

RI Part B

FFY2014 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Rhode Island continues to work diligently to address improving outcomes for students with disabilities. The following is an executive summary for each indicator of the State Performance Plan/ annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).

Indicator 1: Although the target was not met, the FFY 2014 four year graduation rate increased approximately .5 % with no slippage. Because our students benefit from staying in school an additional year, we also look at the five year graduation rate which exceeded 2% over the FFY 2013.

Indicator 2: FFY 2014 exceeded the target by nearly 6 % and dropped 1.5% from FFY 2013.

Indicator 3: In school year 2014 – 2015 Rhode Island changed from the NECAP (New England Common Assessment Program) to the PARCC (Partnership for Assessment Readiness of College and Careers) assessment for all students. A new assessment was also implemented for those students participating in alternate assessment as well. Students in grades 3 through 8 are assessed in math and R/LA. Students in grades 9 and 10 are assessed in R/LA. High school students, grades 9, and 10, are tested in geometry or algebra, reported as Math. Only students participating in alternate assessment are tested in grade 11.

RIDE also changed the definition of the group called “high school”. Previously, grade 11 NECAP was reported for all students with disabilities; in 2014-15, PARCC testing included students in 9th and 10th grades. For this reason, the reporting group has been changed.

Participation in the new test was lower than in previous years.

This is a base year; these are the results from an assessment based on a new set of standards. In addition, students, teachers and test administrators used an online testing environment for the first time.

The differential effect of the PARCC test on students with disabilities is unknown at this point.

Indicator 4: There were no districts with a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, nor were there any districts with a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.

Indicator 5: All results for Indicator #5, Least Restrictive Environment met anticipated targets.

Indicator 6: Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

1. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
2. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

The percentage of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in a regular early childhood program increased from 42.26% in FFY 2013 to 44.97% in FFY 2014. In addition, the percentage of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility decreased from 20.17% in FFY 2013 to 18.83% in FFY 2014

Indicator 7: Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

1. A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
2. B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
3. C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Although all of the targets were not met in the FFY 2014 data, Rhode Island did make growth and meet the target for summary statement 1 of outcome A (positive social-emotional skills). Given concerns with the validity of our data and in an effort to identify the most valid process for identifying Child Outcomes, RIDE has decided to transition to the COS process during the 2015-2016 school year.

Indicator 8: The parent survey report presents findings of a survey conducted by the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) to address Indicator #8, the, “percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.”

The survey administered by RIDE consisted of a 25-item rating scale, the Schools’ Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale (SEPPS), developed and validated by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring. A total of 23,127 surveys were sent to parents in 59 school districts; 1,091 surveys were undeliverable.

Overall, 2,660 completed surveys were submitted, for a return rate of 12.1%. The number of respondent parents who reported schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities was 1,064. The percent of parents who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement, calculated as the percentage of respondents with a SEPPS measure at or above the adopted standard of 600 is 40%. The FFY 2014 target goal was 41% resulting in a slippage of 1%.

Indicator 9: As a result of its extensive verification process, the State determined that 1 of the 16 districts had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification. File reviews did yield child specific findings of noncompliance. All previous FFY2013 findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected.

Indicator 10: As a result of its extensive verification process, the State determined that 0 of the 28 districts had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification. File reviews did not yield child specific findings of noncompliance. All previous FFY2013 findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected.

Indicator 11: For the FFY2014 (school year 2014-2015) Indicator 11 Child Find rate of compliance for this Indicator was 99.56% an increase of .12% from the prior school year when the compliance rate was 99.44%. Rhode Island’s number of noncompliance decreased from 8 in FFY2013 to 5 for FFY2014. Overall, Rhode Island continues to move towards its benchmark of 100% compliance on this Indicator.

Indicator 12: Compliance indicator: 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.(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B)).

Although Rhode Island did not meet 100% compliance, the FFY 2014 data once again represents an increase in the compliance rate. The percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who were found eligible for Part B, and who had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays increased from 98.41% in FFY 2013 to 98.94% in FFY 2014.

Indicator 13: Once again, RI approaches 100% with only one non-compliant IEP (99.98 %) in 2014 continuing to improve over the 98.21% baseline established in FFY 2009. Indicator 13 continues to demonstrate solid and continuous improvement in both compliance and quality.

Indicator 14: Enrollment in higher education (Measure A) decreased from FFY 2013 but correspondingly Measure B increased by approximately 1%. The total engagement rate (Measure C) target was exceeded by 1.7%, a 3% increase over FFY 2013.

Indicator 15: The resolution sessions indicator is the percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (R.S.A.). In the FFY 2014 there were 15 resolution sessions in which 9 of those resolution sessions were resolved through settlement agreements. The FFY 2014 target was 52% and the FFY 2014 actual data percentage is 60% thus meeting target as well as exceeding the FFY 2013 data of 57.14%.

Indicator 16: The mediation indicator is the percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. In FFY 2014 the Rhode Island Department of Education received 57 total requests for mediation. Out of the 57 requests for mediation, 42 mediation meetings were held. Out of those 42 mediation meetings, 34 resulted in agreements, one being related to a due process complaint. The FFY 2014 target was 87%. The FFY 2014 actual data percentage was 80.95% resulting in an overall slippage of 6.05%.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

The General Supervision System in Rhode Island is managed by the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE), Office of Student, Community & Academic Supports (OSCAS) as the State Education Agency (SEA) and is composed of three primary operations:

- Performance monitoring through the LEA Consolidated Resource Plan Application
- Tiered Monitoring: School Support System (SSS)
- Dispute Resolution Center.

Consolidated Resource Plan

Each LEA annually submits for approval an application for federal program formula funds. This application is composed of the Title I, Title II, Title III, IDEA and recently added this year, Perkins Grant funds. The application involves performance and compliance measures for all programs and budgets which are reviewed and approved by the SEA. The IDEA portion of this application includes a number of the SPP/APR

indicators where districts report, review and provide performance and/or compliances plans (as necessary). This review and approval process serves as the first line of IDEA accountability. The consolidated application is the first level of review of LEAs policies, performance and accountability (program and fiscal) for IDEA implementation and general supervision in Rhode Island. Issues identified in the CRP are reviewed with the LEA and compliance solutions are sought before approval of the plan is awarded. Because this is an annual process, the SEA has regular communication with each LEA and the OSCAS IDEA staff has a deep understanding of each LEA for which they are assigned.

Tiered Monitoring: School Support System (SSS)

Rhode Island's Collaborative System of Tiered Monitoring: School Support System (SSS) incorporates a variety of instruments and procedures that are utilized to ensure compliance with state and federal laws and regulations. The process is an ongoing focused cycle for LEAs and requires LEA self-assessment, data analysis, interviews, surveys and on-site visits. Combined with the Consolidated Resource Plan review and other SEA level reviews of data and district performance, the Tiered Monitoring system provides an important accountability element which supports the continuous improvement philosophy of RIDE with each LEA. As a result, LEAs are in some level of monitoring continuously. On-site review typically occurs once every five years although if performance data indicate a need for more frequent on-site review, RIDE will initiate such a review.

Upon completion of on-site review, RIDE will develop a corrective action/support plan that is directed at increasing student performance founded on proven practice. In addition, the support plan addressed findings of general supervision and appropriate corrective actions. The data sources utilized in the continuous review process are utilized for subsequent verification of compliance and improved LEA performance. Further information about Rhode Island's Collaborative System of Tiered Monitoring: School Support System is available at;

<http://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/SchoolSupportSystem.aspx>. In addition, reports for recent on-site visits and action/support plans are available for public review.

Dispute Resolution Center

The Office of Community Academic and Students Supports (OSCAS) utilizes a number of formal and informal dispute resolution options that emphasizes collaborative relationships between families and schools in the interest of productive, shared decision-making that ensures FAPE for every child with a disability. A preventive approach, the system promotes an understanding that relationships and trust are the core of partnership; that conflict is not a necessary result of difference; and that differences in perspective and opinion among parents and professionals, within and beyond the IEP process, are not only expected but valuable when productively managed.

