

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>Status of Public Reporting on LEA Performance: While the State has publicly reported on the FFY 2008 (July 1, 2008-June 30, 2009) and FFY 2009 (July 1, 2009-June 30, 2010) performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in the State on the targets in the State’s performance plan as required by section 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) of IDEA, those reports do not contain the required information. Specifically, the State collected and reported data for Indicator B8 in its APRs but the data were not disaggregated and reported at the LEA level. The State reported that it revised its parent survey to ensure the State is in compliance with the public reporting requirement for Indicator B8 beginning in FFY 2010. The State must include in its FFY 2011 APR confirmation that it has completed public reporting for this indicator.</p>		
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 26.29%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State indicated it “did not believe that the [FFY 2009] target data of 94.23% was an accurate representation of [the] graduation rate for all students with IEPs receiving a regular diploma.” The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 85%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 3.82%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State indicated it “did not believe that the reported [FFY 2009] target data was an accurate representation of the dropout rate for all students with IEPs.” The State met its FFY 2010 target of 6.4%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 4.76%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 50%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 93.69% for reading and 93.57% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 92.79% for reading and 92.42% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 95% for reading and 95% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																												
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 597 1583 919"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></td> <td colspan="3"><u>Math</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Elementary</td> <td>15.85%</td> <td>15.52%</td> <td>73.69%</td> <td>18.31%</td> <td>19.03%</td> <td>70.14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Secondary</td> <td>13.02%</td> <td>15.34%</td> <td>71.79%</td> <td>14.53%</td> <td>14.46%</td> <td>70.27%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			Elementary	15.85%	15.52%	73.69%	18.31%	19.03%	70.14%	Secondary	13.02%	15.34%	71.79%	14.53%	14.46%	70.27%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																								
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>																										
Elementary	15.85%	15.52%	73.69%	18.31%	19.03%	70.14%																								
Secondary	13.02%	15.34%	71.79%	14.53%	14.46%	70.27%																								
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 50%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 42.86%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that nine districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that 25 of 43 districts did not meet the State-established minimum</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, on the status of correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2011 based on 2009-2010 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). The State must also report on the</p>																												

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>“n” size requirement of 40 children with disabilities.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010, using 2009-2010 data. The State identified noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected districts to revise), the districts’ 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 compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010, using 2009-2010 data.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices of districts identified with significant discrepancies based on 2008-2009 data, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was partially corrected; however, as of April 17, 2012, the one-year timeline had not expired.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices of districts identified with significant discrepancies based on 2007-2008 data, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was not corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>status of correction of the remaining noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2010 based on 2008-2009 and 2007-2008 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) .</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2011 based on 2009-2010 data and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 based on 2008-2009 data: (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 Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). The State must also report that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 based on 2007-2008 data is correctly implementing the</p>

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>specific regulatory requirement(s). In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 33.33%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised its calculation methodology. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that nine districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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 compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010 based on 2009-2010 data. The State also reported that six districts were identified as having policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>The State reported that 25 of 43 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 40 children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected districts to revise), the districts’ policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and</p>	<p>The State did not, until FFY 2011, determine whether districts with a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, based on 2009-2010 data, had policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, and therefore did not make findings of noncompliance until FFY 2011. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of</p>

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) of districts identified with significant discrepancies based on 2008-2009 data, was partially corrected.</p>	<p>noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 for this indicator for districts with a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2009 discipline data. The State must also report on the status of correction of the remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 based on 2008-2009 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b)</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2011 based on 2009-2010 data and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in in FFY 2010 based on 2008-2009 data: (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to</p>

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		<p>verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>																				
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 716 1583 1190"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">35.52</td> <td align="center">42.40</td> <td align="center">15.5</td> <td align="center">6.88%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">11.86</td> <td align="center">10.31</td> <td align="center">12.5</td> <td align="center">1.55%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">28.97</td> <td align="center">28.05</td> <td align="center">25</td> <td align="center">0.92%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for 5A and 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2010 target for 5C.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	35.52	42.40	15.5	6.88%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11.86	10.31	12.5	1.55%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	28.97	28.05	25	0.92%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	35.52	42.40	15.5	6.88%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	11.86	10.31	12.5	1.55%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	28.97	28.05	25	0.92%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program;</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>	<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011</p>																				

