As a result, the District did not modify any targets during the reporting period. However, in FFY 2021, OSSE conducted broad stakeholder engagement on all SPP/APR indicators and LEA special education performance. As OSSE undergoes its transition to a results-based accountability system for LEAs, the agency conducted extensive stakeholder engagement activities to review areas of measurement, including all APR indicators; support stakeholder understanding of baselines and targets; and receive feedback. OSSE engaged parent groups, DC's special education advocacy and legal community, its SAPSE, LEAs, a cross-Divisional OSSE working group, and DC's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Additionally, in August 2022, OSSE collaborated with the District of Columbia Office of the Ombudsman for Education to jointly launch a family resource center for students with disabilities, known as the DC Special Education Hub. The DC Special Education Hub is an extension of the resource hub developed by OSSE in 2020, and provides families with the one-to-one support, training, resources, and peer-to-peer engagement to navigate the District's complex special education landscape. As part of this partnership, OSSE and the DC Special Education Hub identify opportunities to support building parent capacity to understand and provide feedback on the District's APR data and implementation. OSSE continues to support engagement with families through partnership with the DC Special Education Hub by supporting the development of family-centered resources, translating existing requirements and District policy into accessible formats for families, ensuring the availability of landscape navigation tools for families, and connecting LEAs and schools with the DC Special Education Hub for training.

With the goal of updating OSSE's framework for general supervision for special education, OSSE created the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a results-based accountability framework of each LEA's special education program in the District. Developed from a theory of action to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, SEPR is designed to engage stakeholders to better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities. During FFY 2022, OSSE convened stakeholders using a variety of mechanisms to solicit feedback on a proposed framework for the report. OSSE convened with parents, the District's State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE), LEAs, technical advisory committee (TAC), and special education advocacy groups. During these convenings, OSSE reviewed newly proposed metrics, data trends, scoring protocols and guidance to ensure a valid and reliable framework for evaluating each LEA's special education program. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback in a variety of ways. OSSE reviewed all feedback and made revisions as appropriate.

FFY 2022 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.

65

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0		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

OSSE 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 greater than 1.5 times the equivalent rate for children without disabilities in the same LEA. To be identified as having significant discrepancy, an LEA must meet the following criteria: 1) The LEA has suspended and/or expelled at least five students with disabilities (cell size), and 2) The rate of suspensions or expulsions of children with a disability is greater than 1.5 times the rate of suspensions or expulsions of all students without disabilities within the same LEA.

OSSE recently transitioned to utilizing multi-year data in the calculation for indicator 4a. For the FFY21 review, OSSE identified LEAs as having a significant discrepancy when they consecutively met the criteria for the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years in the same analysis category. Beginning this year, in conjunction with the review of 2021-2022 school year data, OSSE has flagged LEAs that were identified in the same analysis category for three (3) consecutive years.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSSE revised its indicator 4 baseline to reflect its change in methodology (i.e., moving from using 2 to 3 consecutive years of data). This change in the methodology makes data no longer comparable to prior year's data.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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 2022, 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 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, DC must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how DC's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under DC's chosen methodology.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

OSSE 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 greater than 1.5 times the equivalent rate for children without disabilities in the same LEA. To be identified as having significant discrepancy, an LEA must meet the following criteria: 1) The LEA has suspended and/or expelled at least five students with disabilities (cell size), and 2) The rate of suspensions or expulsions of children with a disability is greater than 1.5 times the rate of suspensions or expulsions of all students without disabilities within the same LEA.

OSSE's methodology is reasonable because it accounts for the very small n-sizes at the state and LEA levels. In SY 2020-21 only 221 students in the District were suspended or expelled for more than 10 days, and fewer than 60 of those were students with disabilities. The rates of discipline for more than 10 days have decreased in the District over the past five years as local policies have encouraged LEAs to utilize less exclusionary practices such as restorative justice or school-based interventions. Maintaining a minimum cell size of five students with disabilities who were disciplined to determine significant discrepancy is still a lower n-size than most other metrics; using a lower cell size would reduce data reliability. Utilizing stakeholder feedback, OSSE changed to a three-year methodology to provide additional stability and reliability to LEAs in determining where significant discrepancy is occurring, given the small cell size.

OSSE recently transitioned to a multi-year data in the calculation for indicator 4a. For the FFY21 review, OSSE identified LEAs as having a significant discrepancy when they consecutively met the criteria for the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years in the same analysis category. Beginning this year, OSSE identified LEAs as having a significant discrepancy when they met the criteria for three (3) consecutive years - namely, SY 2019-2020, SY 2020-2021, and SY 2021-2022.

During SY 2020-2021, due to circumstances related to the public health emergency, 95% of school days in the District of Columbia were conducted via virtual instruction, which resulted in substantially lower rates of suspension and expulsion for all students. During that time period, fewer than 100

students in the District had suspensions and expulsions, none of which totaled more than 10 days. The inclusion of that year's data within the District's multi-year data analysis for the calculation of indicator 4a, contributed to zero LEAs being identified for significant discrepancy.

4A - OSEP Response

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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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 the rates of suspensions and expulsions for 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 section 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 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 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, 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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
2022	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	11.76%	4.55%	0.00%	0.00%	

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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.

65

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0		0%		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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

OSSE 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 greater than 1.5 times the equivalent rate for non-disabled peers. To be identified as having significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity, an LEA must meet the following criteria: 1) The LEA has suspended and/or expelled at least three students with disabilities in a particular racial and ethnic category (cell size), and 2) 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 recently transitioned to utilizing multi-year data in the calculation for indicator 4b. For the FFY21 review, OSSE identified LEAs as having a significant discrepancy when they consecutively met the criteria for the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years in the same analysis category. Beginning this year, in conjunction with the review of 2021-2022 school year data, OSSE has flagged LEAs that were identified in the same analysis category for three (3) consecutive years.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSSE revised its indicator 4 baseline to reflect its change in methodology (i.e., moving from using 2 to 3 consecutive years of data). This change in the methodology makes data no longer comparable to prior year's data.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.

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 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, DC must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race or ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how DC's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, under DC's chosen methodology.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

OSSE 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 greater than 1.5 times the equivalent rate for non-disabled peers. To be identified as having significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity, an LEA must meet the following criteria: 1) The LEA has suspended and/or expelled at least three students with disabilities in a particular racial and ethnic category (cell size), and 2) 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's methodology is reasonable because it accounts for the very small n-sizes at the state and LEA levels. In SY 2020-21 only 221 students in the District were suspended or expelled for more than 10 days, and fewer than 60 of those were students with disabilities. The rates of discipline for more than 10 days have decreased in the District over the past five years as local policies have encouraged LEAs to utilize less exclusionary practices such as restorative justice or school-based interventions. Maintaining a minimum cell size of five students with disabilities who were disciplined to determine significant discrepancy is still a lower n-size than most other metrics; using a lower cell size would reduce data reliability. Utilizing stakeholder feedback, OSSE changed to a three-year methodology to provide additional stability and reliability to LEAs in determining where significant discrepancy is occurring, given the small cell size.

OSSE recently transitioned to a multi-year data in the calculation for indicator 4b. For the FFY21 review, OSSE identified LEAs as having a significant discrepancy when they consecutively met the criteria for the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years in the same analysis category. Beginning this year, OSSE identified LEAs as having a significant discrepancy when they met the criteria for three (3) consecutive years - namely, SY 2019-2020, SY 2020-2021, and SY 2021-2022.

During SY 2020-2021, due to circumstances related to the public health emergency, 95% of school days in the District of Columbia were conducted via virtual instruction, which resulted in substantially lower rates of suspension and expulsion for all students. During that time period, fewer than 100 students in the District had suspensions and expulsions, none of which totaled more than 10 days. The inclusion of that year's data within the District's multi-year data analysis for the calculation of indicator 4b, contributed to zero LEAs being identified for significant discrepancy.