OSCAS is committed to accurately overseeing and reporting on the local resolution process. At the same time, to reduce the need to rely on due process to manage differences and ensure FAPE, the OSCAS addresses dispute resolution within the context of continuous improvement. Rhode Island's model for continuous improvement and operation of an effective, high quality system of dispute resolution and due process in special education, the centerpiece of which is family-school partnership for FAPE.

OSCAS operates a Special Education Call Center which has handled as many as 200 calls in one month to assist parents and school districts in resolving their differences amicably. However, there are times when issues may not be resolved and OSCAS offers and supports parents and districts in accessing the full array of dispute resolution options. Data collected from the Call Center and through other dispute options informs the formal communication and technical assistance to LEAs for meeting the general supervision requirements. More information about the Rhode Island dispute resolution options may be found at: <http://www.ride.ri.gov/StudentsFamilies/SpecialEducation/WhenSchoolsandFamiliesDoNotAgree.aspx>.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

The RI Department of Education, Office of Student, Community & Academic Supports (OSCAS) manages all technical assistance activities related to the implementation of IDEA Part B in Rhode Island. OSCAS defines technical assistance as the support necessary to effectively and efficiently implement the requirements of Part B. This support is provided to internal state departments, local education agencies, professional organizations, community based organizations, The Parent Training and Information Center, other parent and disability organizations and individuals including professionals and parents.

Some of the technical assistance activities are provided directly by OSCAS staff in particular areas of need and/or through the development of contracts with vendors for the delivery of specific technical assistance activities. In addition, the OSCAS team works closely with parent, advocacy, disability specific and professional organizations to leverage the hard work of these organizations in developing unifying communication to reduce redundancies and improve consistency of understanding.

Examples of direct technical assistance provided by OSCAS staff includes:

- Direct assistance with LEAs to meet the requirements under Part B which includes:
 - Addressing performance issues in an LEAs SPP indicators.
 - Addressing compliance and subsequent verification of compliance issues.
 - Assistance in communicating with parents and minimizing the need for formal dispute resolution options.
 - Meeting reporting requirements for data and fiscal reporting.
 - Submitting applications for IDEA part B funds and ensuring the appropriate use of the funds in including early intervening services.
- Partnerships with parent and advocacy organizations:
 - Cosponsoring events and providing assistance with specific request for clarification of regulations and effective strategies to support students with disabilities.
 - Participating on work groups to develop initiatives and grant applications.
 - OSCAS staff serve on over 40 advisory committees statewide.
- Organizational support and communication (correspondence, web site support, etc.) for:
 - RI State Special Education Advisory Committee (state advisory panel)
 - RI Vision Services Advisory Board

Each member of the OSCAS IDEA team (currently eight full time employees) is assigned to a number of LEAs as the primary contact for technical assistance. Each team member has an area(s) to which they are assigned based on a specific function in Part B. A complete list of OSCAS IDEA Staff assignments is attached.

In addition to the OSCAS Staff engaged in technical assistance, OSCAS maintains a number of contracts which deliver technical assistance and training statewide. Attached is a table which lists the major training and technical assistance activities contracted by OSCAS for the delivery of technical assistance and training for the OSCAS community of customers.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

The Rhode Island Department of Education Strategic Plan calls for every student to have highly effective teacher in their classroom and every school to have highly effective leaders & support professionals. To this end, RIDE maintains a comprehensive professional development system for all educators. Information about current professional development may be viewed at the RIDE web site at: <http://www.ride.ri.gov/TeachersAdministrators/ProfessionalDevelopment.aspx>.

Rhode Island has enjoyed a sufficient supply of qualified teachers for many years. There are currently no shortages in certified personnel in general education and special education. The areas where LEAs currently face the greatest strain in recruiting include math and science content teachers, ELL teachers and occasionally teachers for low incidence disability populations. However, RI has not faced a substantial shortage in special education since 2004-2005 with a shortage of Teachers of the Visually Impaired. In 2005, RIDE launched an aggressive effort to recruit and certify an adequate number of TVIs and has since met all current personnel demands for the blind and low vision population.

Obviously, the building of professional capacity does not end with teachers being appropriately certified. Ongoing professional development is a priority of the agency and of the OSCAS team. Recent offerings have focused on the development of Common Core State Standards (CCSS) with specific training in the understanding of CCSS, scaffolding of the standards, recent work with the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII), of which Rhode island was one of five intensive technical assistance states and the integration of measurable CCSS goals into the IEP. In addition, RIDE, in partnership with TechACCESS of RI and the Shrelock Center at RI College, developed a new training for teachers and related service personnel to assess student's ability to access digital learning through feature matching. This training has become very popular as the state moves toward blended learning and the use of online state assessments (PARCC).

OSCAS also provided a number of direct training activities through the contracts described in the Technical Assistance section of the APR described in the previous section.

Additional information on the RI educator certification requirements may be found on the RIDE web site at: <http://www.ride.ri.gov/TeachersAdministrators/EducatorCertification.aspx>.

Attachments			
File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	
No APR attachments found.			

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) first compiled and analyzed data for the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) utilizing the expertise of internal personnel. A draft along with the data was reviewed with the Rhode Island Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC). RISEAC (a) advises the Commissioner and Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education on matters concerning 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 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 reviews the draft and provides suggestions and input. These are considered and, as appropriate, incorporated into the final copy of the SPP. Progress and slippage in meeting the targets in the SPP are discussed in detail regarding each indicator submitted to OSEP. All indicators are publicly available on the RIDE website at the following link:

<http://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx>

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Each year RIDE publicly reports per 34 CFR 300.602(b)(1)(i)(A). Per OSEP, this typically occurs the first week of June. The link for accessing Rhode Island's public reporting information, which details the performance of each LEA on the targets in the SPP is as follows:

<http://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx>

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2013 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

Each year RIDE publicly reports per 34 CFR 300.602(b)(1)(i)(A). Per OSEP, this typically occurs the first week of June. The link for accessing Rhode Island's public reporting information, which details the performance of each LEA on the targets in the SPP is as follows:

<http://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx>

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			73.89%	35.00%	56.90%	57.90%	58.90%	59.90%	60.90%	61.90%
Data		73.46%	55.90%	55.90%	58.70%	58.70%	57.20%	58.10%	58.50%	59.22%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	62.90%	63.90%	64.90%	65.90%	66.90%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	1,494	
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	2,491	null
SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	12/2/2015	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	59.98%	Calculate <input type="checkbox"/>

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data
1,494	2,491	59.22%	62.90%	59.98%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

Graduating with a Regular High School Diploma in Rhode Island

The awarding of high school diplomas in Rhode Island is a Local Education Agency (LEA) decision based on the authority granted by the Rhode Island Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education. In the 2007-08 school year, the Rhode Island High School Diploma System (described below) reached full implementation. Special education students meet the same proficiency requirements under the Rhode Island Diploma System as all students. Rhode Island does not offer a differentiated diploma system.

Rhode Island High School Reform

The Rhode Island Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education approved high school regulations in January, 2003, and revised the regulations in September, 2008 and May 2011 (see: <http://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Diploma-System/Guidance-Final-2011.pdf>). The regulations address the areas of literacy, personalization and graduation by proficiency. The regulations intend to improve the performance of high schools, increase graduation rates, improve post graduation outcomes and supports to students. A significant effect of the regulations has been the development of the Rhode Island Diploma System.

