# Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

**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: Preschool Outcomes**

**Indicator 7:** Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

**Measurement:**

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level

comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d +e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

**Data Collection System**

Since 2001, the Rhode Island Department of Education (Early Childhood), in partnership with the Department of Human Services (Child Care Office), has provided professional development to more than 800 early care and education providers, including preschool special education teachers, on implementing a system of assessment a) linked with the Rhode Island Early Learning Standards and b) supported by research in the early childhood field regarding appropriate methods of assessing child progress. This system of authentic assessment is comprised of developmentally appropriate tools and strategies including; observation in the child's natural environment, collection of student work, and input from the student's family.

To meet the Preschool Outcomes reporting requirement and to align that measurement of young children's development with the assessment practices described above, the Department of Education conducted an exhaustive search of early childhood outcome-based measures and determined the research-driven, curriculum-based measure most aligned with the state's early learning standards, while also meeting federal data collection and reporting requirements, to be the Creative Curriculum On-Line Assessment System. This assessment system is based on a reliable and valid instrument, *The Developmental Continuum for Ages 3-5,* which meets all of the assessment standards of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and the National Association of State Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education (NASECS/SDE). Dr. Richard Lambert, of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, conducted reliability and validity tests of the *Developmental Continuum for Ages 3-5* on a sample of over 1,500 low-income children. He concluded that the *Developmental Continuum* has adequate assessment properties. The Creative Curriculum system uses the COSF categories six and seven as the "comparable to same aged peers" threshold. The Early Childhood Outcomes Center guidelines state that children above the 9.68 percentile of functioning for an outcome should be considered comparable. Creative Curriculum uses this threshold as a cutoff for a child to be placed in category 6. Children functioning above the 15$^{th}$ percentile are placed in category 7.

The Creative Curriculum On-Line Assessment System is a web-based system for documenting authentic assessment practices. It operates as follows:

1. The state purchases subscriptions for each identified district and assigns district data administrators.
2. Those administrators then add approved teachers, who in turn create classrooms and add children who meet the criteria of this reporting requirement.
3. Administrators also add Speech and Language Pathologists (SLPs), who are the primary special educators for some children. They also, in turn, create classrooms and add children who meet the criteria of this reporting requirement.
4. After a brief entry period (3-6 weeks), the teachers and SLPs conduct an on-line entry assessment based on observational data, examples of children's work, and parent input that they have been regularly entering into each child's on-line portfolio. This serves as the child's entry assessment.
5. Authentic assessment data is then continually collected and recorded in each child's on-line folder for the remainder of the time the child receives preschool special education services.

   In addition to the entry assessment, teachers and SLPs conduct assessments each December, each June, and upon exit for each child. These multiple assessments, though not required for federal reporting, are used to guide teacher planning and instruction, as well as to provide clear and specific information to families about their child's progress.
6. The Creative Curriculum On-Line Assessment System also includes a data reporting feature that is aligned with the OSEP reporting requirements. This feature organizes the multiple child development objectives assessed by teachers into the three OSEP areas. Each January, the state runs a report using this feature and the system compares the entry and

exit assessment data for children who received more than six moths of service to determine the level of progress of each child.

**Phasing in representative districts**

Given the training requirements and expense of purchasing the on-line subscriptions, the state opted to phase in its data collection by beginning with districts which were representative of the population of children served in the state. Within these districts data was collected on all children with Individual Education Programs who services were provided by the district. Sampling was not used. The discrepancy between the number of children included in the data collection and the annual census count used to identify the representative districts, is likely due to out-of district placements and/or children moving from the district after the June census. Because out-of district placements often include children from multiple districts, the state will include out-of-district placements in the data collection process once all districts have been phased in. This will alleviate confusion in the classroom about who to assess and who is not yet included in the assessment process.