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 ED Facts 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	61.00%	64.00%	64.00%	58.19%	60.00%
A	58.19%	Data	56.63%	56.97%	57.19%	58.19%	59.71%
B	2020	Target <=	15.00%	14.00%	14.00%	16.80%	14.00%
B	16.80%	Data	15.31%	15.61%	15.27%	16.80%	17.02%
C	2020	Target <=	11.00%	10.00%	10.00%	7.73%	9.00%
C	7.73%	Data	9.03%	8.54%	8.10%	7.73%	6.81%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	62.00%	62.00%	65.00%	65.00%
Target B <=	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%	14.00%
Target C <=	9.00%	8.00%	7.00%	7.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

When soliciting stakeholder feedback on the District's targets for FFY 2020-25:

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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.
4. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

OSSE received extensive stakeholder feedback supporting the baselines and targets reported in its FFY 2020 APR. As a result, the District did not modify any targets during the reporting period. However, in FFY 2021, OSSE conducted broad stakeholder engagement on all SPP/APR indicators and LEA special education performance. As OSSE undergoes its transition to a results-based accountability system for LEAs, the agency conducted extensive stakeholder engagement activities to review areas of measurement, including all APR indicators; support stakeholder understanding of baselines and targets; and receive feedback. OSSE engaged parent groups, DC’s special education advocacy and legal community, its SAPSE, LEAs, a cross-Divisional OSSE working group, and DC’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Additionally, in August 2022, OSSE collaborated with the District of Columbia Office of the Ombudsman for Education to jointly launch a family resource center for students with disabilities, known as the DC Special Education Hub. The DC Special Education Hub is an extension of the resource hub developed by OSSE in 2020, and provides families with the one-to-one support, training, resources, and peer-to-peer engagement to navigate the District’s complex special education landscape. As part of this partnership, OSSE and the DC Special Education Hub identify opportunities to support building parent capacity to understand and provide feedback on the District’s APR data and implementation. OSSE continues to support engagement with families through partnership with the DC Special Education Hub by supporting the development of family-centered resources, translating existing requirements and District policy into accessible formats for families, ensuring the availability of landscape navigation tools for families, and connecting LEAs and schools with the DC Special Education Hub for training.

With the goal of updating OSSE’s framework for general supervision for special education, OSSE created the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a results-based accountability framework of each LEA’s special education program in the District. Developed from a theory of action to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, SEPR is designed to engage stakeholders to better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities. During FFY 2022, OSSE convened stakeholders using a variety of mechanisms to solicit feedback on a proposed framework for the report. OSSE convened with parents, the District’s State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE), LEAs, technical advisory committee (TAC), and special education advocacy groups. During these convenings, OSSE reviewed newly proposed metrics, data trends, scoring protocols and guidance to ensure a valid and reliable framework for evaluating each LEA’s special education program. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback in a variety of ways. OSSE reviewed all feedback and made revisions as appropriate.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	13,750
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	8,296
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,288
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	848
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	11
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	28

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 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	8,296	13,750	59.71%	62.00%	60.33%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,288	13,750	17.02%	14.00%	16.64%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	887	13,750	6.81%	9.00%	6.45%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For indicators 5A and 5B, the District did not meet its targets, but the increase in students served in these categories is indicative of the natural progression for students moving from the most restrictive setting into lesser restrictive settings. For some students, incremental transition will include moving into an environment with extensive academic and behavioral support outside of the regular classroom to allow for a smoother reintegration into the general education setting. The District continues to make progress in these areas.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

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 ED Facts file specification FS089.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# 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) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 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 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 (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	59.00%	60.00%	60.00%	55.99%	60.00%
A	Data	51.70%	48.92%	55.45%	55.99%	54.36%
B	Target <=	11.00%	10.00%	10.00%	18.41%	10.00%
B	Data	16.21%	17.26%	15.28%	18.41%	23.70%
C	Target <=					
C	Data				0.08%	0.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

When soliciting stakeholder feedback on the District's targets for FFY 2020-25:

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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.
4. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

OSSE received extensive stakeholder feedback supporting the baselines and targets reported in its FFY 2020 APR. As a result, the District did not modify any targets during the reporting period. However, in FFY 2021, OSSE conducted broad stakeholder engagement on all SPP/APR indicators and LEA special education performance. As OSSE undergoes its transition to a results-based accountability system for LEAs, the agency conducted extensive stakeholder engagement activities to review areas of measurement, including all APR indicators; support stakeholder understanding of baselines and targets; and receive feedback. OSSE engaged parent groups, DC's special education advocacy and legal community, its SAPSE, LEAs, a cross-Divisional OSSE working group, and DC's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Additionally, in August 2022, OSSE collaborated with the District of Columbia Office of the Ombudsman for Education to jointly launch a family resource center for students with disabilities, known as the DC Special Education Hub. The DC Special Education Hub is an extension of the resource hub developed by OSSE in 2020, and provides families with the one-to-one support, training, resources, and peer-to-peer engagement to navigate the District's complex special education landscape. As part of this partnership, OSSE and the DC Special Education Hub identify opportunities to support building parent capacity to understand and provide feedback on the District's APR data and implementation. OSSE continues to support engagement with families through partnership with the DC Special Education Hub by supporting the development of family-centered resources, translating existing requirements and District policy into accessible formats for families, ensuring the availability of landscape navigation tools for families, and connecting LEAs and schools with the DC Special Education Hub for training.

With the goal of updating OSSE's framework for general supervision for special education, OSSE created the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a results-based accountability framework of each LEA's special education program in the District. Developed from a theory of action to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, SEPR is designed to engage stakeholders to better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities. During FFY 2022, OSSE convened stakeholders using a variety of mechanisms to solicit feedback on a proposed framework for the report. OSSE convened with parents, the District's State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE), LEAs, technical advisory committee (TAC), and special education advocacy groups. During these convenings, OSSE reviewed newly proposed metrics, data trends, scoring protocols and guidance to ensure a valid and reliable framework for evaluating each LEA's special education program. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback in a variety of ways. OSSE reviewed all feedback and made revisions 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		

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%
Target B <=	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=				

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	520	835	21	1,376
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	291	467	13	771
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	135	168	3	306
b2. Number of children attending separate school	3	8	0	11
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	1	1	0	2

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 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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	771	1,376	54.36%	60.00%	56.03%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	317	1,376	23.70%	10.00%	23.04%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Home	2	1,376	0.10%		0.15%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

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 3 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2019	Target >=	78.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
A1	74.59%	Data	84.62%	87.50%	74.59%	76.35%	76.92%

A2	2019	Target >=	66.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%
A2	61.47%	Data	65.45%	68.99%	61.47%	53.64%	64.65%
B1	2019	Target >=	85.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
B1	76.43%	Data	85.56%	88.35%	76.43%	69.67%	80.26%
B2	2019	Target >=	66.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%
B2	64.90%	Data	69.70%	68.81%	64.90%	43.68%	62.24%
C1	2019	Target >=	82.00%	84.00%	84.00%	84.00%	84.00%
C1	56.95%	Data	92.03%	67.22%	56.95%	76.19%	80.09%
C2	2019	Target >=	78.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%
C2	60.10%	Data	86.26%	70.83%	60.10%	54.79%	68.88%

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

When soliciting stakeholder feedback on the District's targets for FFY 2020-25:

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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.
4. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

OSSE received extensive stakeholder feedback supporting the baselines and targets reported in its FFY 2020 APR. As a result, the District did not modify any targets during the reporting period. However, in FFY 2021, OSSE conducted broad stakeholder engagement on all SPP/APR indicators and LEA special education performance. As OSSE undergoes its transition to a results-based accountability system for LEAs, the agency conducted extensive stakeholder engagement activities to review areas of measurement, including all APR indicators; support stakeholder understanding of baselines and targets; and receive feedback. OSSE engaged parent groups, DC's special education advocacy and legal community, its SAPSE, LEAs, a cross-Divisional OSSE working group, and DC's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Additionally, in August 2022, OSSE collaborated with the District of Columbia Office of the Ombudsman for Education to jointly launch a family resource center for students with disabilities, known as the DC Special Education Hub. The DC Special Education Hub is an extension of the resource hub developed by OSSE in 2020, and provides families with the one-to-one support, training, resources, and peer-to-peer engagement to navigate the District's complex special education landscape. As part of this partnership, OSSE and the DC Special Education Hub identify opportunities to support building parent capacity to understand and provide feedback on the District's APR data and implementation. OSSE continues to support engagement with families through partnership with the DC Special Education Hub by supporting the development of family-centered resources, translating existing requirements and District policy into accessible formats for families, ensuring the availability of landscape navigation tools for families, and connecting LEAs and schools with the DC Special Education Hub for training.