The Rhode Island Diploma System

Beginning with the Class of 2008, students will be required to demonstrate academic proficiency based on the Rhode Island Grade Level/Grade Span Expectations (GSE/GLEs), apply knowledge and skills in real world settings, and successfully complete a variety of challenging assessments in order to earn a high school diploma. In September 2008, the RI Board of Regents approved revised high school regulations which extend the 2003 regulations and added provisions for middle schools. Below are the 2003 requirements with the 2008 revisions noted:

- Completion of a minimum of 20 Carnegie units.
- Base up to 10% (revised to 33 1/3% by 2014) of the graduation decision on student performance on the State Assessment. As of June 2014, this requirement has been delayed until 2017.
- Completion of a performance based requirement such as end of course exam, senior project, digital portfolio, Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) or similar requirement that demonstrates proficiency on the Rhode Island Grade Level/Grade Span Expectations (GSE/GLEs) and applied learning standards.

Local Education Agencies were awarded a designation of "approval withheld" (showing little or no evidence of implementation of the regulations) or "preliminary approval" (showing signs of implementation of the high school regulations) based on the Commissioners Review in January 2008. Each high school received guidance from RIDE in January 2009 on the next review process which will position schools to receive "full approval" by 2010. On site reviews of each high school began in the fall of 2009. The RI Board of Regents had established a 2014 deadline for all school to reach "full approval" status or the Regents may deny the LEA the authority to award high school diplomas.

Implementation of this review process is leading all high schools to aggressively implement the requirements of the high school regulations. The following areas are the focus of the Commissioners review process:

- Access/Opportunity – Evidence that ensures all students have a legitimate and fair opportunity to meet the RI Grade Level/Grade Span Expectations. All students have genuine access to rigorous programs that support their individual learning plans. Students have access to multiple pathways through high school to achieve the GSE/GLE's.
- Alignment – Evidence that the LEA has aligned curriculum with the RI GLE/GSE's and national content standards. The LEA has established evidence of expectations for student learning, employs applied learning across content areas and utilizes a variety of assessments.
- Sufficiency – Evidence that the LEA has established a method for specifying the numbers and types of assessment evidence for determining student proficiency.
- Fairness – Evidence that the LEA has provided valid opportunities for all students, including any sub groups of students, to demonstrate what they know. The LEA has implemented universally designed methods and instruments and has reviewed assessments for bias. Assessment results are communicated to students and families in a clear and timely manner and there is an open appeals

Source: Rhode Island Accountability Technical Bulletin, 2010

Implications for the Special Education Graduation Rate

The implications of the Rhode Island Diploma system present a major opportunity for ensuring all students achieve high expectations. By providing students multiple methods to meeting an ELA's proficiency requirements. (Course credits, performance on state assessment, comprehensive course assessments, portfolio, senior project, CIM, etc.), it is anticipated that more students will achieve proficiency and graduate with a high-school diploma ready for entry into post-secondary education and training. The implementation of the Rhode Island Diploma system has defined a clear set of expectations for all students in the state. The process has encouraged LEAs to carefully examine the value of their current diploma and examine the needs of students not meeting proficiency expectations. The request for technical assistance from the districts for universal design, collaborative teaching, literacy interventions and other practices that would benefit special education students continues to increase with the implementation of the RI Diploma System.

The specific impact on graduation rates for students in special education is difficult to predict; however, many high schools have begun rigorous examination of data through the Commissioner's Review process, which has informed them of the progress of special education students and access to the general education curriculum. It is anticipated that the work of the high schools in meeting the RI Diploma System requirements and the RI High School Regulations will improve access for students in special education to the general education curriculum. Informal observation from the RIDE School Support Visit (monitoring system) has indicated an increased awareness of the gaps in performance of students in special education and districts intentionally aligning resources to address performance gaps.

Reliability of the Graduation/Dropout Data

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The Rhode Island Department of Education moved to the cohort measurement formula described in the measurement section in 2007. With the implementation of this system which verifies each student's reported status through the student's universal identifier, RIDE obtained a more accurate picture of the graduation and dropout rates for youth in special education. RIDE first reported graduation and dropout rates based on the cohort formula in the April 2008 revision. The baseline graduation rate of 55.9% for students in special education was established and the rigorous and measurable targets (below) were calibrated.

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Please refer to **Indicator 1 supporting tables** document for measurement specification.

Please refer to **Indicator 1 supporting tables** document in conjunction with the discussion below

Baseline for the percent of students in special education graduating with a regular high school diploma as established in the 2007 APR at 55.9%.

The target graduation rate for 2013-14 school year is 62.9. Using the 4 year cohort, the target was not met. The graduation rate for special education students has been improving at the rate of approximately .7% per year. In 2013-14, the cohort size increased by 7; the number of graduating students increased by 23. Both the number and percentage of students retained increased. Correspondingly the count of dropouts has decreased meeting the target for FFY 2014.

However, using the 5 year cohort, at a 67.9% graduation rate, Rhode Island exceeds the target by five percentage points. Given the opportunity of a fifth year, an additional 198 students, 8% of the cohort, were able to complete graduation requirements. The corresponding increase in graduation rate for the entire population is 3.8%, an additional 435 students. The IEP population, approximately 21.6% of the total population, is responsible for 45.5% of the fifth year graduates. Students with IEPs benefit greatly from an additional year of instruction.

The most significant finding is that a larger percentage of students, both those with IEPs and all student populations, are being retained in school. In particular, for students with IEPs, retention in school (increased approximately 4% from 12.9% in 2008-9 to 21% in 2013-14) translates to stronger likelihood of graduation in the fifth year.

The Rhode Island High School regulations speak to the need for schools to create alternative pathways for students to achieve proficiency in the RI High School Diploma System even if the student's pathway will require the student to remain enrolled beyond four years of high school. In special education, this continues to result in a variety of transition programs at the regional and local levels focused on students who require more than four years of high school to achieve proficiency and graduate to self-sufficiency. The increase of students in special education remaining enrolled beyond four years could be a result of the alternative pathway programming.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			26.11%	25.11%	26.70%	25.70%	24.70%	23.70%	23.70%	22.70%
Data		27.11%	27.70%	25.40%	25.40%	22.80%	21.90%	22.00%	20.10%	17.15%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	21.70%	20.70%	19.70%	18.70%	17.70%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the 4 year cohort who exited special education by dropping out (dropouts - returned dropouts)	Number of youth in the adjusted 4 year cohort (# of first time entering 9th graders - transfers out + transfers in)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
392	2,491	17.15%	21.70%	15.74%

Use a different calculation methodology

Change numerator description in data table

Change denominator description in data table

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Measurement: States must report using the dropout data used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

Beginning in 2007 Rhode Island integrated the data collection for graduation and dropout rates for special education students with the state's student information system. Rhode Island's student information system includes a unique state assigned student identifier (SASID) for every student in the state. The integration of the special education graduation and dropout data collection system into the Rhode Island student information system has allowed the state to generate a valid and reliable picture of the graduation and dropout situation. The cohort formula (five year graduation rate) utilized for graduation rate is:

$$\text{Annual Dropout Rate} = \frac{(\text{Dropouts-Returned Dropouts})}{(\text{Number of first time entering 9}^{\text{th}} \text{ graders)- transfers out + transfers in}} \times 100$$

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

No longer required due to passage of ESSA.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Data			97.40%			98.30%	98.30%	98.40%	98.40%	98.14%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Data			97.70%			99.00%	99.20%	98.60%	98.70%	98.46%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Data			98.00%			98.80%	98.70%	98.80%	98.80%	99.28%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Data			97.20%			98.90%	99.00%	98.50%	99.10%	99.30%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Data			97.30%			98.60%	98.40%	98.10%	98.80%	98.67%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Data			96.90%			97.90%	97.50%	97.70%	97.90%	98.10%
	G Grade 11	2005	Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Data			96.20%			94.50%	92.70%	93.00%	90.80%	92.55%
Math	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Data			97.50%			98.10%	98.30%	98.50%	98.40%	98.01%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Data			98.80%			98.90%	98.20%	98.80%	98.70%	98.46%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Data			98.20%			98.70%	98.50%	98.90%	98.80%	99.28%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Data			97.30%			98.70%	99.00%	98.40%	99.10%	99.17%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Data			97.20%			98.50%	98.30%	98.20%	98.80%	98.74%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Data			96.80%			97.60%	97.40%	97.50%	97.90%	97.78%
	G Grade 11	2005	Target ≥			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Data			95.70%			93.30%	92.60%	93.10%	90.80%	94.18%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	B ≥ Grade 4	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	C ≥ Grade 5	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	D ≥ Grade 6	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	E ≥ Grade 7	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	F ≥ Grade 8	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	G ≥ HS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	B ≥ Grade 4	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	C ≥ Grade 5	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	D ≥ Grade 6	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	E ≥ Grade 7	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	F ≥ Grade 8	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	G ≥ HS	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Grade 3	1,861	1,682	98.14%	100%	90.38%
B Grade 4	1,734	1,561	98.46%	100%	90.02%
C Grade 5	1,783	1,623	99.28%	100%	91.03%
D Grade 6	1,823	1,579	99.30%	100%	86.62%
E Grade 7	1,761	1,522	98.67%	100%	86.43%