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
<p>and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator; New]</p>		APR.												
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided FFY 2010 baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State’s reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 646 1444 1174"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 646 919 764">10-11 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="919 646 1192 764"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="1192 646 1444 764"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 764 919 899">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 764 1192 899">50.0</td> <td data-bbox="1192 764 1444 899">29.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 899 919 1068">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 899 1192 1068">78.3</td> <td data-bbox="1192 899 1444 1068">16.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1068 919 1174">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 1068 1192 1174">0</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1068 1444 1174">62.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State reported that its baseline data are based upon entry and exit data for 24 children. The State explained the actions it is taking to address the low number of children reflected in the baseline data and the steps it will take to increase the number of children for whom it receives entry and exit data for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. OSEP’s FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to include in the FFY 2010 APR, baseline data and targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. The State provided all of the required information.</p>	10-11 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	50.0	29.2	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	78.3	16.7	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	0	62.5	The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.
10-11 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>												
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	50.0	29.2												
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	78.3	16.7												
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	0	62.5												
8. Percent of parents with a child	The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 79.3%. These data represent	OSEP appreciates the State’s												

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 82.9%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 72.2%.</p>	<p>efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 5.88%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that two districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. One of these districts closed at the end of the 2010-2011 school year. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 19 of 40 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 40 children with disabilities and “within LEAs of 40 or more students with disabilities, at least five students of a single race/ethnicity are required for weighted risk ratio analysis for that particular race/ethnicity.”</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2009, the State did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2009. The State reported that it made one finding of noncompliance based on FFY 2009 data in FFY 2011. Specifically, on page 74 of the APR the State reported that it “erroneously reported in its FFY 2009 APR that it notified the [one] LEA of the findings of noncompliance in writing in February 2011,” but that the “LEA was notified of the finding of noncompliance as part of its annual determination letter in August 2011.”</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>The State must report in its FFY 2011 APR, on the status of correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2011 based on 2009-2010 data for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the one district identified in FFY 2011 based on 2009-2010 data with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that the district: (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</p>

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 data for this indicator are 10%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 11.76%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that ten districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. One of these districts closed at the end of the 2010-2011 school year. The State also reported that two districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that 20 of 40 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 40 students with disabilities and “within LEAs of 40 or more students with disabilities, at least five students of a single race/ethnicity are required for weighted risk ratio analysis for that particular race/ethnicity.”</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2009, the State did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2009. The State reported that it made two findings of noncompliance based on FFY 2009 data in FFY 2011. On page 83 of the APR the State reported that it “erroneously</p>	<p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2011 based on 2010-2011 data for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the two districts identified in FFY 2011 based on 2010-2011 data and the two districts identified in FFY 2011 based on 2009-2010 data 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</p>

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>reported in its FFY 2009 APR that it notified the LEA of the findings of noncompliance in writing in FFY 2010,” but that “both LEAs were notified of the findings of noncompliance as part of their annual determination letters in August 2011.”</p>	<p>in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 71.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 75.43%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 383 of 426 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner. On page 91, the State reported that 11 findings were</p>	<p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator. The State must also clarify in its FFY 2011 APR, the number of remaining</p>

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]	<p>subsequently corrected with 32 remaining findings of noncompliance as of April 17, 2012. However, on page 92, the State reported there were 34 remaining findings of noncompliance as of April 17, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of intervention for five consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 2005, FFY 2006, FFY 2007, FFY 2008, and FFY 2009 APRs and noncompliance with IDEA requirements included in the Special Conditions imposed on the State’s FFY 2010 grant award and was required to submit a Corrective Action Plan (CAP). The State’s CAP, submitted on July 27, 2011, includes the information required by OSEP’s June 20, 2011 Determination Letter.</p> <p>In addition, pursuant to section 616(e)(1)(B) and (2)(A) of the IDEA, the Department directed the State to use \$500,000 of its FFY 2011 State-level funds under IDEA section 611(e) to address the longstanding noncompliance with the requirements to ensure timely initial evaluations and reevaluations. The Department authorized the State to use the otherwise directed funds for other purposes if the State elects to direct LEAs that demonstrated noncompliance with the requirements to conduct timely initial evaluations and reevaluations, to use \$500,000 of their FFY 2011 IDEA Part B funds to reduce the backlog of overdue initial evaluations and reevaluations. The State was required to report on the use of the directed funds and reduction of the backlog consistent with OSEP’s June 20, 2011 Determination Letter (see pages 6-8) and the Special Conditions to the FFY 2011 Grant Award Letter (see Enclosure E, pages 9-12). The State submitted the information in its CAP and CAP progress reports as required. OSEP responded to the State’s submissions in separate correspondence.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2011 Grant Award Letter (Enclosure E, Special Conditions), dated July 1, 2011, required that the State report on its progress toward implementing the CAP and to provide updated data on its compliance with initial evaluation requirements in Special Conditions progress reports. The State submitted the CAP progress reports and Special Conditions progress reports as required. OSEP responded to the State’s CAP, CAP progress reports, and Special Conditions progress reports in separate correspondence.</p>	<p>uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 (i.e., 32 or 34) and demonstrate that those findings were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and each LEA with remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (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 completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In its FFY 2011 Special Conditions progress reports, the State reported data that demonstrate continued noncompliance with the</p>