With the goal of updating OSSE's framework for general supervision for special education, OSSE created the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a results-based accountability framework of each LEA's special education program in the District. Developed from a theory of action to improve

outcomes for students with disabilities, SEPR is designed to engage stakeholders to better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities. During FFY 2022, OSSE convened stakeholders using a variety of mechanisms to solicit feedback on a proposed framework for the report. OSSE convened with parents, the District's State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE), LEAs, technical advisory committee (TAC), and special education advocacy groups. During these convenings, OSSE reviewed newly proposed metrics, data trends, scoring protocols and guidance to ensure a valid and reliable framework for evaluating each LEA's special education program. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback in a variety of ways. OSSE reviewed all feedback and made revisions as appropriate.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

753

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	63	8.37%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	82	10.89%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	162	21.51%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	222	29.48%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	224	29.75%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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>	384	529	76.92%	80.00%	72.59%	Did not meet target	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>	446	753	64.65%	68.00%	59.23%	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	63	8.37%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	81	10.76%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	159	21.12%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	225	29.88%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	225	29.88%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome	384	528	80.26%	87.00%	72.73%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
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:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$							
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	450	753	62.24%	68.00%	59.76%	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	77	10.23%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	60	7.97%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	133	17.66%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	209	27.76%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	274	36.39%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	342	479	80.09%	84.00%	71.40%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	483	753	68.88%	80.00%	64.14%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	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 in the post COVID-19 landscape.
A2	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 in the post COVID-19 landscape.
B1	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

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	implementation is the high rate of staff turnover in early childhood education experienced both locally and nationally in the post COVID-19 landscape.
B2	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 in the post COVID-19 landscape.
C1	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 in the post COVID-19 landscape.
C2	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 in the post COVID-19 landscape.

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 (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 must 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)

OSSE has and will continue to provide targeted technical assistance, working group sessions and special education webinars on the COS process. Additionally, at the start of SY 2023-2024, OSSE transitioned to a new special education data system that will provide real time reminders to LEAs to submit entry and/or exit data.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

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 3 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 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 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 must consider race/ethnicity. 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 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.

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

When soliciting stakeholder feedback on the District's targets for FFY 2020-25:

- 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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.
- OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

OSSE received extensive stakeholder feedback supporting the baselines and targets reported in its FFY 2020 APR. As a result, the District did not modify any targets during the reporting period. However, in FFY 2021, OSSE conducted broad stakeholder engagement on all SPP/APR indicators and LEA special education performance. As OSSE undergoes its transition to a results-based accountability system for LEAs, the agency conducted extensive stakeholder engagement activities to review areas of measurement, including all APR indicators; support stakeholder understanding of baselines and targets; and receive feedback. OSSE engaged parent groups, DC's special education advocacy and legal community, its SAPSE, LEAs, a

cross-Divisional OSSE working group, and DC's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Additionally, in August 2022, OSSE collaborated with the District of Columbia Office of the Ombudsman for Education to jointly launch a family resource center for students with disabilities, known as the DC Special Education Hub. The DC Special Education Hub is an extension of the resource hub developed by OSSE in 2020, and provides families with the one-to-one support, training, resources, and peer-to-peer engagement to navigate the District's complex special education landscape. As part of this partnership, OSSE and the DC Special Education Hub identify opportunities to support building parent capacity to understand and provide feedback on the District's APR data and implementation. OSSE continues to support engagement with families through partnership with the DC Special Education Hub by supporting the development of family-centered resources, translating existing requirements and District policy into accessible formats for families, ensuring the availability of landscape navigation tools for families, and connecting LEAs and schools with the DC Special Education Hub for training.

With the goal of updating OSSE's framework for general supervision for special education, OSSE created the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a results-based accountability framework of each LEA's special education program in the District. Developed from a theory of action to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, SEPR is designed to engage stakeholders to better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities. During FFY 2022, OSSE convened stakeholders using a variety of mechanisms to solicit feedback on a proposed framework for the report. OSSE convened with parents, the District's State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE), LEAs, technical advisory committee (TAC), and special education advocacy groups. During these convenings, OSSE reviewed newly proposed metrics, data trends, scoring protocols and guidance to ensure a valid and reliable framework for evaluating each LEA's special education program. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback in a variety of ways. OSSE reviewed all feedback and made revisions as appropriate.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	88.49%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	89.00%	89.00%
Data	88.87%	86.56%	88.49%	77.89%	80.07%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1,894	2,224	80.07%	90.00%	85.16%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 FY22, OSSE distributed an online survey through 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) and the text message was sent in both English and Spanish. Survey participants could select their preferred language within the online system, and paper and translated versions were made available upon request. OSSE sent direct SMS text messages including a link to the online survey to the telephone numbers of parents as provided by LEAs in the Statewide Longitudinal Education Data (SLED) system, after comparing the school year 2022-23 enrollment data with the school year 2023-24 parent demographic data to ensure the most current data and contact information.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

15,126

Percentage of respondent parents

14.70%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022

Response Rate	27.15%	14.70%
---------------	--------	--------

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. For analysis related to race/ethnicity, the District applied a minimum n-size of 500 enrolled students with disabilities. For analysis related to geographical location (in the District, "ward"), the District applies a minimum n-size of 1000 enrolled students with disabilities. Consistent with this methodology, a percent difference over 115% indicates relative overrepresentation while a percent difference under 85% indicates relative underrepresentation.

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

Overall, survey response rates are largely representative of the District's special education population, especially as it relates to race/ethnicity and geographical location. OSSE identified the following highlights within FY22 data and across historical data:

- Parents of Hispanic/Latino students were overrepresented (22% of total participants compared to 19.1% of the enrolled population) in survey responses. In FY21, this same population was less likely to participate in the survey than other racial and ethnic groups. This change in response rates and representativeness may be attributable to the survey being distributed via text message in both English and Spanish. Respondents who are Hispanic or Latino were not more or less likely to respond differently from the overall population at a p<.05 level.
- Parents of students residing in Ward 6 were overrepresented as compared to all other Wards (8.6% of total participants compared to 6.8% of the enrolled population). Respondents from Ward 6 are similar demographically to DC as a whole and respondents from Ward 6 were not more or less likely to respond differently from the overall population at a p<.05 level.

1. Participation by Ward (excluding "unknown" responses)

Ward of Residence	Percentage of Total Participants	Enrollment Rate by Ward of Residence	Percent difference between enrollment and participants	Meets Representativeness
Ward 1	8.4%	8.8%	95.5%	YES
Ward 2	3.8%	2.3%	165.2%	n<1000
Ward 3	4.7%	3.8%	123.7%	n<1000
Ward 4	15.5%	14.3%	108.4%	YES
Ward 5	16.3%	15.5%	105.2%	YES
Ward 6	8.6%	6.8%	126.5%	NO
Ward 7	19.4%	22.2%	87.4%	YES
Ward 8	23.2%	26.3%	88.2%	YES

2. Participation by Race/Ethnicity

Race	Percentage of Total Participants	Enrollment Rate by Race	Percent difference between enrollment and participants	Meets Representativeness
Black or African American	66.9%	74.3%	90.0%	YES
White	6.3%	6.1%	103.3%	YES
Hispanic or Latino	22.0%	16.7%	131.7%	NO
Asian	0.5%	0.6%	83.3%	n<500
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.1%	0.1%	100.0%	n<500
Native American/Native Alaskan	0.5%	0.2%	250.0%	n<500
Two or More Races	3.6%	2.1%	171.4%	n<500

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

The District's data shows overrepresentation of Hispanic families and those families residing in Ward 6, but does not show evidence of significant underrepresentation of any analyzed subgroup. OSSE will continue efforts to engage all parents of students with disabilities through broad outreach to community partners, distribution through direct SMS text messaging, and supporting LEAs in disseminating information about the survey to parents.

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 FY22, OSSE built on prior success in distributing the survey via direct SMS text messages and will continue this strategy in future years. OSSE expanded access to the survey by sending the direct SMS text messages in both English and Spanish. However, response rates dropped from 27% in FY21 to 14.7% in FY22. OSSE is working with stakeholders and community partners to identify reasons for nonparticipation and develop strategies to increase parent response. In FY22, the survey was moved to a new platform, Microsoft Forms, which may have impacted parents' access to the survey (due to technology challenges). Going forward, OSSE will expand its internal analysis of nonresponse and improvement strategies to better target parent populations. OSSE will seek input from parents and parent groups on the Microsoft Forms platform, the use of text messages, and other ways to better engage parents. For FY23, the parent survey will be distributed in the spring to support parents in providing more timely input on their experiences. OSSE will also engage with LEAs to determine how it can better support LEAs in communicating with parents about the parent survey and encouraging participation. OSSE is also considering ways in which the parent survey could be provided to parents immediately following the annual IEP team meeting, including through electronic communication via the new statewide special education data system, which features a parent portal for ease in communication.

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 examined nonresponse bias by examining both the representativeness of survey responses and how key subgroups responded to the survey. This analysis showed that survey response rates are largely representative of the District's special education population. The wards that had the highest

response rates also had the lowest levels of agreement with the survey questions, so adjusting for nonresponse bias based on ward would improve DC's rate of agreement that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. Similarly, white parents had lower levels of agreement and higher response rates than Black or African American parents, the largest racial/ethnic group in DC. Hispanic or Latino parents agreed with the survey questions at a statistically similar rate to Black or African American parents. Adjusting for non-response bias based on race/ethnicity would have very minimal impact on the survey results.