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
F Grade 8	1,884	1,568	98.10%	100%	83.23%
G Grade 11	3,459	2,437	92.55%	100%	70.45%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

Please see attached document from the Rhode Island Commissioner Ken Wagner regarding RIDE's response to participation rates

Explanation of Group B Slippage

Please see attached document from the Rhode Island Commissioner Ken Wagner regarding RIDE's response to participation rates

Explanation of Group C Slippage

Please see attached document from the Rhode Island Commissioner Ken Wagner regarding RIDE's response to participation rates

Explanation of Group D Slippage

Please see attached document from the Rhode Island Commissioner Ken Wagner regarding RIDE's response to participation rates

Explanation of Group E Slippage

Please see attached document from the Rhode Island Commissioner Ken Wagner regarding RIDE's response to participation rates

Explanation of Group F Slippage

Please see attached document from the Rhode Island Commissioner Ken Wagner regarding RIDE's response to participation rates

Explanation of Group G Slippage

Please see attached document from the Rhode Island Commissioner Ken Wagner regarding RIDE's response to participation rates

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Grade 3	1,866	1,690	98.01%	100%	90.57%
B Grade 4	1,735	1,571	98.46%	100%	90.55%
C Grade 5	1,784	1,634	99.28%	100%	91.59%
D Grade 6	1,826	1,580	99.17%	100%	86.53%
E Grade 7	1,758	1,524	98.74%	100%	86.69%
F Grade 8	1,883	1,560	97.78%	100%	82.85%
G Grade 11	4,886	3,520	94.18%	100%	72.04%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

Please see attached document from the Rhode Island Commissioner Ken Wagner regarding RIDE's response to participation rates

Explanation of Group B Slippage

Please see attached document from the Rhode Island Commissioner Ken Wagner regarding RIDE's response to participation rates

Explanation of Group C Slippage

Please see attached document from the Rhode Island Commissioner Ken Wagner regarding RIDE's response to participation rates

Explanation of Group D Slippage

Please see attached document from the Rhode Island Commissioner Ken Wagner regarding RIDE's response to participation rates

Explanation of Group E Slippage

Please see attached document from the Rhode Island Commissioner Ken Wagner regarding RIDE's response to participation rates

Explanation of Group F Slippage

Please see attached document from the Rhode Island Commissioner Ken Wagner regarding RIDE's response to participation rates

Explanation of Group G Slippage

Please see attached document from the Rhode Island Commissioner Ken Wagner regarding RIDE's response to participation rates

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

<http://www.ride.ri.gov/InstructionAssessment/Assessment/AssessmentResults.aspx>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For Group G, listed above as Grade 11, students are assessed in grades 9 and 10 for reading assessment and in algebra 1 and geometry for mathematics assessment. In EdFacts reporting, Rhode Island reported reading results as Grade 9, Grade 10, and Grade 11 (for alternate assessment only). Rhode Island reported the combined algebra 1 and geometry data as HS (high school) with no differentiation by grade. For this reason, all Group G data (both reading and mathematics) is accumulated and reported as high school.

Please note that the SPP-APR comment for 3b "Participation counts above differ for mathematics and for reading assessment because EL students in their first year are not required to take the reading assessment." was inaccurate due to a misunderstanding. Our EDEN Coordinator and data leads have confirmed that fact. Further, they have checked the assessment files and found that there were no students who:

1. Did not participate in either the RI alternate Assessments or PARCC
2. Were IEP
3. Were EL
4. Arrived in US less than 1 year

Thus, the number of students who were EL, IEP and did not take the assessment was zero (0).

Participation counts above differ for mathematics and for reading assessment because students who are enrolled in algebra I and geometry courses (math) at their schools are required to participate in algebra I and geometry assessments in PARCC. Since some school districts offer algebra I at the middle school, the number of students who participate in algebra I and geometry at the high school is different from the number of students who participate in ELA/L at the high school where every student enrolled is required to take the PARCC assessment in ELA/L. Fifty-one (51) students with disabilities participated in the 2015 PARCC assessments in math.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥			34.00%	35.00%	37.70%	37.00%	38.00%	39.00%	39.00%	39.00%
			Data		33.00%	34.00%	37.90%	36.00%	36.30%	34.89%	43.10%	32.64%	33.50%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥			28.00%	29.00%	33.50%	31.00%	32.00%	33.00%	33.00%	33.00%
			Data		27.20%	34.10%	28.80%	30.00%	26.70%	29.95%	31.93%	27.77%	25.44%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥			27.00%	28.00%	24.40%	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%	32.00%	32.00%
			Data		25.70%	29.40%	26.20%	29.00%	30.20%	32.17%	26.10%	27.57%	27.34%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥			22.00%	23.00%	29.50%	25.00%	26.00%	27.00%	27.00%	27.00%
			Data		20.90%	26.10%	25.40%	24.00%	26.60%	28.44%	30.60%	27.62%	30.10%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥			21.00%	22.00%	31.50%	24.00%	26.00%	26.00%	26.00%	26.00%
			Data		19.70%	22.40%	27.90%	23.00%	31.10%	23.44%	29.90%	27.16%	25.78%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥			24.00%	25.00%	18.40%	27.00%	28.00%	29.00%	29.00%	29.00%
			Data		22.90%	21.20%	18.80%	26.00%	30.80%	37.07%	40.52%	35.79%	34.61%
	G Grade 11	2005	Target ≥			23.00%	24.00%	20.10%	26.00%	27.00%	27.00%	27.00%	27.00%
			Data		23.60%	20.80%	15.70%	25.00%	31.60%	36.54%	39.63%	36.17%	47.08%
Math	A Grade 3	2005	Target ≥			31.00%	32.00%	33.70%	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%	37.00%	37.00%
			Data		30.50%	33.90%	37.40%	33.00%	31.10%	34.14%	32.34%	29.36%	28.20%
	B Grade 4	2005	Target ≥			27.00%	28.00%	32.00%	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%	32.00%	32.00%
			Data		26.30%	31.30%	26.70%	29.00%	25.40%	28.07%	30.20%	25.53%	25.24%
	C Grade 5	2005	Target ≥			25.00%	26.00%	28.50%	28.00%	29.00%	30.00%	30.00%	30.00%
			Data		24.30%	29.40%	27.10%	27.00%	23.86%	26.81%	25.49%	22.57%	20.83%
	D Grade 6	2005	Target ≥			18.00%	19.00%	20.30%	21.00%	22.00%	23.00%	23.00%	23.00%
			Data		17.40%	26.10%	18.70%	20.00%	21.25%	25.15%	24.22%	21.42%	18.68%
	E Grade 7	2005	Target ≥			16.00%	17.00%	15.80%	19.00%	20.00%	21.00%	21.00%	21.00%
			Data		14.90%	22.40%	16.40%	18.00%	18.45%	17.16%	18.77%	18.85%	19.74%
	F Grade 8	2005	Target ≥			17.00%	18.00%	15.70%	20.00%	21.00%	22.00%	22.00%	22.00%
			Data		15.80%	20.00%	15.90%	19.00%	17.14%	18.21%	19.15%	17.23%	17.79%
	G Grade 11	2005	Target ≥			15.00%	16.00%	5.00%	6.00%	7.00%	8.00%	9.00%	9.00%
			Data		15.10%	12.10%	3.60%	17.00%	5.42%	9.18%	7.80%	8.91%	9.36%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Grade 3	10.00%	10.50%	14.00%	15.00%	16.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	5.00%	5.50%	6.00%	7.00%	8.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	4.50%	5.00%	6.00%	8.00%	9.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	3.00%	3.50%	4.00%	5.00%	6.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	6.00%	6.50%	7.00%	7.50%	8.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	5.00%	5.50%	6.00%	6.50%	7.00%
	G ≥ HS	5.50%	6.00%	7.00%	8.00%	9.00%
Math	A ≥ Grade 3	12.00%	12.50%	13.00%	14.00%	15.00%
	B ≥ Grade 4	4.00%	4.50%	5.00%	6.00%	7.00%
	C ≥ Grade 5	3.50%	4.00%	5.00%	6.00%	7.00%
	D ≥ Grade 6	2.00%	2.50%	3.00%	4.00%	5.00%
	E ≥ Grade 7	2.50%	3.00%	4.00%	5.00%	6.00%
	F ≥ Grade 8	3.00%	3.50%	4.00%	5.00%	6.00%
	G ≥ HS	2.00%	2.50%	3.00%	4.00%	5.00%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Rhode Island has changed from the NECAP assessment to the PARCC assessment for all students in school year 2014 - 2015 and a new assessment for students participating in alternate assessment was implemented as well.