Census data provided by districts in June 2006 was used to identify the initial six districts. In the fall of 2006, the state provided training in authentic assessment and the use of the Creative Curriculum On-Line Assessment System to these first districts. As outlined below in Tables 7A-C, the representative districts included Newport, Coventry, Westerly, Cranston, Smithfield, and Central Falls.

**TABLE 7A**

| Selected Districts | Asian/Pacific Islander | Black (Not Hispanic) | Hispanic | Native American | White (Not Hispanic) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Central Falls | | 10 | 57 | | 14 |
| Coventry | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 71 |
| Cranston | 5 | 13 | 18 | | 162 |
| Newport | | 9 | 14 | | 50 |
| Smithfield | | | | | 42 |
| Westerly | 2 | | 2 | | 41 |

**TABLE 7B**

| Total Child Count | Asian/Pacific Islander | Black (Not Hispanic) | Hispanic | Native American | White (Not Hispanic) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SELECTED DISTRICTS | 8 | 32 | 92 | 1 | 380 |
| STATE | 41 | 169 | 438 | 26 | 2127 |

**TABLE 7C**

| % of population | Asian/Pacific Islander | Black (Not Hispanic) | Hispanic | Native American | White (Not Hispanic) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SELECTED DISTRICTS | 1.64% | 6.54% | 18.81% | .20% | 77.71% |
| STATE | 1.46% | 6.03% | 15.64% | .93% | 75.94% |

In 2007, an identical district identification process was conducted using available census data, and an additional eight districts were identified. Tables 7D-F report the data used in this process. Training in the use of authentic assessment and the use of the Creative Curriculum On-Line Assessment System was again provided to both original districts and new districts.

**TABLE 7D**

| Selected Districts | Asian/Pacific Islander | Black (Not Hispanic) | Hispanic | Native American | White (Not Hispanic) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Central Falls | | 10 | 57 | | 14 |
| Coventry | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 71 |
| Cranston | 5 | 13 | 18 | | 162 |
| Newport | | 9 | 14 | | 50 |
| Smithfield | | | | | 42 |
| Westerly | 2 | | 2 | | 41 |
| East Providence | 1 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 99 |
| Foster | | | | | 6 |
| Pawtucket | | 22 | 56 | 1 | 81 |
| West Warwick | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 71 |
| Glocester | | | | 1 | 24 |
| North Smithfield | | | 3 | | 36 |
| Jamestown | | 1 | | | 12 |
| Middletown | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 31 |

**TABLE 7E**

| Total Child Count | Asian/Pacific Islander | Black (Not Hispanic) | Hispanic | Native American | White (Not Hispanic) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SELECTED DISTRICTS | 11 | 68 | 161 | 7 | 740 |
| STATE | 41 | 169 | 438 | 26 | 2127 |

**TABLE 7F**

| % of population | Asian/Pacific Islander | Black (Not Hispanic) | Hispanic | Native American | White (Not Hispanic) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SELECTED DISTRICTS | 1.11% | 6.89% | 16.31% | .71% | 74.97% |
| STATE | 1.46% | 6.03% | 15.64% | .93% | 75.94% |

In 2008, the following districts were added: North Kingstown, Cumberland, Woonsocket, and Portsmouth. Census data was again used to identify these districts and Tables 7G-I illustrate the representativeness of the districts currently participating.

**Table 7G**

| Selected Districts | | Asian/Pacific Islander | Black (Not Hispanic) | Hispanic | Native American | White (Not Hispanic) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Central Falls | 0 | 12 | 72 | 0 | 11 |
| | Coventry | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 99 |
| | Cranston | 11 | 18 | 23 | 0 | 174 |
| | Newport | 0 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 44 |
| | Smithfield | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 46 |
| | Westerly | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 44 |
| | East Providence | 5 | 24 | 11 | 5 | 107 |
| | Foster | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| | Glocester | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| | Pawtucket | 2 | 26 | 52 | 3 | 87 |
| | West Warwick | 3 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 75 |
| | North Smithfield | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 42 |
| | Jamestown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| | Middletown | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 36 |
| | North Kingstown | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 80 |
| | Woonsocket | 9 | 23 | 47 | 3 | 145 |
| | Cumberland | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 93 |
| | Portsmouth | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 36 |
| | Totals | 40 | 120 | 233 | 13 | 1158 |

