Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2007-2008

Overview of the Annual Performance Report (APR):

The Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) first complied and analyzed data for the development of the Annual Performance Report (APR)/State Performance Plan (SPP) utilizing the expertise of internal personnel. A draft along with the data was reviewed with the Rhode Island Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC). RISEAC advises the Commissioner and Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education on matters concerning: (a) the unmet educational needs of children with disabilities; (b) comments publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the State regarding the education of children with disabilities; (c) advises the Rhode Island Department of Education in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary under section 618 of the IDEA; (d) advises the RIDE in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in Federal Monitoring Reports under Part B of the IDEA; and (e) advises the RIDE in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities. Membership of the committee is composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. Parents of children with disabilities birth through 26 maintain the majority of the Committee Membership. The Membership also includes individuals with disabilities, teachers, representatives of institutions of higher education, private schools, charter schools, state and local education officials, administrators of programs for children with disabilities foster care and homelessness, vocational, community or business organizations, juvenile and adult corrections and State Child Serving Agencies. The SEAC reviewed the draft and provided suggestions and input. These were incorporated into the final copy of this document.

Monitoring Priority: Early Childhood Transition

Indicator –#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.

Measurement:

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.

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

Percent = [(c) divided by (a – b - d) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2004	**Target set by the Secretary at 100%** *In 2004, 635 children were referred from Part C. A process by which actual names were then matched with*

(2004-2005)	*RIDE census reports indicated that 564 of those children were eligible for Part B. However, date of initial IEP was not data that the state collected at that time and thus it is not possible to calculate the percent of children referred by Part C and found eligible for Part B who had IEPs developed and implemented by their third birthday.*
2005 (2005-2006) *Progress Data*	**Target set by the Secretary at 100%** *998 children were referred to Part B from Part C* *405 children were found NOT eligible* *328 children had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday* *50 children had delays due to parental failure to provide consent* *[328/998-405-50]100 = 60* ***60% of children referred by Part C and found eligible for Part B had IEPs developed and implemented by their third birthday. Delay factors were reported for some, but not all, children and are as follows:*** *24 children were delayed due to late referral from Early Intervention* *6 children were delayed due to child illness* *72 children were delayed due to their birthday occurring during a period of school closing* *17 children were delayed due to outside evaluations extending beyond the third birthday* *22 children were delayed due to other factors not specified* ***Data collection during this year did not include range of delays.***
2006 (2006-2007) *Progress Data*	**Target set by the Secretary at 100%** *945 children were referred to Part B from Part C* *330 children were found NOT eligible* *430 children had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday* *60 children had delays due to parental failure to provide consent* *[430/945-330-60]100 = 77* ***77% of children referred by Part C and found eligible for Part B had IEPs developed and implemented by their third birthday.*** ***Range of delays is indicated below:***

Range of Delays	>10 days	10-20 days	21-30 days	31-40 days	41-60 days	61 days or more
	61	38	16	10	21	16

2007 (2007-2008) *Progress Data*	**Target set by the Secretary at 100%** *953 children were referred to Part B from Part C* *395 children were found NOT eligible* *456 children had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday* *8 children had delays due to parental failure to provide consent*

[456/(953-395-8)]100=83

83% of children referred by Part C and found eligible for Part B had IEPs developed and implemented by their third birthday.

Range of delays is indicated below:

Range of Delays	>10 days	10-20 days	21-30 days	31-40 days	41-60 days	61 days or more
	73	53	26	11	13	17

Actual Target Data for 2007-2008:

Targets were set by the Secretary at 100%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed <u>and</u> Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2007-2008:

The Department of Education uses the LEA's application for their federal funds, the Consolidated Resource Plan (CRP), to collect data for this indicator. In 2007, an electronic CRP was developed and implemented. It was specifically designed to ensure that complete information regarding the number of children whose transition from Part C to Part B was delayed and the reason for those delays. For example, the system gives an error message when the number of children found eligible for Part B does not equal the number of children who had an IEP in place by their third birthday plus the number of children who were delayed. LEAs also receive an error message if they enter numbers under the delay category "Other", but do not provide an explanation in the corresponding text box. Additionally, the CRP requires the LEA to describe their data collection practices. A review of LEA responses indicates that all LEAs are utilizing a centralized tracking system and are recording information in an ongoing, systematic manner. These methods of data collection and reporting appear to be very accurate based on a comparison of data from the Department of Human Services (DHS), the lead agency for Part C. DHS data indicates that 101 children exited EI without a Part B eligibility determination and developed IEP. Department of Education data indicates that 102 children feel into this category. Finally, the CRP requires the LEA to develop improvement plans based on their transition data. These plans will be reviewed annually and compared with improvement plans from previous years to determine their effectiveness. In 2007-2008, there was one LEA determined to be in need of assistance for the second year. This LEA was notified of its status and an individualized support plan was developed. A review of the current year's CRP indicates that non-compliance has been corrected and appropriate improvement plans have been developed. The remaining LEAs have accounted for all delayed transitions and have developed appropriate improvement plans.