These results are inconclusive as participation is lower than expected. This is a base year; these are the results from an assessment based on a new set of standards. In addition to this, students, teachers and test administrators used an online testing environment for the first time.

The differential effect of the PARCC test on students with disabilities is unknown at this point.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
------------	--	---	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Grade 3	1,684	216	33.50%	10.00%	12.83%
B Grade 4	1,562	128	25.44%	5.00%	8.19%
C Grade 5	1,623	116	27.34%	4.50%	7.15%
D Grade 6	1,580	94	30.10%	3.00%	5.95%
E Grade 7	1,523	140	25.78%	6.00%	9.19%
F Grade 8	1,568	126	34.61%	5.00%	8.04%
G Grade 11	2,437	201	47.08%	5.50%	8.25%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Grade 3	1,691	239	28.20%	12.00%	14.13%
B Grade 4	1,572	103	25.24%	4.00%	6.55%
C Grade 5	1,634	101	20.83%	3.50%	6.18%
D Grade 6	1,581	80	18.68%	2.00%	5.06%
E Grade 7	1,525	88	19.74%	2.50%	5.77%
F Grade 8	1,560	99	17.79%	3.00%	6.35%
G Grade 11	2,438	116	9.36%	2.00%	4.76%

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

<http://www.ride.ri.gov/InstructionAssessment/Assessment/AssessmentResults.aspx>

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			12.00%	9.00%	6.00%	3.00%	3.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Data		14.00%	6.00%	4.00%	4.00%	2.00%	0%	1.90%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	60	0%	2.00%	0%

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Significantly Discrepant: comparison of the risk of a district's special education students to be suspended for more than 10

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

days to the risk of the district's general education students to be suspended for more than 10 days to obtain a risk ratio. Districts with a risk ratio of 2.5 or higher for 2 consecutive years and a minimum cell size of 10 students with IEPs that are suspended greater than 10 days would be considered significantly discrepant.

There were 58 districts that did not meet the 'n' size.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

There were no districts with a significant discrepancy so there was no review of policies, procedures and practices.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	null	null	0

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: 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
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						2.00%	1.90%	1.92%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	60	0%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Significant Discrepancy: comparison of the risk of a district's students from a particular racial/ethnic group with disabilities to be suspended for more than 10 days to the risk of all general education students from that same district to be suspended for more than 10 days to obtain a risk ratio. Districts with a risk ratio of 2.5 or higher for 2 consecutive years and a minimum cell size of 10 students with disabilities in a particular racial/ethnic category suspended greater than 10 days would be considered significantly discrepant.

58 districts were excluded from the calculation as a result of having less than the minimum 'n' size.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

No district was identified as having a significant discrepancy, so there was no review of policies, procedures and practices.

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2005	Target ≥			68.00%	71.00%	74.00%	77.00%	80.00%	81.00%	82.00%	82.00%
		Data		65.00%	62.80%	70.67%	70.58%	73.06%	71.39%	71.80%	71.18%	70.75%
B	2005	Target ≤			16.00%	14.00%	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%	9.50%	9.50%	9.50%
		Data		18.00%	18.10%	14.71%	7.44%	12.77%	13.24%	11.55%	11.55%	11.73%
C	2005	Target ≤			4.30%	4.00%	4.00%	3.50%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	5.00%
		Data		4.50%	4.85%	4.94%	5.07%	4.19%	5.10%	5.81%	5.87%	6.11%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	71.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%
Target B ≤	14.00%	13.50%	13.00%	12.50%	12.00%
Target C ≤	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	4.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	6/4/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	20,418	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	14,507	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,552	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
C002; Data group 74)				
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	892	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	131	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	21	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	14,507	20,418	70.75%	71.00%	71.05%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,552	20,418	11.73%	14.00%	12.50%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,044	20,418	6.11%	5.00%	5.11%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- 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.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2011	Target ≥									45.00%	45.50%
		Data									42.72%	43.00%
B	2011	Target ≤									20.00%	20.00%
		Data									22.69%	22.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	46.00%	47.00%	48.00%	49.00%	50.00%
Target B ≤	19.00%	18.00%	17.00%	16.00%	15.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	2,942	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,323	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	513	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b2. Number of children attending separate school	41	null

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,323	2,942	42.26%	46.00%	44.97%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	554	2,942	20.17%	19.00%	18.83%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 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.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2010	Target ≥						77.00%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	75.00%
		Data					76.00%	72.00%	69.00%	77.00%	74.00%	75.65%
A2	2010	Target ≥						82.00%	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%	57.00%
		Data					81.00%	68.00%	59.00%	59.00%	56.00%	57.49%
B1	2010	Target ≥						69.00%	65.00%	67.00%	69.00%	76.50%
		Data					68.00%	63.00%	74.00%	78.00%	76.00%	77.39%
B2	2010	Target ≥						81.00%	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%	61.20%
		Data					80.00%	53.00%	61.00%	62.00%	61.00%	60.98%
C1	2010	Target ≥						68.00%	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%	74.25%
		Data					67.00%	67.00%	74.00%	72.00%	65.00%	67.78%
C2	2010	Target ≥						87.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	64.50%
		Data					86.00%	72.00%	69.00%	69.00%	64.00%	61.90%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	75.75%	76.50%	77.00%	77.50%	78.00%
Target A2 ≥	58.00%	60.00%	62.00%	65.00%	70.00%
Target B1 ≥	77.50%	78.00%	78.50%	79.00%	79.50%
Target B2 ≥	62.00%	62.50%	63.00%	63.50%	64.00%
Target C1 ≥	74.50%	75.00%	75.50%	76.00%	76.50%
Target C2 ≥	65.00%	66.00%	68.00%	70.00%	74.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	765.00
--	--------

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	47.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	97.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	188.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	285.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	148.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	473.00	617.00	75.65%	75.75%	76.66%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	433.00	765.00	57.49%	58.00%	56.60%

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	41.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	111.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	167.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	303.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	143.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	470.00	622.00	77.39%	77.50%	75.56%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	446.00	765.00	60.98%	62.00%	58.30%

Explanation of B1 Slippage

Rhode Island is pleased with the growth and meeting the FFY 2014 target for summary statement 1 of outcome A.