**Table 7H**

| Total Child Count | Asian/Pacific Islander | Black (Not Hispanic) | Hispanic | Native American | White (Not Hispanic) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SELECTED DISTRICTS | 40 | 120 | 233 | 13 | 1158 |
| STATE | 69 | 215 | 523 | 24 | 2154 |

**Table 7I**

| % of population | Asian/Pacific Islander | Black (Not Hispanic) | Hispanic | Native American | White (Not Hispanic) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SELECTED DISTRICTS | 2.56% | 7.67% | 14.9% | .83% | 74.04% |
| STATE | 2.31% | 7.20% | 17.52% | .80% | 72.16% |

It is anticipated that two of the largest districts in the state, Warwick and Providence, will be phased into the data collection in 2009-2010, followed by the remainder of the state and out-of-district placements in 2010-2011.

**Training and Technical Assistance Supports**

In 2006, the first cohort of six districts received two full days of training from Teaching Strategies, a national publishing company whose Staff Development Network Trainers are the only trainers officially endorsed to conduct training on *The Creative Curriculum*. Trainees from the first six districts included early childhood administrators, preschool special education teachers, and speech and language pathologists. The training primarily focused on honing authentic assessment skills such as observing children's behavior and assessing children's work. Additionally, technical training in using the on-line assessment system was provided. Technical assistance was provided to districts in an ongoing manner throughout the first year of implementation by both state early childhood staff and Creative Curriculum technical assistance services.

In June of 2007, the state convened a meeting with representatives from these districts to review the first year of implementation. Feedback from that meeting was incorporated into the planning for the following year.

Training for the 2007-2008 cohort was very similar to the original training. A full day of training focused on a system of authentic assessment was provided by a RI Early Learning Standards approved trainer. Teaching Strategies again provided training for participants in the technical use of the on-line assessment system. Technical assistance and support was available through state early childhood staff and through Creative Curriculum.

In 2008, the training and technical assistance supports offered to participating districts were refined and expanded. Classroom teachers participated in a full day of training in authentic assessment provided by a Rhode Island Early Learning Standards certified trainer. Teachers also received a half day training in the technical use of the on-line Creative Curriculum system. This training was provided by a Teaching Strategies certified consultant. In early fall of 2008, a focus group of speech and language pathologists was convened to assist the state in understanding data collection issues specific to those practitioners. This information was used to develop the half day training provided to a large group of speech and language pathologists later that fall. Additionally, a half day training in the technical use of the on-line Creative Curriculum system, specific to SLPs, was provided by a Teaching Strategies certified consultant. A similar process was used to develop a half day training for administrators. This training focused on the

administrator's role in supporting the data collection and in ensuring accurate and complete data. Administrators also received a half day training in the technical use of the on-line Creative Curriculum system. Finally, the state has contracted with a local consultant to provide on-site technical assistance in the use of the Creative Curriculum assessment system and additional technical assistance and support was available through state early childhood staff and through Creative Curriculum.

**Quality Assurance and Monitoring Procedures**

The state's efforts to ensure accurate and complete data begins with its selection of a reliable and valid assessment tool, *The Creative Curriculum*, and its use of authentic assessment practices in which data is collected in an ongoing manner in familiar environments while children are engaged in regular activities. Additionally, professional development focused on enhancing the skills and competencies of teachers and SLPs in the areas of child observation and analysis of children's work was provided. Training and technical assistance in recording data in the on-line assessment system was also provided to support accuracy and completeness.