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>requirement to ensure timely initial evaluations.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in future submissions to OSEP demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c).</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 62.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 30.25%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2009, the State reported it did not make any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2009 for this indicator. The State reported that three LEAs were monitored in FFY 2009; however, the findings of noncompliance were not issued until FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of intervention for five consecutive years based on the State's FFY 2005, FFY 2006, FFY 2007, FFY 2008, and FFY 2009 APRs and noncompliance with IDEA requirements included in the Special Conditions imposed on the State's FFY 2010 grant award and was required to submit a CAP. The State's CAP, submitted on July 27, 2011, includes the information required by OSEP's June 20, 2011 Determination Letter.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2011 Grant Award Letter (Enclosure E, Special Conditions), dated July 1, 2011, required that the State report on its progress toward implementing the CAP and to provide updated data on its compliance with early childhood transition requirements in Special Conditions progress reports. The State submitted the CAP progress reports and Special Conditions progress reports as required. OSEP responded to the State's CAP, CAP progress reports, and Special Conditions progress reports in separate correspondence.</p>	<p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (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 developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction</p>

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In its FFY 2011 Special Conditions progress reports, the State provided data that demonstrate continued noncompliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in future submissions to OSEP demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 6.75%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 112 of 225 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that 53 findings were subsequently corrected by April 17, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP’s FFY 2011 Grant Award Letter (Enclosure E, Special Conditions), dated July 1, 2011, required that the State report on its progress toward implementing the CAP and to provide updated data on its compliance with secondary transition requirements in</p>	<p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR</p>

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>Special Conditions progress reports. The State submitted the CAP progress reports and Special Conditions progress reports as required. OSEP responded to the State's CAP, CAP progress reports, and Special Conditions progress reports in separate correspondence.</p>	<p>§§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (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.</p> <p>The State must also demonstrate in the FFY 2011 APR, that the remaining 60 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2009 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (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 2011</p>

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		<p>APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In its FFY 2011 Special Conditions progress reports, the State provided data that demonstrate continued noncompliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b).</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in future submissions to OSEP demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b).</p>																				
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1084 1583 1521"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">23</td> <td align="center">32</td> <td align="center">25</td> <td align="center">9.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">45</td> <td align="center">54</td> <td align="center">47</td> <td align="center">9.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training</td> <td align="center">55</td> <td align="center">63</td> <td align="center">58</td> <td align="center">8.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	23	32	25	9.00%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	45	54	47	9.00%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training	55	63	58	8.00%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	23	32	25	9.00%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	45	54	47	9.00%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training	55	63	58	8.00%																		

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>program; or competitively employed</p>					
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 81.29%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 98%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 895 of 1,101 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that 72 findings were subsequently corrected by April 17, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of intervention for five consecutive years based on the State's FFY 2005, FFY 2006, FFY 2007, FFY 2008, and FFY 2009 APRs and noncompliance with IDEA requirements included in the Special Conditions imposed on the State's FFY 2010 grant award and was required to submit a CAP. The State's CAP, submitted on July 27, 2011, includes the information required by OSEP's June 20, 2011 Determination Letter.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2011 Grant Award Letter (Enclosure E, Special Conditions), dated July 1, 2011, required that the State report on its progress toward implementing the CAP and to provide updated data on its compliance with the timely correction of noncompliance requirements in Special Conditions progress reports. The State submitted the CAP progress reports and Special Conditions progress reports as required. OSEP responded to the State's CAP, CAP progress reports, and Special Conditions progress reports in separate correspondence.</p>					<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR that the remaining 134 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2010 APR were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and each LEA with remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (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</p>

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>In responding to Indicators 4A, 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In its May 1, 2012 Special Conditions progress report, amended May 15, 2012, the State reported preliminary data on the timely correction of findings the State issued between July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011. These data demonstrate continued noncompliance with the requirement to ensure timely correction of noncompliance in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in future submissions to OSEP demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance</p>

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		identified by the State in accordance with these requirements.
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 85.7%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 98.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 97.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data, demonstrating that it is in compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 34.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 48.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 50-65%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing</p>

District of Columbia Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>94.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 60%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 40-55%. Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the State's FFY 2009 data of 86.03%. OSEP notes that on page 142 of the APR, the State compared its FFY 2010 data to FFY 2008 data, rather than its FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>