In addition to the use of the CRP data, a data collection page (Section 38, see Appendix) that accompanies the IEP was developed. This data page is completed at the initial IEP meeting and entered into the Department of Education's data collection system, eRIDE, by district census clerks. This system of data collection affords the state an additional assurance of reliability as the page is completed at the child's first IEP meeting by a diverse group which includes the parent. Training in the use of this data collection page was provided in September of 2007. Districts were instructed to begin using the form immediately, but were not required to go back and complete the form for children who transitioned previously. Thus, the eRIDE data was not used to determine the state's performance on this indicator for this year, but was compared to the district reported data in the CRP. Going forward, the state will use both forms of data collection to illustrate the district's performance related to the transition of children from Part C.

The state has continued to work toward a data collection effort focused on collaborating with the Department of Human Services to issue a unique student identifier (SASID) to all children enrolled in

Early Intervention. An interagency agreement signed by the Commissioner of Education and Director of the Department of Human Services is currently being reviewed and revised to enable Part C to assign children a unique identifier that will be used by both Part C and Part B. This identifier will allow the Department of Education to unequivocally determine whether children who were referred from Early Intervention and were determined to be eligible for special education services, had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. The current eRIDE data system collects of information on when children's services begin. With a shared unique identifier, the state will be able to compare the information provided by Part C, the date of birth, and the initial date of the child's IEP. Additional revisions to the eRIDE system will allow the state to require identification of delay factors. The state sees this as the most reliable method of collecting the data required for this indicator. This work has been delayed due to fiscal constraints, as well as, workforce capacity issues at the Department of Human Services (DHS). The fiscal constraints are related to the cost of building a new field for the SASID within the Part C data collection system. The time required to regularly assign new Part C students a SASID is the primary workforce capacity issue.

The state's efforts to collect more accurate data for this indicator are reflected in the improvement from 77% (2006-2007) to 83% (2007-2008) of children referred from Part C and who are eligible for Part B, having an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. Ninety-four unacceptable delay factors were indentified. In the category of "Other", scheduling difficulties related to parental availability for meetings accounted for the majority of the delays (15%). The following table delineates delay factors not allowed by OSEP:

Number of children delayed	Reason for delay
60	Late referral from Early Intervention
5	Child illness
29	Other

The majority of those delay factors were short-term delays, as indicated below:

Range of Delays	>10 days	10-20 days	21-30 days	31-40 days	41-60 days	61 days or more
	73	53	26	11	13	17

In the 2007-2008 data collection, the information collected specific to the range of time children were delayed included all delay factors (e.g. children who turned three during a period of school closing, but who had an IEP developed before their third birthday or parental refusal to provide consent), but did not link time of delay with delay factor. Those children are included in the range of delay table above and arguably account for most of the longer periods of delay.

Revisions, <u>with Justification</u>, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2007-2008:

The proposed improvement target for 2008-2009 is set at 100% of children referred from Part C and found eligible for Part B will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.
In continued collaboration with stakeholders, activities, timelines, and resources will be identified to improve state performance on this indicator and to reach the levels of performance for delineated targets.

Improvement Activity	Timelines	Resources

RIDE will review 2007-2008 Part B and Part C data with Part C representatives to assess comparability of the separate data collection systems and to identify patterns specific to individual delay factors.	March 2009	RI Department of Education, Office for Diverse Learners personnel (ODL, Part B) and the Department of Human Service (DHS, Part C) and other collaborative partnerships with stakeholders
Data will be delineated by district and early intervention provider. RIDE will review identified patterns of delayed transitions with appropriate LEAs to elicit more detailed information.	April 2009	RI Department of Education, Office for Diverse Learners personnel (ODL, Part B) and the Department of Human Service (DHS, Part C) and LEA representatives
Targeted improvement plans will be developed and implemented in districts and/or early intervention programs that data indicates are performing below the standard.	May 2009 and onward	RI Department of Education, Office for Diverse Learners personnel (ODL, Part B) and the Department of Human Service (DHS, Part C) and other collaborative partnerships with stakeholders
RIDE will provide training and technical assistance to ensure that LEAs are completing data collection forms and tables in accordance with OSEP guidance	September 2009	RI Department of Education, Office for Diverse Learners personnel (ODL, Part B)
RIDE will continue to coordinate the use of a shared student identifier to be used by both RIDE and the Department of Human Services (DHS), which oversees IDEA Part C.	2009-2010 and onward	RI Department of Education, Office for Diverse Learners personnel (ODL, Part B) and the Department of Human Service (DHS, Part C) and other collaborative partnerships with stakeholders
Continued joint professional development will be provided on how to collect the data from LEAs and early intervention programs based on any refinements to the data collection system.	2009-2010 and onward	RI Department of Education, Office for Diverse Learners personnel (ODL, Part B) and the Department of Human Service (DHS, Part C) and other collaborative partnerships with

		stakeholders