In 2008, the state also provided training and guidance on the monitoring of the data collection process to district administrators. This training included the following areas of focus:

- Ensuring adequate access to computers
- Ensuring adequate time for teachers and SLPs to enter authentic assessment data and to complete required assessments
- Use of monitoring reports available within the Creative Curriculum system (e.g. administrators can run reports which demonstrate the number of data entries teachers have completed)
- Professional development supports
- Use of teams to make entry and exit determinations

Going forward, the state has identified to following areas for further research and development to support the accuracy and completeness of the outcome data collection:

- Ensuring the reliability of observers of child behavior
- Supplementing entry and exit assessment decisions with standardized assessment information
- Supporting speech and language pathologists' child assessment practices
- Supporting the use of teams to make entry and exit assessment determinations
- Integrating additional monitoring into state systems (e.g. district application for federal funds and focused monitoring visits)

**Progress Data for FFY 2008 (2007-2008):**

In 2007-2008, 14 districts participated in the data collection for this indicator. The charts below details the progress made by the 188 children who exited preschool special education after receiving at least six months of service in these districts covering the period of 7/1/2007 – 6/30/2008.

**Outcome 1: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

| ECO Recommended Expanded Categories | Number of Children | Percent of Children |
|---|---|---|
| a. children who did not improve functioning | 9 | 5% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 11 | 6% |
| c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 12 | 6% |
| d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 34 | 18% |
| e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 122 | 65% |
| **Totals** | **188** | **100%** |

**Outcome 2: Acquiring and using knowledge and skills**

| ECO Recommended Expanded Categories | Number of Children | Percent of Children |
|---|---|---|
| a. children who did not improve functioning | 8 | 4% |
| b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 14 | 7% |
| c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 17 | 9% |
| d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 24 | 13% |
| e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 125 | 66% |
| **Totals** | **188** | **100%** |

**Outcome 3: Taking appropriate action to meet needs**

| ECO Recommended Expanded Categories | Number of Children | Percent of Children |
|---|---|---|
| a. children who did not improve functioning | 8 | 4% |
| b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 6 | 3% |
| c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 10 | 5% |
| d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 30 | 16% |
| e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 134 | 71% |
| **Totals** | **188** | **100%** |

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

TBD – January 2009

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---|---|
| **2005** (2005-2006) | **State submitted required plan for collecting and reporting child outcome data.** |
| **2006** (2006-2007) | **New Indicator: Status at entry data reported.**<br><br>**Outcome Indicator 1: Positive social and emotional skills**<br>• 52% (170) entered at a typical level of functioning<br>• 48% (154) were not at a typical level of functioning<br><br>**Outcome Indicator 2: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills**<br>• 53% (170) entered at a typical level of functioning<br>• 47% (153) were not at a typical level of functioning<br><br>**Outcome Indicator 3: Use of appropriate behaviors**<br>• 65% (204) entered at a typical level of functioning<br>• 35% (111) were not at a typical level of functioning<br><br>Total number of children = 324 |
| **2007** (2007-2008) | **Progress data:**<br><br>**Outcome 1: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**<br><br>**ECO Recommended Expanded Categories** — **Number of Children** — **Percent of Children**<br>a. children who did not improve functioning — 1 — 1%<br>b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers — 3 — 4%<br>c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it — 4 — 6%<br>d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers — 11 — 16%<br>e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers — 50 — 72%<br>**Totals** — **69** — **100%**<br><br>**Outcome 2: Acquiring and using knowledge and skills**<br><br>**ECO Recommended Expanded Categories** — **Number of Children** — **Percent of Children**<br>a. children who did not improve functioning — 2 — 3%<br>b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers — 3 — 4% |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 6 | 9% |
| | d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 10 | 14% |
| | e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 48 | 70% |
| | **Totals** | **69** | **100%** |

