

Washington Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 80.1%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 71.4%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 70.0%.</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 appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013, 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 4.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 6.3%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 5.75%.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, 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 10.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 3.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 15.4%.</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 IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, 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 96.3% for reading and 95.0% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 95.8% for reading. The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 95.6% for math. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 95.0%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State did not report publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district level with the same frequency and in</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps														
	<p>The State did not report publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments at the district and school level with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities in regular assessments who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district, and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.</p>	<p>the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the district level. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.</p> <p>Within 90 days of the receipt of this Response Table, the State must provide a Web link that demonstrates it has reported to the public on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must continue to include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f).</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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, 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="548 1421 1583 1490"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Grade</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY</u> <u>2009</u></th> <th><u>FFY</u> <u>2010</u></th> <th><u>FFY</u> <u>2010</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>FFY</u> <u>2009</u>	<u>FFY</u> <u>2010</u>	<u>FFY</u> <u>2010</u>								<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>FFY</u> <u>2009</u>	<u>FFY</u> <u>2010</u>	<u>FFY</u> <u>2010</u>										

Washington 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 alternate academic achievement standards. [Results Indicator]</p>					<u>Data</u>	<u>Data</u>	<u>Target</u>	
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>				
	3-5	36.3%	34.0%	88.1%	29.1%	29.9%	58%	
	6-8	24.4%	23.8%	82.5%	17.7%	18.0%	79.3%	
	10	38.5%	42.3%	87.2%	11.9%	24.0%	81.2%	
	<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>							
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 3.7%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised its calculation methodology. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 8.0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that ten 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 two of 270 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of 30 children with IEPs.</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. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.</p>							<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. The State revised its calculation for this indicator. Therefore, OSEP is not comparing the FFY 2010 data to FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 40 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy,</p>							<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

Washington 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 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>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. The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that 39 of 270 districts did not meet the State-established minimum "n" size requirement of fewer than 30 children with IEPs in the identified racial/ethnic group.</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; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 800 1583 1276"> <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">50.06</td> <td align="center">50.81</td> <td align="center">51.55</td> <td align="center">0.75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">13.57</td> <td align="center">13.47</td> <td align="center">13.56</td> <td align="center">0.10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">1.00</td> <td align="center">.092</td> <td align="center">1.00</td> <td align="center">0.91%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for 5B and 5C, but did not meet its FFY 2010 target for 5A.</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	50.06	50.81	51.55	0.75%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13.57	13.47	13.56	0.10%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.00	.092	1.00	0.91%	<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	50.06	50.81	51.55	0.75%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	13.57	13.47	13.56	0.10%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	1.00	.092	1.00	0.91%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</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</p>																				

Washington Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
<p>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. [Results Indicator; New]</p>		<p>target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																								
<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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 784 1583 1456"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 784 959 883"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="959 784 1163 883"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 784 1373 883"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 784 1583 883"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 883 959 1019">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 883 1163 1019">84.7</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 883 1373 1019">89.0</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 883 1583 1019">83.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1019 959 1187">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 1019 1163 1187">84.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1019 1373 1187">87.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1019 1583 1187">82.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1187 959 1292">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 1187 1163 1292">84.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1187 1373 1292">87.9</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1187 1583 1292">81.0</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1292 959 1391"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th data-bbox="959 1292 1163 1391"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1292 1373 1391"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1292 1583 1391"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1391 959 1456">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="959 1391 1163 1456">50.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1163 1391 1373 1456">53.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1373 1391 1583 1456">50.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	84.7	89.0	83.0	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	84.8	87.9	82.0	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	84.9	87.9	81.0	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills	50.8	53.8	50.0	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance. The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																							
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	84.7	89.0	83.0																							
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	84.8	87.9	82.0																							
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	84.9	87.9	81.0																							
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																							
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills	50.8	53.8	50.0																							

Washington Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	(including social relationships) (%)				
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	51.8	55.2	51.0	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	65.7	68.0	65.0	
	These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.				
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]	The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 19.9%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 19.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 28%. In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.				OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%. The State reported that 42 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that one district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification. The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.” The State reported that 60 of 267 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity category.				OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2011 APR demonstrating compliance. 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 2010 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011

Washington 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, that the district identified in FFY 2010 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services 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 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 Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (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</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.
<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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 81 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that one district was 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 165 of 267 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students with disabilities in each race/ethnicity category.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2011 APR, demonstrating compliance.</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 2010 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the district identified in FFY 2010 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 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;</p>

Washington 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 (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>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98.9%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 40 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). 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</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (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>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.1%. The State's FFY 2009 data were 98.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 12 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100%</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 §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 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>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 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>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 96.6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 83.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 24 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). 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 §§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 APR, the State must describe the</p>

Washington 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 actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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 other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 634 1583 1175"> <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">25.1</td> <td align="center">25.5</td> <td align="center">25.5</td> <td align="center">0.40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">48.7</td> <td align="center">46.3</td> <td align="center">49.0</td> <td align="center">-2.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">66.9</td> <td align="center">66.2</td> <td align="center">68.0</td> <td align="center">-0.70%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 14A and slippage for 14B and 14C from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 target for 14A, but did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for 14B and 14C.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	25.1	25.5	25.5	0.40%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	48.7	46.3	49.0	-2.30%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	66.9	66.2	68.0	-0.70%	<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. % Enrolled in higher education	25.1	25.5	25.5	0.40%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	48.7	46.3	49.0	-2.30%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	66.9	66.2	68.0	-0.70%																		
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints,</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting</p>																				

Washington Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 172 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009.</p> <p>In reporting in the FFY 2011 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 3C, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		this table under those indicators.
<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 remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. 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 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. 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 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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 22.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 38.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 25%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

Washington Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Resolution data until July 2012.	
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are, as of January 31, 2012, 77.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 83.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 89%. 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>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 2009 reported data for this indicator are 97.73%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 97.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary. In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>