After employing the use of direct SMS text messages in FY20, OSSE saw dramatic increases in overall response rates and parental participation in previously underrepresented geographical locations (Wards), which suggests prior methods of outreach were less successful in accessing that geographical population. In FY22, the text message was sent in both English and Spanish; representative analysis showed that parents of Hispanic or Latino students were slightly overrepresented in their participation as compared to other races and ethnicities. OSSE will continue to explore the possibility of sending text messages in parents' native languages, and will support LEAs in disseminating information about the survey in a variety of languages. As part of larger infrastructure changes to better support parents, and better support LEAs in supporting parents, OSSE will engage stakeholders to identify ways it could reach more diverse populations, including altering the timing of the survey and more widely sharing survey outcomes.

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?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, DC must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and report on steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

As previously mentioned, OSSE examined nonresponse bias by examining both the representativeness of survey responses and how key subgroups responded to the survey. This analysis showed that survey response rates are largely representative of the District's special education population. The wards that had the highest response rates also had the lowest levels of agreement with the survey questions, so adjusting for nonresponse bias based on ward would improve DC's rate of agreement that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. Similarly, white parents had lower levels of agreement and higher response rates than Black or African American parents, the largest racial/ethnic group in DC. Hispanic or Latino parents agreed with the survey questions at a statistically similar rate to Black or African American parents. Adjusting for non-response bias based on race/ethnicity would have very minimal impact on the survey results.

After employing the use of direct SMS text messages in FY20, OSSE saw dramatic increases in overall response rates and parental participation in previously underrepresented geographical locations (Wards), which suggests prior methods of outreach were less successful in accessing that geographical population. In FY22, the text message was sent in both English and Spanish; representative analysis showed that parents of Hispanic or Latino students were slightly overrepresented in their participation as compared to other races and ethnicities. OSSE will continue to explore the possibility of sending text messages in parents' native languages, and will support LEAs in disseminating information about the survey in a variety of languages. As part of larger infrastructure changes to better support parents, and better support LEAs in supporting parents, OSSE will engage stakeholders to identify ways it could reach more diverse populations, including altering the timing of the survey and more widely sharing survey outcomes.

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

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. 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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
2022	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	3.23%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	53	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).

OSSE changed its definition of disproportionate representation as follows:

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 2021-2022 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 adopted a risk ratio threshold of five (5) which means that OSSE will investigate an LEA if a particular racial/ethnic group is more than five (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 2021-22 school year review, OSSE identified LEAs with significant discrepancy and/or disproportionate representation that consecutively met the criteria for the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 school years in the same analysis category. For the 2022-23 school year review, OSSE began flagging LEAs identified in the same analysis category for three (3) consecutive years.

4) An LEA must have at least ten (10) children from a racial/ethnic group with a disability and 30 children from a racial/ethnic group enrolled to create a calculation. OSSE applies an alternate risk ratio when LEAs meet the minimum cell size (10 children with disabilities in racial/ethnic group) and n size (30 children enrolled in racial/ethnic group) requirements for the target group (racial/ethnic group being analyzed) but do not meet the minimum cell and n size requirements for the comparison groups. In such instances, statewide data serve as the comparison group for calculating risk ratios.

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.

For FFY 2022, zero (0) LEAs met the District's definition of disproportionate representation as it relates to indicator 9.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSSE revised its indicator 9 baseline to reflect its change in methodology (i.e., moving from using 2 to 3 consecutive years of data). This change in the methodology makes data no longer comparable to prior year's data.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

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 section 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 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). 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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
2022	2.63%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.33%	2.56%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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.

28

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
4	1	38	2.56%	0%	2.63%	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).

In 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 2021-2022 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 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 as having disproportionate representation for the 2020-2021 school year only. For the 2021-22 school year review, OSSE identified LEAs as having disproportionate representation for two (2) consecutive years in the same analysis category. For the 2022-23 school year review, OSSE began to only flag LEAs identified in the same analysis category for three (3) consecutive years.

4) An LEA must have at least ten (10) children from a racial/ethnic group in a disability category and 30 children from a racial/ethnic group enrolled to create a calculation. OSSE applies an alternate risk ratio when LEAs meet the minimum cell size (10 children with disabilities in racial/ethnic group) and n size (30 children enrolled in racial/ethnic group) requirements for the target group (racial/ethnic group being analyzed) but do not meet the minimum cell and n size requirements for the comparison groups. In such instances, statewide data serve as the comparison group for calculating risk ratios.

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 four (4) of 38 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 four (4) 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 must review a specified 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 four (4) LEAs submitted their completed self-studies. OSSE reviewed the results of the self-studies, including reviewing each LEA's child find, evaluation, and eligibility policies and practices, and found that 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)

OSSE revised its indicator 10 baseline to reflect its change in methodology (i.e., moving from using 2 to 3 consecutive years of data). This change in the methodology makes data no longer comparable to prior year's data.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

As a result of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2021, OSSE's IDEA Monitoring team required the LEA to submit a Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) that aligned with the required revisions related to their inappropriate identification finding. The CIP was approved by OSSE and closely monitored throughout the school year. In addition to the CIP, OSSE required the LEA to submit two (2) progress reports to their assigned OSSE IDEA monitor on the progress of the CIP's action items.

The LEA had one year to complete each action item in the CIP, including but not limited to revising procedures in the areas of evaluation requirements, parent engagement, and IEP team participation. OSSE verified these required actions by reviewing the revised procedures and trainings submitted by the LEA. Upon completion of the CIP and through subsequent review of data, OSSE found that the LEA now has written procedures that comply with the regulatory requirements.

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

The LEA identified in FFY 2021 was required to revise its procedures in the areas of evaluation requirements, parent engagement, and IEP team participation.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	1	1	0

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

As a result of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2020, OSSE's IDEA Monitoring team required the LEA to submit a Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) that aligned with the required revisions related to their inappropriate identification finding. The CIP was approved by OSSE and closely monitored throughout the school year. In addition to the CIP, OSSE required the LEA to submit two (2) progress reports to their assigned OSSE IDEA monitor on the progress of the CIP's action items.

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

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

The LEA identified in FFY 2020 was required to revise and/or develop written policies and procedures related to the initial evaluation process and measures for determining eligibility and related services.

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because DC reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), DC must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. DC must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the one district identified in FFY 2021 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.

If DC did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Further, DC must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining one district identified in FFY 2020 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification, are in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311.

In demonstrating the correction of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and FFY 2020, DC must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that DC verified that each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (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 2022 SPP/APR, DC must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The LEA that was identified in FFY 2020 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification was identified in FFY 2021 as well.

As a result of the noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and FFY 2021, OSSE's IDEA Monitoring team required the LEA to submit a Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) that aligned with the required revisions related to their Disproportionate Representation finding. The CIP was approved by OSSE and closely monitored throughout the school year. In addition to the CIP, OSSE required the LEA to submit two (2) progress reports to their assigned OSSE IDEA monitor on the progress of the CIP's action items.

The LEA had one year to complete each action item in the CIP, including but not limited to revising the specific language and IDEA references in their policies, providing training to staff members on the updated policies, and posting updated policies to the LEA's website. OSSE verified these required actions by reviewing the revised policies and LEA's website. Upon completion of the CIP and through subsequent review of data, OSSE found that the LEA had appropriately revised its policies and procedures to comply with the regulatory requirements.

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	92.37%	86.03%	70.71%	63.09%	76.15%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
3,770	2,985	76.15%	100%	79.18%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

785

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 363 days. There were 113 evaluations delayed due to parental delay. There were 672 evaluations delayed due to the LEA, including delayed action taken related to initial referral and delays in scheduling meetings.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

OSSE uses its statewide Special Education Data Systems (SEDS) to collect data for this indicator. Data is collected for the entire reporting year (July 1, 2022 - June 30, 2023) on all children referred for initial evaluation. OSSE reviews data from all LEAs. Following the review of data, OSSE issues findings of noncompliance to each LEA that did not achieve 100% compliance for evaluation timelines.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
50	50	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OSSE verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021: (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 23-01. 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. The student-level corrections were demonstrated when OSSE verified that the student had received the evaluation, although late.

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 OSSE verified that every individual instance of noncompliance was corrected, OSSE 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, OSSE closed the findings of noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because DC reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, DC must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, DC must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why DC did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

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.

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 OSSE verified that every individual instance of noncompliance was corrected, OSSE 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, OSSE closed the findings of noncompliance.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.33%	98.56%	84.34%	56.21%	90.85%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	674
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	41

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	208
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.	58
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	53
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.	308

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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.	208	214	90.85%	100%	97.20%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

6

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.

