



SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Randy I. Dorn Old Capitol Building · PO BOX 47200 · Olympia, WA 98504-7200 · <http://www.k12.wa.us>

November 1, 2013

Mr. Michael Green
Superintendent
Woodland School District
800 Third Street
Woodland, WA 98674

Dear Mr. Green:

The *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA 2004) requires the U.S. Department of Education to make annual “determinations” as to the overall compliance of each State with the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. States are likewise required to make “determinations” as to the level of overall compliance of each district within the State. The round of determinations issued in the Fall of 2009 **started the official timeline** for the federally-required enforcement actions (described in 34 CFR 300.604 and in the attached *District Determination Summary*). The purpose of this letter is to notify you of the determination made for your district based on performance in the 2012–2013 school year.

The levels of determinations are as follows:

- 1) Meets requirements
- 2) Needs assistance
- 3) Needs intervention
- 4) Needs substantial intervention

Your district received a determination of **meets requirements** (Level 1) for the 2012–2013 school year. Review the enclosed *District Determination Summary* for more information about the areas contributing to this determination for your district. OSPI encourages you to ensure that efforts are geared toward maintaining this level of compliance. Your local ESD, through the Coordinated Services Agreement (CSA) with OSPI, will be providing technical assistance and other support to assist the district in maintaining a Level 1 determination.

The process of making determinations incorporates the following criteria:

- ▶ *Unresolved* special education audit findings
- ▶ Timely correction of non-compliance
- ▶ Timely, reliable, and accurate data
- ▶ Performance on State Performance Plan (SPP) compliance indicators
- ▶ Information from ongoing monitoring activities and other public information related to district compliance with IDEA 2004.

Mr. Michael Green
Page 2
November 1, 2013

We appreciate all of your efforts to provide quality programs for all students, and especially your efforts on behalf of students eligible for special education services. If you have any questions, please call Valerie Arnold at (360) 725-6075 or email Valerie.Arnold@k12.wa.us.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Douglas H. Gill".

Douglas H. Gill, Ed.D., Director
Special Education

DHG: jo

Enclosure: District Determination Summary

cc: Ms. Debbie Kernen, Director, Special Education, Woodland School District
Ms. Mary Mertz, ESD 112, Special Education
File

2012-13 District Determination Summary (issued November 2013)

This template provides a summary of the LEA/ESA's IDEA determination level for the 2012-13 school year. As described in the revised IDEA 2004 regulations (34 CFR §300.600 and 300.602), states must rate all LEAs annually on their performance with implementing the requirements of IDEA. Refer to the "Scoring Rubric for Making Determinations" for information regarding how determination levels were calculated (using federally-mandated criteria). Refer to the "Overview of Technical Assistance and Enforcement Actions for Each Determination Level" for an overview of the actions that may be taken if districts do not meet requirements.

CCDDD: **08404**

District: Woodland

ESD: 112

District Determination Level:

1	Meets Requirements
----------	---------------------------

District Summary:

CRITERIA	DISTRICT RESULTS	(1) MEETS REQUIREMENTS	(2) NEEDS ASSISTANCE	(3) NEEDS INTERVENTION	(4) NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL INTERVENTION
1. Did the LEA/ESA resolve special education audit findings (if any)? <i>[Source - OSPI Audit Resolution]</i>	yes	X			
2. Were all identified issues of non-compliance corrected by the LEA/ESA, including verification and validation by the ESD and OSPI, as soon as possible but no later than one year from identification? <i>[Source - OSPI general supervision, including program reviews, Safety Net, citizen complaints, etc.]</i>	yes	X			
3. Did the LEA/ESA submit timely and accurate data? <i>[Source - District-submitted data reports, see rubric] (Note: This includes information from ongoing monitoring activities & other public information related to district compliance with IDEA 2004.)</i>	100.00%	X			
4.1 Did the LEA/ESA demonstrate substantial compliance (on SPP Indicators 11, 12, and 13)? <i>[Source - District-submitted reports (Ind. 11 and 12 - see rubric); Safety Net &/or monitoring review (Ind. 13)]</i> <i>("n < reqd" means the district did not meet the "n" size for that indicator)</i>	11: 100.00%	X			
	12: 100.00%				
	13: n<reqd				
4.2 Is disproportionate representation (if any) the result of <u>inappropriate identification</u> (Indicators 9 and 10)? <i>[Source - OSPI Monitoring and Program Review]</i>	no	X			
4.3 Is the district's suspension/expulsion data above the Single State Bar, AND is the data the result of non-compliant policies, procedures, or practices (Indicator 4B)? <i>[Source - OSPI Monitoring and Program Review]</i>	no	X			