Slippage was evident however in summary statement 1 of outcome B, the *acquisition of knowledge and skills (including early language communication)*.

Last year 77.39% of children substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age while this year only 75.56% of the children substantially increased their rate of growth. In addition RI did not meet the goal of 77.50%.

As mentioned in last year's APR, RIDE continues to have concerns with the use of Teaching Strategies GOLD as the instrument for determining child outcomes. Although the formula for calculating outcomes is acknowledged as being valid, teachers and families do not have direct input into the entry and exit results and may be unaware of the actual determinations. In addition, RIDE continues to be concerned about the number of children captured in the child outcomes data. This reduction in child data can be attributed to a

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

couple of factors. First, GOLD requires a significant amount of data at both entry and exit and does not allow for individualized assessment practices but rather requires 100% completion. If teachers or therapists miss one of the many assessment indicators or have a data entry error, scores cannot be calculated and RIDE is unable to capture the child's outcomes scores. Second, the use of GOLD does not afford the opportunity to link with RI's special education database to ensure that all children are entered into GOLD. RI recognizes the increased probability of error given the use of GOLD as a separate data system. Together these concerns may have been a major factor in the reduction of child data and the reliability of the FFY 2014 data.

Due to multiple concerns including those mentioned above, RIDE has spent the last year researching how other states are collecting their child outcome data and identifying the most valid and reliable system. This work was completed in conjunction with the Executive Office of Health and Human Services as part of the creation of RI's new *Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education Comprehensive Assessment System*.

After extensive investigation, RI has decided to transition to the COS process during the 2015-2016 school year. New protocols and procedures have been developed with the assistance of ECTA and a variety of stakeholders throughout RI. In collaboration with John Hopkins University, RI is currently in the process of developing the associated professional development and technical assistance that will allow for the full implementation of the new Child Outcomes Measurement System in the fall of 2016. RIDE is also working on the development of a new preschool data entry system that will allow LEAs to input child outcome data directly into the state's existing PK-12 Instructional Support System. RIDE welcomes the upcoming change and looks forward to the opportunity to document improved outcomes for preschoolers with disabilities in future years.

Explanation of B2 Slippage

Rhode Island is pleased with the growth and meeting the FFY 2014 target for summary statement 1 of outcome A.

Slippage was evident however in summary statement 2 of outcome B, the *acquisition of knowledge and skills (including early language communication)*.

Last year 60.98% of children were functioning within age expectations in outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age while this year only 58.30% of children were functioning within age expectations. In addition RI did not meet the goal of 77.50%62.00%

As mentioned in last year's APR, RIDE continues to have concerns with the use of Teaching Strategies GOLD as the instrument for determining child outcomes. Although the formula for calculating outcomes is acknowledged as being valid, teachers and families do not have direct input into the entry and exit results and may be unaware of the actual determinations. In addition, RIDE continues to be concerned about the number of children captured in the child outcomes data. This reduction in child data can be attributed to a couple of factors. First, GOLD requires a significant amount of data at both entry and exit and does not allow for individualized assessment practices but rather requires 100% completion. If teachers or therapists miss one of the many assessment indicators or have a data entry error, scores cannot be calculated and RIDE is unable to capture the child's outcomes scores. Second, the use of GOLD does not afford the opportunity to link with RI's special education database to ensure that all children are entered into GOLD. RI recognizes the increased probability of error given the use of GOLD as a separate data system. Together these concerns may have been a major factor in the reduction of child data and the reliability of the FFY 2014 data.

Due to multiple concerns including those mentioned above, RIDE has spent the last year researching how other states are collecting their child outcome data and identifying the most valid and reliable system. This work was completed in conjunction with the Executive Office of Health and Human Services as part of the creation of RI's new *Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education Comprehensive Assessment System*.

After extensive investigation, RI has decided to transition to the COS process during the 2015-2016 school year. New protocols and procedures have been developed with the assistance of ECTA and a variety of stakeholders throughout RI. In collaboration with John Hopkins University, RI is currently in the process of developing the associated professional development and technical assistance that will allow for the full implementation of the new Child Outcomes Measurement System in the fall of 2016. RIDE is also working on the development of a new preschool data entry system that will allow LEAs to input child outcome data directly into the state's existing PK-12 Instructional Support System. RIDE welcomes the upcoming change and looks forward to the opportunity to document improved outcomes for preschoolers with disabilities in future years.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	70.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	114.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	110.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	251.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	220.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	361.00	545.00	67.78%	74.50%	66.24%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	471.00	765.00	61.90%	65.00%	61.57%

Explanation of C1 Slippage

Rhode Island is pleased with the growth and meeting the FFY 2014 target for summary statement 1 of outcome A.

Slippage was evident however in summary statement 1 of outcome C, the *use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs*.

Last year, 67.78% of children substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age while this year only 66.24% of the children substantially increased their rate of growth. In addition, RI did not meet the goal of 74.50%.

As mentioned in last year's APR, RIDE continues to have concerns with the use of Teaching Strategies GOLD as the instrument for determining child outcomes. Although the formula for calculating outcomes is acknowledged as being valid, teachers and families do not have direct input into the entry and exit results and may be unaware of the actual determinations. In addition, RIDE continues to be concerned about the number of children captured in the child outcomes data. This reduction in child data can be attributed to a couple of factors. First, GOLD requires a significant amount of data at both entry and exit and does not allow for individualized assessment practices but rather requires 100% completion. If teachers or therapists miss one of the many assessment indicators or have a data entry error, scores cannot be calculated and RIDE is unable to capture the child's outcomes scores. Second, the use of GOLD does not afford the opportunity to link with RI's special education database to ensure that all children are entered into GOLD. RI recognizes the increased probability of error given the use of GOLD as a separate data system. Together these concerns may have been a major factor in the reduction of child data and the reliability of the FFY 2014 data.

Due to multiple concerns including those mentioned above, RIDE has spent the last year researching how other states are collecting their child outcome data and identifying the most valid and reliable system. This work was completed in conjunction with the Executive Office of Health and Human Services as part of the creation of RI's new *Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education Comprehensive Assessment System*.

After extensive investigation, RI has decided to transition to the COS process during the 2015-2016 school year. New protocols and procedures have been developed with the assistance of ECTA and a variety of stakeholders throughout RI. In collaboration with John Hopkins University, RI is currently in the process of developing the associated professional development and technical assistance that will allow for the full implementation of the new Child Outcomes Measurement System in the fall of 2016. RIDE is also working on the development of a new preschool data entry system that will allow LEAs to input child outcome data directly into the state's existing PK-12 Instructional Support System. RIDE welcomes the upcoming change and looks forward to the opportunity to document improved outcomes for preschoolers with disabilities in future years.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No
Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Instruments and Procedures Used to Gather Data

To meet the Preschool Outcomes reporting requirement and to align that measurement of young children's development with high quality assessment practices, the Rhode Island Department of Education conducted an exhaustive search of early childhood outcome-based assessment 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 Teaching Strategies Gold On-Line Assessment System.

TS GOLD was developed based on an extensive literature-based research review of the most current and significant studies on early learning, including the most effective indicators of school success. TS GOLD provides a seamless, observation-based assessment system for all learners, birth through kindergarten and blends ongoing authentic assessment in all areas of development and learning with intentional, focused performance assessment tasks. It was designed to allow teachers to document learning over time, to inform instruction, to compare individual scores/growth to that of their peers and to facilitate communication with families and stakeholders.

An independent research study which included 10,963 young children from 2,525 early childhood centers throughout the United States found that GOLD was a valid and reliable measure of child growth and development for all children 0-5, including ELLs and those with disabilities. In partnership with TS GOLD and to supplement initial research which established the validity and reliability of GOLD, the Center for Educational Measurement and Evaluation (CEME) at The University of North Carolina at Charlotte conducted additional research to establish growth norms. CEME used a longitudinal study design, tracking 54,504 children across a single academic year to observe growth and development. The research confirmed the validity and reliability of the scaled scores created for each developmental area in TS GOLD. More importantly, the results demonstrated that the TS GOLD scores are sensitive to the process of child growth and development. The assessment data assists teachers in understanding where children are functioning, their strengths, weaknesses, and growth compared to the normed sample.