Six children who were served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. The number of days beyond the child's third birthday was 4 to 288 days, and reasons for delay included delay in evaluations, delay in scheduling meetings, and transfer between LEAs.

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 District 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 District did not meet its target for this indicator. However, the District will continue to engage stakeholders and OSSE staff to implement strategies and provide resources for improving effective Part C to Part B transition.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OSSE verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021: (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 23-01. 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. Student-level corrections were demonstrated when OSSE verified that the student had received an IEP, although late.

OSSE issued 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 submitted evidence of correction of noncompliance to the DC CATS system. After OSSE verified that the LEA had properly corrected every instance of noncompliance associated with a specific regulatory requirement, OSSE reviewed subsequent data from the LEA. OSSE closed the finding(s) of noncompliance when each instance of noncompliance had been corrected, and the LEA was 100% compliant in a subsequent data review.

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

OSSE verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected by verifying in DC CATS and the Special Education Data System (SEDS) that the LEAs cited for noncompliance had developed and implemented an IEP for each student previously cited for noncompliance. After OSSE verified every individual instance of noncompliance was corrected, OSSE pulled and reviewed subsequent data to ensure the LEAs were correctly implementing the relevant IDEA requirements.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because DC reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, DC must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, DC must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why DC did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

OSSE issued 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 submitted evidence of correction of noncompliance to the DC CATS system. After OSSE verified that the LEA had properly corrected every instance of noncompliance associated with a specific regulatory requirement, OSSE reviewed subsequent data from the LEA. OSSE closed the finding(s) of noncompliance when each instance of noncompliance had been corrected, and the LEA was 100% compliant in a subsequent data review.

OSSE verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected by verifying in DC CATS and the Special Education Data System (SEDS) that the LEAs cited for noncompliance had developed and implemented an IEP for each student previously cited for noncompliance. After OSSE verified every individual instance of noncompliance was corrected, OSSE pulled and reviewed subsequent data to ensure the LEAs were correctly implementing the relevant IDEA requirements.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

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 = [(# 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) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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
2020	65.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	76.00%	76.00%	70.00%	65.00%	65.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
115	200	65.00%	100%	57.50%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

During SY 2020-21, OSSE revised its monitoring methodology for secondary transition shifting from a cohort monitoring model to a weighted data pull approach. The weighted data pull is 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 the District of Columbia. The minimum 'n' size for each LEA is five (5) student files. OSSE believes this revised methodology contributed to slippage as all LEAs, rather than a small subset, that serve transition aged students were included in the sample. OSSE anticipates that in the initial years of implementing the revised methodology and resulting technical assistance, the compliance rates will vary because in each iteration of review unique student files will be found noncompliant. OSSE believes this approach will drive improvement in compliance rates over time; however, this first federal fiscal year 2022 review under the new methodology included all LEAs, instead of a cohort of 4-5 LEAs, including those who require additional support in the area of secondary transition.

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 is 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 is 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)

As a result of our attention to DC's specific conditions under IDEA, OSSE continues to engage in interagency collaboration with a variety of stakeholders, including the District's vocational rehabilitation agency, Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA). OSSE participates in the capacity building institute hosted by the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) and, as part of the state plan, has entered into a data sharing agreement with RSA. This agreement supports RSA's capacity and ability to provide preemployment and pretransition skill building initiatives as required under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
24	24	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

OSSE verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021: (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 23-01. 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 issued 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 submitted evidence of correction of noncompliance to the DC CATS system. If the LEA's first submission did not correct noncompliance, OSSE compliance monitors followed-up with the LEA to provide additional technical assistance on the requirements for correction. After OSSE verified that the LEA had properly corrected every instance of noncompliance associated with a specific regulatory requirement, OSSE reviewed subsequent data from the LEA. OSSE closed the finding(s) of noncompliance when each instance of noncompliance had been corrected, and the LEA was 100% compliant in a subsequent data review.

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

OSSE ensured that the LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, by ensuring each LEA had completed the required action (e.g., develop an appropriate measurable postsecondary 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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because DC reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, DC must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, DC must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why DC did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

OSSE issued 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 submitted evidence of correction of noncompliance to the DC CATS system. After OSSE verified that the LEA had properly corrected every instance of noncompliance associated with a specific regulatory requirement, OSSE reviewed subsequent data from the LEA. OSSE closed the finding(s) of noncompliance when each instance of noncompliance had been corrected, and the LEA was 100% compliant in a subsequent data review.

OSSE ensured that the LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, by verifying each LEA had completed the required action (e.g., develop an appropriate measurable postsecondary 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.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

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

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 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).

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 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 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 analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their 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.

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

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2012	Target >=	31.00%	32.00%	32.00%	22.00%	24.00%
A	23.00%	Data	24.37%	23.78%	21.95%	17.54%	28.44%
B	2012	Target >=	54.00%	59.00%	59.00%	23.00%	25.00%
B	25.62%	Data	34.22%	29.08%	22.51%	20.11%	34.75%
C	2012	Target >=	63.00%	74.00%	74.00%	28.00%	30.00%
C	30.81%	Data	54.86%	44.16%	27.60%	53.97%	44.66%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	26.00%	28.00%	30.00%	32.00%
Target B >=	27.00%	29.00%	31.00%	33.00%
Target C >=	32.00%	34.00%	36.00%	38.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

When soliciting stakeholder feedback on the District’s targets for FFY 2020-25:

- 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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.
- OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

OSSE received extensive stakeholder feedback supporting the baselines and targets reported in its FFY 2020 APR. As a result, the District did not modify any targets during the reporting period. However, in FFY 2021, OSSE conducted broad stakeholder engagement on all SPP/APR indicators and LEA special education performance. As OSSE undergoes its transition to a results-based accountability system for LEAs, the agency conducted extensive stakeholder engagement activities to review areas of measurement, including all APR indicators; support stakeholder understanding of baselines and targets; and receive feedback. OSSE engaged parent groups, DC's special education advocacy and legal community, its SAPSE, LEAs, a cross-Divisional OSSE working group, and DC's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Additionally, in August 2022, OSSE collaborated with the District of Columbia Office of the Ombudsman for Education to jointly launch a family resource center for students with disabilities, known as the DC Special Education Hub. The DC Special Education Hub is an extension of the resource hub developed by OSSE in 2020, and provides families with the one-to-one support, training, resources, and peer-to-peer engagement to navigate the District's complex special education landscape. As part of this partnership, OSSE and the DC Special Education Hub identify opportunities to support building parent capacity to understand and provide feedback on the District's APR data and implementation. OSSE continues to support engagement with families through partnership with the DC Special Education Hub by supporting the development of family-centered resources, translating existing requirements and District policy into accessible formats for families, ensuring the availability of landscape navigation tools for families, and connecting LEAs and schools with the DC Special Education Hub for training.

With the goal of updating OSSE's framework for general supervision for special education, OSSE created the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a results-based accountability framework of each LEA's special education program in the District. Developed from a theory of action to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, SEPR is designed to engage stakeholders to better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities. During FFY 2022, OSSE convened stakeholders using a variety of mechanisms to solicit feedback on a proposed framework for the report. OSSE convened with parents, the District's State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE), LEAs, technical advisory committee (TAC), and special education advocacy groups. During these convenings, OSSE reviewed newly proposed metrics, data trends, scoring protocols and guidance to ensure a valid and reliable framework for evaluating each LEA's special education program. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback in a variety of ways. OSSE reviewed all feedback and made revisions as appropriate.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	787
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	787
Response Rate	100.00%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	214
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	92
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)	8
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).	114

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	214	787	28.44%	26.00%	27.19%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	306	787	34.75%	27.00%	38.88%	Met target	No Slippage

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	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)	428	787	44.66%	32.00%	54.38%	Met target	No Slippage

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	2021	2022
Response Rate	100.00%	100.00%

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

Through the use of administrative data sources, the District obtained data for 100% of all leavers; therefore, the data are fully representative of the target group.

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 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.

Through the use of administrative data sources, the District obtained data for 100% of all leavers; therefore, the data are fully representative of the target group.

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

Through the use of administrative data sources, the District obtained data for 100% of all leavers; therefore, the data are fully representative of the target group.

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.