Washington State Determinations Rubric

CRITERIA	(1) MEETS REQUIREMENTS	(2) NEEDS ASSISTANCE	(3) NEEDS INTERVENTION	(4) NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL INTERVENTION
1. Did the LEA/ESA resolve all special education audit findings (if any)? <i>[Source - OSPI Audit Resolution]</i>	yes		no	
2. Were all identified issues of noncompliance corrected by the LEA/ESA, including verification and validation by the ESD and OSPI, as soon as possible but no later than one year from identification? <i>[Source - OSPI general supervision, including program reviews, Safety Net, citizen complaints, etc.]</i>	yes		no <i>(corrected, but not timely)</i>	no <i>(not timely & uncorrected non-compliance remains)</i>
3. Did the LEA/ESA submit timely and accurate data (Indicator 20)? <i>[Source - District-submitted data reports, see bulleted list below]</i> <i>(Note: This includes information from ongoing monitoring activities & other public information related to district compliance with IDEA 2004.)</i>	90% or higher	75.0% to 89.9%	Below 75%	
4.1 Did the LEA/ESA demonstrate substantial compliance (on SPP Indicators 11, 12, and 13)? <i>[Source - District-submitted reports (Ind. 11/12 - see below), Safety Net &/or monitoring review (Ind. 13)]</i> <i>("n<reqd" = district did not meet the "n" size for that indicator)</i>	90% or higher on all three indicators (&/or "n<reqd")	75.0% to 89.9%	Below 75% <i>(on any of the three indicators)</i>	
4.2 Is disproportionate representation (if any) the result of <u>inappropriate identification</u> (Indicators 9 and 10)? <i>[Source - OSPI Monitoring and Program Review]</i>	no	yes		
4.3 Is the district's suspension/expulsion data above the Single State Bar, AND is the data the result of <u>non-compliant policies, procedures, or practices</u> (Indicator 4B)? <i>[Source - OSPI Monitoring and Program Review]</i>	no	yes		

Required Data Reports (must be both timely and accurate) :
• Special Education Personnel Employed & Needed <i>(Federal 618 requirement, due 12/13/12)</i>
• Federal Child Count/Least Restrictive Environment <i>(Indicators 5, 6, 9, 10, & Federal 618 requirement, due 12/20/12)</i>
• Special Education Students Suspended/Expelled <i>(Indicator 4, Federal 618 requirement, due 7/1/13)</i>
• Child Outcomes Summary Form <i>(Indicator 7, due 7/15/13)</i>
• Timeline for Initial Evaluation <i>(Indicator 11, due 7/15/13)</i>
• Transition from Part C to Part B <i>(Indicator 12, due 7/15/13)</i>
• Post-School Data Survey <i>(Indicator 14, due 11/1/12)</i>
• Information from ongoing monitoring activities and other public information related to district compliance with IDEA 2004.

Overview of Technical Assistance and Enforcement Actions for Each Determination Level

LEVEL	Program Review	Technical Assistance (TA)	Improvement Activities	Federally-mandated Enforcement Action(s)
(1) MEETS REQUIREMENTS (MR)	No changes to program review schedule.	District may receive technical assistance (TA) on general areas of need, if necessary.	District may receive recommendations for improvement in identified area(s) of need, if necessary.	There are no federally-mandated enforcement actions for districts that Meet Requirements.
(2) NEEDS ASSISTANCE (NA)	No changes to program review schedule.	On-site technical assistance from OSPI if district is on the schedule for an on-site program review visit in the year an NA determination was issued. If not visited that year, district may receive technical assistance call and/or resources in area(s) where it did not meet requirements. Sources of technical assistance will include the local ESD, and may include federal resource centers, advice from experts, distinguished professionals, collaboration with colleges/ universities, etc. The district may be required by OSPI to work with a specific entity for technical assistance &/or improvement planning.	District may receive recommendations for improvement in certain areas of need. Informational resources will be made available to districts that are in NA, including electronic resource communities, publications, national informational and technical assistance centers, etc., to assist with improvement activities.	Districts identified in this level for <u>two consecutive years</u> ("NA2") may be required to work with a specific entity for technical assistance, and/or conditions may be imposed on the district's use of IDEA Part B funds. Note: Determinations issued in November 2009 were considered to be year one.
(3) NEEDS INTERVENTION (NI)	District may receive priority for a focused program review. This may result in an on-site visit and/or an in-depth, district-completed self-study.	District will receive recommendations for improvement in any area that was considered NA (in the case there are areas rated as NA). District will receive TA resources for improvement (see TA listed under Needs Assistance above).	District may be required to prepare and implement a plan of improvement and/or corrective action. OSPI will provide advice or assistance in defining strategies toward moving from one status to another. OSPI may partner districts to form mentor relationships for districts in need of intervention.	Districts identified as Needs Intervention for <u>three consecutive years</u> ("NI3") will be required to implement a corrective action plan and/or compliance agreement with specified timelines for correction, and/or further Part B fund payments may be withheld, in whole or in part. 34 CFR 300.604 (b)(2)(v) Note: Determinations issued in November 2009 were considered to be year one.
(4) NEEDS SUBSTANTIAL INTERVENTION (NSI)	District will receive a focused program review of the issues that resulted in this determination. May lead to a comprehensive review of all federal programs, as well as general education.	District will receive recommendations for improvement in any area that was considered NA or NI (in the case there are areas rated as NA or NI apart from the NSI area(s)). District will receive TA resources for improvement (see TA listed under Needs Assistance above).	District will be required to develop and implement corrective action plan. OSPI may partner districts to form mentor relationships for districts in need of substantial intervention.	Districts will be required to implement a corrective action plan and/or compliance agreement. If, <u>at any time</u> , a district is determined to Need Substantial Intervention, further Part B payments will be withheld or recovered, in whole or in part. 34 CFR 300.604 (b)(2)(v) Note: This enforcement action will begin with the determinations issued in November 2009.