The Teaching Strategies Gold 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 portfolios for each 3- 5 year old student who meets the criteria of this reporting requirement.

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

3. Administrators also add Speech and Language Pathologists if they are the primary special educators for their preschool students. SLPs in turn create classrooms and add portfolios for the children who meet the criteria of this reporting requirement.
4. On an ongoing basis teachers and SLPs enter observational documentation, pictures of children's work, assessment/evaluation information, as well as information from other service providers and parents.
5. After an entry period (6-8 weeks), the teachers and SLPs conduct an on-line entry assessment based on the multiple pieces of evidence in the children's portfolio. This compilation of data serves as the entry assessment.
6. Evidence is then continually collected and recorded in each child's on-line portfolio for the remainder of the time the child receives preschool special education services.
7. Teachers continue to conduct assessments every November, February and June for each child. These multiple formative 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.
8. SLPs conduct COS assessments upon entry and exit for each child.
9. Teachers and SLPs exit and archive students turning 6 years old, exiting special education or transitioning to kindergarten, thus allowing the students' outcome data to be measured and reported.
10. The Teaching Strategies Gold On-Line Assessment System allows teachers, SLPs and administrators to run a variety of reports to determine district, school, class and individual child assessment information. The data both informs instruction within the classroom and school improvement efforts.
11. The Teaching Strategies Gold On-Line Assessment System 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 June, 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 months of service.

Comparable to Same-Aged Peers

Teaching Strategies provides users with the ability to electronically generate state mandated OSEP outcomes reports. Recently they have strengthened their reporting capabilities by increasing the sensitivity of the conversion process. TS GOLD partnered with ECO and researchers from the Center for Educational Measurement and Evaluation at UNC-Charlotte to convert item level data in Teaching Strategies GOLD™ to OSEP's 7 point scale. Initially, a crosswalk between the OSEP outcomes and the items of Teaching Strategies GOLD™ a assessment system was developed and statistical evidence gathered ensuring that the GOLD items chosen offered a valid and reliable scaled score.

Researchers then separated the population of children assessed using the Teaching Strategies GOLD™ system into three month age bands and according to whether they did or did not have an IEP / IFSP. This process allowed the researchers to understand what scores would be expected for each age band, on each outcome, for both typically developing children and those with identified special needs.

The next step was identifying the scores for 5 and 6, on the 1 to 7 scale. This was chosen as a starting point because this is the dividing line between what is typically developing and below expectations. In order to do so, the researchers created a statistically based band of scores around the average score for typically developing children for each outcome and age band.

This process was used for each three month age band so that a set of cut scores was created across the entire 1 to 7 OSEP reporting scale. These cut scores can be used to convert Teaching Strategies GOLD™ raw scores for any child to the OSEP scaling, based on how a child scores relative to how children of the same age, typically developing and with special needs, were rated on the same items.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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.

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

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2006

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥				26.00%	31.37%	38.88%	34.50%	36.10%	38.00%	39.00%
Data			26.00%	28.00%	33.00%	33.00%	38.00%	39.00%	40.00%	41.46%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	41.00%	43.00%	45.00%	47.00%	50.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1064.00	2660.00	41.46%	41.00%	40.00%

Explanation of Slippage

A total of 23,127 surveys were sent to parents in 59 school districts; 1,091 surveys were undeliverable. Overall, 2,660 completed surveys were submitted, for an overall return rate of 12.1% (2,660/22,036). The percentage of parents of a child receiving special education services who reported that, "schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities," calculated as the percentage of respondents with a SEPPS measure that met or exceeded the standard 600, was 40%. The FFY 2014 Target goal was 41% thus resulting in slippage of one percent which may have been a result of a number of factors including lack of sufficient marketing and outreach, a lack of follow up in urban communities and the methods of administration of the survey to parents.

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The response group included parents of students with disabilities of every age group ranging from three to twenty-one years old from nearly every school district statewide. The response group was representative of the state population of students with disabilities for language, race/ethnicity, district and disability.

The state population of students ages 3-5 with disabilities represents 5.47% of the state population of students with disabilities and the students ages 3-5 with disabilities represented with parent respondents was 8.34%.

Please see attachment.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

The response group included parents of students with disabilities of every age group 3-21 years old within 59 school districts. A total of 23,127 surveys were sent to parents; 1,091 surveys were undeliverable; and 2,660 completed surveys were submitted resulting in an overall return rate of 12.1%. The response group was representative of the state population of students with disabilities language, race/ethnicity, district and disability. Measures on the SEPPS were available for 2,658 individuals, as two respondents did not provide responses to the rating scale items.

The survey was available to parents in English, Spanish, Portuguese and Khmer. The percentage of surveys distributed in English was the greatest at 94% followed by Spanish at 6%, Khmer at <1% and Portuguese at <1%.

In regards to racial representation, parent survey responses were received from all specific racial/ethnic groups including American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, African American, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian, Other Pacific Islander, White, "Two or more Races," and, "Missing." The two largest subgroups of respondents were from the White and Hispanic/Latino categories (71.35% and 17.37%). While these were likewise, the two largest groups of students with disabilities (59.13% and 25.20%), the percentage of respondents representing the white category was 12.22 points greater than the state wide population, while the percentage of respondents in the Hispanic category was 17.83 percentage points lower than it is in the state wide population.

Interestingly, the state population of Asian students with disabilities is 1.64% and the represented parent response percentage is higher at 2.18% resulting in an increase of .54 percentage points. African American Rhode Island students with disabilities make up 8.97% of the population. Parent respondents whose children are identified within the African American racial group was 3.93 percentage points lower than in that state wide population of students with disabilities.

For disability, the percentage of parent respondents for student disability categories of OHI, HI, D, OI and TBI (15.49%, .45%, .30%, .19%, and .38%) closely mirrored the state wide population percentages of students identified in these categories (14.85%, .39%, .28%, .29% and .26%).

The percentages of parent respondents representing the categories of DD, MD, ASD and V/B were slightly higher than the state wide percentage of students with disabilities within these categories. The percentages of parent respondents for the categories of SLD and ED (25.87% and 4.17%) were somewhat lower than the state wide percentages of students within these categories (33.71% and 7.54%). The statewide percentage of the population of students identified within the D/B disability category is .03%. The percentage of parent responses within this same category was 0.00%, resulting in the only disability category producing zero responses. The greatest gap in percentage rates was within the Specific Learning Disability (SLD) category. The overall state population was 33.71% and the parent response group was 25.87%. This is a difference of 7.84 percentage points.

Please see attachment.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? No

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		8.00%	18.00%	8.00%	0%	2.00%	1.89%	1.89%	1.85%	1.85%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
16	1	60	1.85%	0%	1.67%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

In analyzing data for this indicator, the State examined its Fall October 2014 Enrollment and December 2014 Child Count by 7 races.

Disproportionate Representation is defined as a risk ratio of 2.5 or higher for two consecutive years with a minimum n size of 10 students and at least a 1% risk difference between LEA risk and national risk (step one) plus evidence of policies, procedures, and/or practices which result in inappropriate identification (step two). Evidence was collected from multiple sources: record reviews, onsite visits, district submissions in the consolidated resources plan and in the disproportionality performance report online, and records of complaints, mediations, and hearings.