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

None

14 - OSEP Response

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 ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	170
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3

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

When soliciting stakeholder feedback on the District's targets for FFY 2020-25:

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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.
4. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

OSSE received extensive stakeholder feedback supporting the baselines and targets reported in its FFY 2020 APR. As a result, the District did not modify any targets during the reporting period. However, in FFY 2021, OSSE conducted broad stakeholder engagement on all SPP/APR indicators and LEA special education performance. As OSSE undergoes its transition to a results-based accountability system for LEAs, the agency conducted extensive stakeholder engagement activities to review areas of measurement, including all APR indicators; support stakeholder understanding of baselines and targets; and receive feedback. OSSE engaged parent groups, DC's special education advocacy and legal community, its SAPSE, LEAs, a cross-Divisional OSSE working group, and DC's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Additionally, in August 2022, OSSE collaborated with the District of Columbia Office of the Ombudsman for Education to jointly launch a family resource center for students with disabilities, known as the DC Special Education Hub. The DC Special Education Hub is an extension of the resource hub developed by OSSE in 2020, and provides families with the one-to-one support, training, resources, and peer-to-peer engagement to navigate the District's complex special education landscape. As part of this partnership, OSSE and the DC Special Education Hub identify opportunities to support

building parent capacity to understand and provide feedback on the District's APR data and implementation. OSSE continues to support engagement with families through partnership with the DC Special Education Hub by supporting the development of family-centered resources, translating existing requirements and District policy into accessible formats for families, ensuring the availability of landscape navigation tools for families, and connecting LEAs and schools with the DC Special Education Hub for training.

With the goal of updating OSSE's framework for general supervision for special education, OSSE created the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a results-based accountability framework of each LEA's special education program in the District. Developed from a theory of action to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, SEPR is designed to engage stakeholders to better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities. During FFY 2022, OSSE convened stakeholders using a variety of mechanisms to solicit feedback on a proposed framework for the report. OSSE convened with parents, the District's State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE), LEAs, technical advisory committee (TAC), and special education advocacy groups. During these convenings, OSSE reviewed newly proposed metrics, data trends, scoring protocols and guidance to ensure a valid and reliable framework for evaluating each LEA's special education program. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback in a variety of ways. OSSE reviewed all feedback and made revisions as appropriate.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	3.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	29.00% - 44.00%	31.00% - 46.00%	31.00%-46.00%	12.00%-15.00%	12.00%-15.00%
Data	14.29%	17.65%	12.44%	2.70%	2.86%

Targets

FFY	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%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
3	170	2.86%	12.00%	15.00%	1.76%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The District experiences a high rate of settlements resolving complaints prior to going to hearing. 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

OSSE is convening a cross-agency working group to design and implement strategies to address performance metrics and strategize program improvements, including program improvements related to dispute resolution activities.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

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 = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$ 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 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	29
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	8
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	12

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

When soliciting stakeholder feedback on the District's targets for FFY 2020-25:

- 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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.
- OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

OSSE received extensive stakeholder feedback supporting the baselines and targets reported in its FFY 2020 APR. As a result, the District did not modify any targets during the reporting period. However, in FFY 2021, OSSE conducted broad stakeholder engagement on all SPP/APR indicators and LEA special education performance. As OSSE undergoes its transition to a results-based accountability system for LEAs, the agency conducted extensive stakeholder engagement activities to review areas of measurement, including all APR indicators; support stakeholder understanding of baselines and targets; and receive feedback. OSSE engaged parent groups, DC's special education advocacy and legal community, its SAPSE, LEAs, a cross-Divisional OSSE working group, and DC's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Additionally, in August 2022, OSSE collaborated with the District of Columbia Office of the Ombudsman for Education to jointly launch a family resource center for students with disabilities, known as the DC Special Education Hub. The DC Special Education Hub is an extension of the resource hub

developed by OSSE in 2020, and provides families with the one-to-one support, training, resources, and peer-to-peer engagement to navigate the District's complex special education landscape. As part of this partnership, OSSE and the DC Special Education Hub identify opportunities to support building parent capacity to understand and provide feedback on the District's APR data and implementation. OSSE continues to support engagement with families through partnership with the DC Special Education Hub by supporting the development of family-centered resources, translating existing requirements and District policy into accessible formats for families, ensuring the availability of landscape navigation tools for families, and connecting LEAs and schools with the DC Special Education Hub for training.

With the goal of updating OSSE's framework for general supervision for special education, OSSE created the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a results-based accountability framework of each LEA's special education program in the District. Developed from a theory of action to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, SEPR is designed to engage stakeholders to better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities. During FFY 2022, OSSE convened stakeholders using a variety of mechanisms to solicit feedback on a proposed framework for the report. OSSE convened with parents, the District's State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE), LEAs, technical advisory committee (TAC), and special education advocacy groups. During these convenings, OSSE reviewed newly proposed metrics, data trends, scoring protocols and guidance to ensure a valid and reliable framework for evaluating each LEA's special education program. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback in a variety of ways. OSSE reviewed all feedback and made revisions as appropriate.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	23.10%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	68.00% - 83.00%	70.00% - 85.00%	70.00%-85.00%	57.00%-60.00%	57.00%-60.00%
Data	75.00%	52.17%	57.14%	91.67%	70.83%

Targets

FFY	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%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target (low)	FFY 2022 Target (high)	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
8	12	29	70.83%	57.00%	60.00%	68.97%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

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) (SiMR) 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 2022 through February 2027, 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) 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 SPPs/APRs, 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., February 1, 2023). 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 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

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 (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., 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 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) 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)

NO

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)

NO

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

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	2019	76.43%
B	2019	64.90%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%	87.00%
Target B	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	384	528	80.26%	87.00%	72.73%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	450	753	62.24%	68.00%	59.76%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for A slippage, if applicable

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 in the post COVID-19 landscape.

Provide reasons for B slippage, if applicable

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 in the post COVID-19 landscape.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 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. Starting with SY23-24, the COS data collection was transitioned to the new statewide special education data 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 documented as appropriate. 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)

NO

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.

In prior years , the District identified fluctuations across LEAs and student populations in student performance data reported in the Child Outcomes Summary data collection for APR Indicator 7. Through the Early Childhood Working Group and stakeholder engagement activities, LEAs and District educators continued to report that the subjective nature of the Child Outcomes Summary standards presented challenges in application. LEAs expressed a need for more training to improve decision-making related to designating student performance scores consistent with the Child Outcomes Summary scales. 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. Through the Early Childhood Working Group, OSSE provided additional Child Outcomes Summary training and facilitated LEA sharing of best practices and troubleshooting common challenges. OSSE provided broader training and technical assistance to LEAs through the monthly District-wide Special Education Points of Contact webinar, and continuously offered targeted technical assistance and support to LEAs regarding data analysis and the Child Outcomes Summary data collection through monitoring activities. Additionally, the Child Outcomes Summary process was incorporated into the new statewide special education data system to provide LEAs with a one-stop system for student special education data, including student IEP data, Child Outcomes Summary, and state monitoring processes. The comprehensive system will support long-term improvements in data quality and reliability by streamlining LEA processes for analyzing and reporting Child Outcomes Summary data.

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)

NO

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

The District’s SSIP contemplates infrastructure improvement activities across four major areas: data collection and use, accountability, training and technical assistance, and educator practice and instruction.

Data Collection and Use: The District will refine the COS data collection process through two activities: updating the COS data collection process guidance and integrating the COS process within aligned data systems. In September 2023, the District fully transitioned all LEAs from the legacy statewide Special Education Data System (SEDS) into a new statewide system, PowerSchool Special Programs. The new system is a comprehensive warehouse for student special education documentation and related data. A key enhancement was the integration of the COS data collection into the

centralized system, which will support LEAs in appropriately documenting COS data and monitoring student progress and outcomes. As OSSE continues its overhaul of special education policies and guidance, the COS guidance will be updated for the 2024-25 school year to reflect processes and documentation requirements of the new system.

Accountability: In 2022, OSSE launched the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a new accountability system for LEA performance specific to students with disabilities. 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. COS data is included in the SEPR, as well as local requirements related to early childhood education. The SEPR framework is designed to proactively engage LEAs in systemic improvement activities and establishes a continuous improvement model. The first SEPR reports were issued in fall 2023, accompanied by stakeholder outreach to guide the community in accessing and using the reports. OSSE, through its partnership with the Special Education Hub, supported the development of parent-facing resources and trainings to support parents in understanding the reports and how to use the data therein. To support LEAs in addressing gaps identified through the SEPR, OSSE developed a comprehensive suite of training and technical assistance activities. To further 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.

Training and Technical Assistance: To support LEAs in successfully completing the COS process, the District continued to provide broad training opportunities and targeted technical assistance. OSSE provided accessible trainings to assist LEAs and educators in understanding the COS process and relevant decisions and to increase educator capacity to apply COS standards to make data-driven decisions about student performance. OSSE leveraged its monthly Special Education Points of Contact webinar to provide training and reminders about COS deadlines. While OSSE provided trainings to support LEAs in completing the COS process, it recognizes that more trainings and supports are needed to meet LEA needs and improve District-wide practice. Additionally, OSSE continued to identify and engage LEAs performing below expectations through the general system of supervision, including OSSE's IDEA monitoring processes and SEPR activities. This included providing technical assistance to support LEAs in establishing effective data collection and analysis processes to ensure appropriate application of COS standards and criteria. OSSE will continue to provide technical assistance and refine trainings, including leveraging the District's new learning management system (LMS) to ensure trainings and resources are readily available to a broad group of educators.