**Outcome 3: Taking appropriate action to meet needs**

| ECO Recommended Expanded Categories | Number of Children | Percent of Children |
|---|---|---|
| a. children who did not improve functioning | 1 | 1% |
| b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1 | 1% |
| c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 3 | 4% |
| d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 8 | 12% |
| e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 56 | 81% |
| **Totals** | **69** | **100%** |

**2008**
**(2008-2009)**

**Outcome 1: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

| ECO Recommended Expanded Categories | Number of Children | Percent of Children |
|---|---|---|
| a. children who did not improve functioning | 9 | 5% |
| b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 11 | 6% |
| c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 12 | 6% |
| d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 34 | 18% |
| e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 122 | 65% |
| **Totals** | **188** | **100%** |

**Outcome 2: Acquiring and using knowledge and skills**

| ECO Recommended Expanded Categories | Number of Children | Percent of Children |
|---|---|---|
| a. children who did not improve functioning | 8 | 4% |
| b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 14 | 7% |
| c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 17 | 9% |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 24 | 13% |
| | e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 125 | 66% |
| | **Totals** | **188** | **100%** |

**Outcome 3: Taking appropriate action to meet needs**

| ECO Recommended Expanded Categories | Number of Children | Percent of Children |
|---|---|---|
| a. children who did not improve functioning | 8 | 4% |
| b. children who improved functioning, but not sufficiently to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 6 | 3% |
| c. children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 10 | 5% |
| d. children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 30 | 16% |
| e. children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 134 | 71% |
| **Totals** | **188** | **100%** |

| | |
|---|---|
| **2009** (2009-2010) | **Progress data to be reported (will be considered baseline data) and targets to be determined.** |
| **2010** (2010-2011) | **Progress data to be reported.** |

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

| Activity | Timelines | Resources |
|---|---|---|
| Improve Training and Technical Support<br><br>Convene an end-of-the-year meeting with current districts to explore successes, challenges, and recommendations for future. | Complete by June 2009 | **RIDE staff** |
| Improve Training and Technical Support | Complete by August | **RIDE staff** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Develop manual which outlines the basic steps and frequently asked questions of outcomes measurement | 2009 | |
| Improve accuracy and completeness of data collection<br><br>Refine training for administrators in interpreting and using Creative Curriculum data, supervising the outcomes data collection, and supporting special educators in observing and documenting children's functioning effectively. | Revise training in July 2009.<br><br>Schedule training sessions for September-October 2009 | **NECTAC, Creative Curriculum, ECO** |
| Improve accuracy and completeness of data collection<br><br>Revise state level monitoring systems to collect and review district level policies and procedures related to outcome measurement | Complete by June 2009 | **RIDE staff** |
| Improve accuracy and completeness of data collection<br><br>Develop guidelines for identifying assessing children whose progress will best be measured using an alternate assessment | Complete by August 2009 | **RIDE staff** |
| Improve observation reliability<br><br>Research methods of implementing reliability training for teachers in child observation to enhance current training plan. | Complete research by August 2009. Revise current training plan as necessary. | **NECTAC, State of NJ, ECO, Creative Curriculum** |
| Improve observation reliability<br><br>Develop training and technical assistance support for speech and language pathologists specific to the area of child assessment | Complete by August 2009 | **RIDE staff** |
| Determine fourth representative cohort to be phased in<br><br>Use eRIDE data system to determine additional districts to be phased in. | Complete by August 2009 | **eRIDE** |
| Send notification letters and provide information session for new districts<br><br>Host information and overview session for new districts to prepare them for fall implementation of assessment system | Complete by September 1, 2009 | **RIDE staff** |
| Design training<br><br>Design training in use of authentic assessment and | Complete by September 1, 2009 | **RIDE staff** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| technical use of the on-line system for all eliglible districts incorporating research on reliability training and feedback from first three cohorts. | | |
| Design training<br><br>Design guidelines and training to support the use of teams to make entry and exit determinations for all children | Complete by September 1, 2009 | **RIDE staff** |