Educator Practice and Instruction: The District's Literacy DC initiative continued in its third year. Literacy DC supports LEAs in implementing a broad range of literacy-focused evidence-based practices and improvement activities, including early literacy evidence-based practices. The foundation of Literacy DC is the DC state-wide Comprehensive Literacy Plan, which serves as a blueprint for subgrantees to utilize in developing their own Local Literacy Plan. Literacy DC also includes the Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) Grant, awarded to OSSE by the US Department of Education in September 2020. This five-year, \$16 million grant in part supports early language and literacy skills through grants provided to prekindergarten programs. 10 LEAs were awarded subgrants to implement evidence-based literacy practices across K-12 environments, with 3 subgrantees serving students ages three to five. Through a community of practice model, OSSE facilitates a space for CLSD Project Directors to engage at least quarterly throughout the school year to discuss challenges with implementing their local literacy plan. This time is used to present problems of practice and learn from other subgrantees.

OSSE has leveraged a limited portion of CLSD grant funds for state-wide activities, specifically professional development opportunities for a variety of audiences. OSSE has utilized CLSD funds to provide Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) for a selected group of educators. Starting in 2023, OSSE offered three LETRS cohorts: LETRS for K-5 teachers, LETRS for Early Childhood Education (ECE) Teachers and LETRS for Administrators. Currently 80 K-5 educators are enrolled in LETRS K-5, 88 educators are enrolled in LETRS for ECE and 44 administrators are enrolled in the LETRS for Administrators course.

The District has dedicated Elementary & Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) funds and CLSD funding to support the launch of a Science of Reading course offered for pre-K to grade 3 educators in participating schools. Educators complete 25 hours of coursework grounded in the science of reading to understand how even the youngest students attain critical literacy skills. Between the Science of Reading training course and LETRS, OSSE will be providing incentives to more than 30% of the District's pre-K through grade 3 educator workforce to complete these important trainings. By the conclusion of 2023, 599 educators registered for the course with 291 educators having completed it.

OSSE has also utilized CLSD funds to host literacy convenings, which provide opportunities for educators and leaders to receive evidence-based professional learning, share best practices, and network with other literacy professionals. In May 2023, OSSE hosted the Spring 2023 Literacy Convening which brought together educators from across the District to engage in professional learning and networking to build citywide capacity. The convening theme, Advancing Excellence in Literacy, invited participants to reflect on instruction and amplify best practices for all DC students. Over 200 attendees representing over 40 LEAs attended the convening and engaged in a variety of sessions focused on early literacy, special education, dyslexia and other reading difficulties, and multilingual learners. Most sessions involved some content tailored to students with disabilities; for example, the "Beyond the Letter-Sound Correspondences: The Critical Role of Grapho-motor Training in Effective Reading Instruction" session was facilitated by a Certified Academic Language Therapist (CALT), an expert in supporting students with language-based learning disabilities. In November 2023, OSSE hosted a convening of CLSD subgrantees. Over 40 attendees across 10 LEAs discussed state assessment data, social emotional learning trainings, MTSS workshops, multilingual learner resources, and met with similar grade band LEAs for small group discussions on implementing evidence-based practices at schools. On a scale of 1-5, participants rated content and operations of the convening at a 4.2.

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.

Consistent with the District's SSIP Evaluation Plan, OSSE achieved the following outcomes during FY22:

Evaluation Question: To what extent are state-level activities building LEA capacity to make data-driven decisions in relation to the COS data collection process? **Data Collection and Use:** OSSE continued to host the Early Childhood Working Group, which discussed practices and barriers affecting COS data collection, decision making, and reporting. strategy and short-term outcome facilitate necessary system improvements in both data collection requirements and LEA and educator practice. At the end of the 2022-23 school year, OSSE distributed a survey to Early Childhood Working Group participants to gather input on the working group and practice challenges. Participants identified educator and provider availability and capacity, evolving and high student needs, and transition from early intervention services into pre-school programming and from pre-school into Kindergarten as especially challenging barriers to be discussed during the 2023-24 school year. Participants also sought additional training and guidance from OSSE on instructional best practices, transition supports, qualitative tracking of student behaviors and performance, parent and family engagement, and COS data collection and decision making. This feedback is being incorporated into the restructuring of the Early Childhood Working Group into a community of practice, supported by training and resources provided by OSSE.

Evaluation Question: To what extent are state-level activities improving LEA practice related to the COS data collection? **Accountability:** The launch of

the SEPR, including the first release of LEA reports in September 2023, serves as an impetus for LEA practice improvement. As the District identifies appropriate directed enforcement activities based on LEA performance on SEPR measures, LEAs identified as needing to implement continuous improvement activities related to the COS will engage in targeted technical assistance to improve data collection and reporting practices. The District continues to note fluctuations in reported Child Outcome Summary data across LEAs and student populations – that is, the intermediate outcome of stabilization in the data has not yet been achieved.

Evaluation Question: To what extent are state-level activities supporting LEAs in implementing early literacy evidence-based practices? Training and Technical Assistance: For the 2022-23 school year, CLSD subgrantees reported a 3.7% decrease from the prior year in the percentage of participating four-year-old children who achieved significant gains in oral language skills. Two of the three subgrantees were new to the type of data collection contemplated for CLSD program evaluation. With additional oversight and technical assistance from OSSE, and a better understanding of the data and data collection practices, the subgrantees have demonstrated improvements in data accuracy and increased fidelity in data reporting in the current school year 2023-24.

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

NO

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

To support overall implementation and evaluation of the District's SSIP, OSSE is in the process of onboarding one full-time employee to coordinate SSIP activities across teams.

Data Collection and Use: Following the launch of the new statewide special education data system, the District will focus efforts on stabilization of the data system, improving LEA and educator capacity to use the system, and leveraging data to drive LEA-level programmatic and systemic improvements. OSSE is providing trainings and resources to support LEAs in refining data collection practices to ensure thorough and complete entry of all COS data into the statewide special education data system, and to improve data reliability and validity through more standardized decision-making in assigning scores. OSSE will update the COS guidance to support LEAs and educators in entering data, highlight best practices related to data collection, and update language related to decision-making. OSSE will leverage state-level resources available through the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) in designing these materials and remind LEAs of the resources available from ECTA to support LEA-level improvements in the process. During FY23, OSSE is expanding the scope of the Early Childhood Working Group to cultivate sustainability of system improvement efforts and establish a vital feedback conduit between LEAs and OSSE. The working group is being restructured as a community of practice to encourage cross-LEA sharing of problems of practice, best practices, and strategizing to address common pitfalls of many aspects of educating and engaging early childhood students with disabilities and their families. The Early Childhood Special Education Community of Practice will continue to provide important input and feedback to help shape the updated COS guidance.

Accountability: The District will publish the second year of SEPR reports (using FY22 data) which will allow the state and LEAs to monitor LEA growth year-over-year. Through cross-team analysis, OSSE will identify high need areas and develop short- and long-term professional development and technical assistance opportunities. Coupling SEPR results with the IDEA determinations process, OSSE will identify individualized supports, corrective actions, and directed technical assistance activities to guide LEAs in addressing areas for growth in both compliance practices and student outcome measures. The District will continue to engage a broad range of stakeholders to inform SEPR efforts, including LEAs, parents, advocates, and community members.

Training and Technical Assistance: OSSE will design updated COS training and guidance, leveraging the state LMS, to connect educator practice to the new data collection process within the statewide special education data system. A key goal of these efforts is to improve LEAs' strategic use of system data, including using COS data to inform student-level service designations and LEA- or school-level programming. The District will connect efforts described under "Data Collection and Use" with training and technical assistance activities to ensure widespread dissemination and implementation of updated guidance. The District will also leverage SEPR data to connect LEAs with appropriate resource, trainings, and technical assistance to improve LEA performance on relevant SEPR measures.

Educator Practice and Instruction: In FY23, the District will continue efforts under the Literacy DC umbrella. To broadly address citywide literacy efforts, OSSE will host a spring convening open to all DC educators in May 2024 and will work toward implementation of the Early Literacy Task Force recommendations, including convening an internal OSSE review group and a school-based advisory team to inform efforts. The District will continue to provide Science of Reading training and will expand creation and publication of additional courses through the LMS. The District will also facilitate new LETRS cohorts throughout 2024 and 2025. Specific to CLSD activities, OSSE will conduct site visits to over 15 LEAs to observe and monitor fidelity of implementation of early literacy evidence-based practices, including all CLSD subgrantees. OSSE will enhance the Foundations of Special Education offerings by dividing participants by cohort, including hosting an early childhood cohort specifically focused on pre-K and kindergarten educators (including general educators, special educators, paraprofessionals, and dedicated aides serving DC public and public charter schools and community-based organizations participating in the District's pre-K Enhancement and Expansion Program).

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 leads 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.

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 impacts the SiMR by changing educator practices to improve literacy outcomes for preschool students with disabilities. The District is working to provide and develop 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.

Implementation fidelity of the Every Child Ready (ECR) curriculum is a key component for AppleTree Institute according to their Local Literacy Plan. Through this plan, AppleTree established a goal that 90% of participating teachers will use best practices in early literacy instruction by implementing the ECR instructional model with fidelity. In 2023, AppleTree focused on professional development given to educators by LEA-wide Implementation Specialists (IS). Given the need for more support in 21-22 SY, three more ISs were made available to support the implementation of the model at the LEA. Implementation specialists have provided ongoing coaching to teachers and leaders with flexible small groups and checklists. Specialists also provide coaching hours to each AppleTree campus to work with both teachers and leaders on best practices in literacy. Additionally, the AppleTree Team has aligned observation cycles with the regularly planned coaching cycle (three times per year over a 9-week period). Implementation specialists worked with school leaders and administrators to establish and report on goals each cycle, including technology and data managers. This alignment has allowed time for more structured data reflection and goal setting throughout the year on a predictable schedule for all school leaders. Measurement of the impact of professional learning activities comes from quarterly observations of three literacy-based components; read-aloud, journals, and flexible small group instruction. AppleTree's Attribute Checklist tool was used for each observation, and each classroom was observed three times each quarter. These Attribute Checklists include a list of essential elements of each component that are indicators of quality instruction. In addition, these "look-fors" are also embedded in each lesson in the ECR curriculum, which makes them an appropriate measure of fidelity to the instructional model. Observations were tracked on a 9-week cycle, aligned to AppleTree's overall coaching cycle schedule. Across 11 campuses, ECR Specialists completed the majority of observations for Flexible Small Groups (FSG) and Attributable Checklists, with 85% of observations fully completed. Reasons for incomplete observations were typically related to the challenges of teachers being out during the observation day and/or last-minute changes in schedule. AppleTree captured how teachers performed on the Attribute Checklists for the targeted components, illustrated in the table below. There was more variability across classrooms, especially in the first two cycles, but some of this variability was due to incomplete observations (often due to teacher absences or other extenuating circumstances). After reviewing the data in March, AppleTree adjusted coaching, feedback, and observation practices in the final cycle, which elevated teacher practices. Regular observations continue to be a challenge due to teacher and student absences. In the 2022-23 school year, AppleTree's implementation of the ECR curriculum impacted 968 students, 53 teachers, and 890 families. The District is working in conjunction with AppleTree to disaggregate this data to determine impacts on students with disabilities as the target population.

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.

Relative to its award of CLSD funds, AppleTree Institute submitted an FY22 annual progress report detailing activities and progress of implementation of the ECR curriculum for all students. The District continues to work to improve data collection and data disaggregation so it can more accurately and specifically determine impacts on students with disabilities as the target population.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

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.

The District will continue to implement universal improvement strategies as described above to improve broad educator utilization of evidence-based practices, build educator capacity around specific literacy strategies, and improve COS data analysis and data collection practices.

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

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

The District continues to identify data collection challenges as a primary barrier to data accuracy and reliability for Indicator 7b data. Although student performance has fluctuated, those fluctuations are consistent with historical data. Based on OSSE analysis and continued stakeholder engagement, the District is confident that resolving confusion around appropriate designation of COS scores and streamlining the COS data collection process will stabilize the data so more discrete conclusions can be drawn from student outcome data. In FY23, the District is working to improve internal organization around SSIP activities, LEA training and resources, and data collection related to the implementation of evidence-based practices.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

When soliciting stakeholder feedback on the District's targets for FFY 2020-25:

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, evaluation and strategies for improvement.
4. OSSE subject matter experts reviewed all stakeholder questions and comments and consulted with District 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 draft 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 District leadership to finalize baselines and targets as appropriate.

OSSE received extensive stakeholder feedback supporting the baselines and targets reported in its FFY 2020 APR. As a result, the District did not modify any targets during the reporting period. However, in FFY 2021, OSSE conducted broad stakeholder engagement on all SPP/APR indicators and LEA special education performance. As OSSE undergoes its transition to a results-based accountability system for LEAs, the agency conducted extensive stakeholder engagement activities to review areas of measurement, including all APR indicators; support stakeholder understanding of baselines and targets; and receive feedback. OSSE engaged parent groups, DC's special education advocacy and legal community, its SAPSE, LEAs, a cross-Divisional OSSE working group, and DC's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

Additionally, in August 2022, OSSE collaborated with the District of Columbia Office of the Ombudsman for Education to jointly launch a family resource center for students with disabilities, known as the DC Special Education Hub. The DC Special Education Hub is an extension of the resource hub developed by OSSE in 2020, and provides families with the one-to-one support, training, resources, and peer-to-peer engagement to navigate the District's complex special education landscape. As part of this partnership, OSSE and the DC Special Education Hub identify opportunities to support building parent capacity to understand and provide feedback on the District's APR data and implementation. OSSE continues to support engagement with families through partnership with the DC Special Education Hub by supporting the development of family-centered resources, translating existing requirements and District policy into accessible formats for families, ensuring the availability of landscape navigation tools for families, and connecting LEAs and schools with the DC Special Education Hub for training.

With the goal of updating OSSE's framework for general supervision for special education, OSSE created the Special Education Performance Report (SEPR), a results-based accountability framework of each LEA's special education program in the District. Developed from a theory of action to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, SEPR is designed to engage stakeholders to better serve and improve academic achievement for students with disabilities. During FFY 2022, OSSE convened stakeholders using a variety of mechanisms to solicit feedback on a proposed framework for the report. OSSE convened with parents, the District's State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE), LEAs, technical advisory committee (TAC), and special education advocacy groups. During these convenings, OSSE reviewed newly proposed metrics, data trends, scoring protocols and guidance to ensure a valid and reliable framework for evaluating each LEA's special education program. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide feedback in a variety of ways. OSSE reviewed all feedback and made revisions as appropriate.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

OSSE convened the DC Early Literacy Education Task Force, which developed a set of recommendations intended to meet the needs of all DC students, including students with disabilities. Specifically, the task force recommended structured literacy competency for educators, including all DC special education teachers working with students in kindergarten through grade 12, on-the-job support for DC educators regarding structured literacy including how to best support all learners, review, and recommendations of literacy instructional materials to better ensure alignment with research and best practice for all students.

Through the Early Childhood Working Group, OSSE engaged a diverse group of early childhood LEA educators and administrators to discuss challenges related to special education, brainstorm resolutions, and provide feedback to OSSE on a variety of initiatives, including early childhood transition, child find activities, and the COS process. As mentioned above, the District gathered survey feedback from early childhood practitioners on practice challenges and needed training and resources from OSSE. The results of that survey are used to guide both the Early Childhood Special Education Community of Practice and SSIP activities. The District also sought input from the State Advisory Panel on Special Education (SAPSE) regarding SSIP plans and the COS process.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

LEAs and educators continued to identify decision making related to the COS processes as specific practice challenge. Broadly, both LEAs and parents urged that the COS data needs to 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. Stakeholders did not express concerns specific to SSIP activities or evaluation plans.

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.

With the transition to the new statewide special education data system, LEAs have experienced challenges with training and system access that affects LEA use of the system with fidelity, including potential impacts on the COS data collection. The District is working to provide LEAs with direct technical assistance to resolve use and access issues, and is developing broad training and guidance to build LEA and educator capacity to effectively collect and report COS data. The COS guidance will be updated to address use of the new system.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

N/A

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

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

Certify

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

Select the certifier's role:

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:

Title:

Email:

Phone:

Submitted on:

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results			
Compliance			

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments		
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments		
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2024: Part B."

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out		
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**		

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (2)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (3)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.			
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.			
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.			
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation			
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday			
Indicator 13: Secondary transition			
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data			
Timely State Complaint Decisions			
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions			
Longstanding Noncompliance			
Specific Conditions			
Uncorrected identified noncompliance			

(2) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(3) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Data Rubric

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1		
2		
3A		
3B		
3C		
3D		
4A		
4B		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23				
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24				
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24				
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24				
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24				
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23				
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23				

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	
B. 618 Grand Total	
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	
Denominator	
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	5/3/2023

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>