Step One: Using the criteria established above, the State determined that 16 school districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation. While some districts did not meet the minimum n of 10 students of a particular race/ethnicity in special education, almost all districts met the n size for at least one race/ethnicity group in special

education. Only 4 districts (all small charter high schools) were excluded from examining disproportionate representation in special education and related services. There were 60 total districts. (Step One)

Step Two: Determining if Disproportionate Representation is the Result of Inappropriate Identification

The State reviewed the child find, evaluation (including re-evaluation), and eligibility policies, procedures, and practices of the 16 districts identified in step 1 of the FFY2014 data review as having disproportionate representation to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. Evidence was collected from multiple sources:

- On-site record review of individual student files which occur both as part of the School Support System of focused Monitoring and also as part of additional probes in response to disproportionality data.
- Additional data probes in which districts reviewed individual student files for a group showing disproportionate representation to examine trends in age/grade of eligibility, current or former ELL status, mobility in and out of district, changes in eligibility category over time, and completion of a full and individual evaluation.
- Onsite visits in which district general education and special education leadership, building principals, special education and general education teaching staff including ESL/bilingual staff, related service providers, parents and students are interviewed regarding child find, evaluation/re-evaluation, and eligibility practices, procedures, and policies. Visits include the review of previous action plans for addressing disproportionality and accompanying revisions of policies, procedures, and practices.
- Review of required district submissions of a disproportionality self-assessment and corresponding evidence checklist as Word/excel/PDF documents in the June 2014 and 2015 Disproportionality Performance Reports including updates to action plans and prevention and/or correction activities. District documents are uploaded for further review and may include forms, agendas, revised policies, new or revised procedures, etc.
- Review of complaints, mediations, and hearings during FFY2014.

As a result of its extensive verification process, the State found that 1 district was noncompliant with the eligibility and evaluation requirements. Accordingly, the State determined that 1 of the 16 districts had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification. File reviews did yield child specific findings of noncompliance.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through a State data system (June 2014 and June 2015 Child Count data), as well as updated data subsequently collected through the 2014 and 2015 Disproportionality Performance Report/Accellegrants system, the district has revised policies and procedures for the identification as children with disabilities as eligible for special education and related services. The district has put into place revised procedures plus training supports to support implementation at the practice level specifically with regard to math intervention and social emotional supports. The district is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The State engaged in specific actions to verify the correction. The State examined trends in the number of students with IEPs by race/ethnicity in December 2013, June 2014, December 2014, and June 2015 data sets as compared to trends in general enrollment by race/ethnicity for those time periods for this district. The State collected and reviewed revised policies and procedures such as written procedures for a comprehensive evaluation process and use of intervention and progress monitoring (practices and procedures) in the identification. The State determined that the revised policies and procedures were appropriate and support reduction of disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification including ensuring appropriate educational opportunities for Hispanic students as well as for ELLs and students with social emotional concerns.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The State verified that the LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance through Rhode Island's Collaborative System of Tiered Monitoring: School Support System (SSS). The State engaged in specific actions to verify the correction. The SSS Team and the district jointly developed a Support Plan (corrective action/improvement plan) which specified technical assistance and training needed to enable the schools and district to correct policies and procedures for the identification of children with disabilities as eligible for special education and related services. Resources were identified and made available to the district to assist in carrying out the support plan. The School Support System continuous improvement planning included action plans, specific resources, staff responsibilities, timelines for completion, and mechanisms for verification (practices). Monthly progress checks were done with the LEA as outlined in the support plan/corrective action plan. These progress checks involved verification documentation submitted to RIDE for review and verification by RIDE personnel. The State determined that the district was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and corrected individual cases of noncompliance.

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		8.00%	20.00%	8.00%	6.00%	8.00%	3.77%	3.77%	5.56%	3.70%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
28	0	60	3.70%	0%	0%

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

In analyzing data for this indicator, the State examined its Fall October 2014 Enrollment and December 2014 Child Count by 7 races.

Disproportionate Representation is defined as a risk ratio of 2.5 or higher for two consecutive years with a minimum n size of 10 students and at least a 1% risk difference between LEA risk and national risk (step one) plus evidence of policies, procedures, and/or practices which result in inappropriate identification (step two). Evidence was collected from multiple sources: record reviews, onsite visits, district submissions in the consolidated resources plan and in the disproportionality performance report online, and records of complaints, mediations, and hearings.

Step One: Using the criteria established above, the State determined that 28 school districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation. While some districts did not meet the minimum n of 10 students of a

particular race/ethnicity in special education, almost all districts met the n size for at least one race/ethnicity group in special education. Only 4 districts (all small charter high schools) were excluded from examining disproportionate representation in special education and related services. There were 60 total districts. (Step One)

Step Two: Determining if Disproportionate Representation is the Result of Inappropriate Identification

The State reviewed the child find, evaluation (including re-evaluation), and eligibility policies, procedures, and practices of the 28 districts identified in step 1 of the FFY2014 data review as having disproportionate representation to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. Evidence was collected from multiple sources:

- On-site record review of individual student files which occur both as part of the School Support System of focused Monitoring and also as part of additional probes in response to disproportionality data.
- Additional data probes in which districts reviewed individual student files for a group showing disproportionate representation to examine trends in age/grade of eligibility, current or former ELL status, mobility in and out of district, changes in eligibility category over time, and completion of a full and individual evaluation.
- Onsite visits in which district general education and special education leadership, building principals, special education and general education teaching staff including ESL/bilingual staff, related service providers, parents and students are interviewed regarding child find, evaluation/re-evaluation, and eligibility practices, procedures, and policies. Visits include the review of previous action plans for addressing disproportionality and accompanying revisions of policies, procedures, and practices.
- Review of required district submissions of a disproportionality self-assessment and corresponding evidence checklist as Word/Excel/PDF documents in the June 2014 and 2015 Disproportionality Performance Reports including updates to action plans and prevention and/or correction activities. District documents are uploaded for further review and may include forms, agendas, revised policies, new or revised procedures, etc.
- Review of complaints, mediations, and hearings during FFY2014.

As a result of its extensive verification process, the State found that 0 districts were noncompliant with the eligibility and evaluation requirements. Accordingly, the State determined that 0 of the 28 districts had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification. File reviews did not yield child specific findings of noncompliance.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

FFY 2013 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Based on a review of updated data subsequently collected through a State data system (June 2014 and June 2015 Child Count data), as well as updated data subsequently collected through the 2014 and 2015 Disproportionality Performance Report/Accellegrants system, the districts have revised policies and procedures for the identification as children with disabilities as eligible for special education and related services. The districts have provided training to staff on the implementation at the practice level of the revised policies and procedures for the identification of children with disabilities as eligible for special education. Coordination with the District Strategic Plan in one district ensured that

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

several focus areas for improvement directly tied to the correction of disproportionate representation and inappropriate identification of students with disabilities. In the other district, participation in targeted 1-1 technical assistance and data review supported implementation of revised policies, procedures, and practices. The districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

The State engaged in specific actions to verify the correction. The State examined trends in the number of students with IEPs by race/ethnicity in December 2032, June 2043, December 2043, and June 2054 data sets as compared to trends in general enrollment by race/ethnicity for those time periods for this district. The State collected and reviewed revised policies and procedures such as written procedures for a comprehensive evaluation process and use of intervention and progress monitoring (practices and procedure) in the identification process as well as revised ELL program procedures and policies. The State determined that the revised policies and procedures were appropriate and support reduction of disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification including ensuring appropriate educational opportunities for ELLs.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Through Rhode Island's Collaborative System of Tiered Monitoring: School Support System (SSS) and the Due Process system, the state has verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance. The State engaged in specific actions to verify the correction. The SSS Team and the districts jointly developed Support Plans (corrective action/improvement plans) which specified technical assistance and training needed to enable the schools and districts to correct policies and procedures for the identification of children with disabilities as eligible for special education and related services. Resources were identified and made available to the districts to assist in carrying out their support plans. The School Support System continuous improvement planning included action plans, specific resources, staff responsibilities, timelines for completion, and mechanisms for verification (practices). Monthly progress checks were done with the LEAs as outlined in the support plans/corrective action plans. These progress checks involved verification documentation submitted to RIDE for review and verification by RIDE personnel. One LEA had an action plan/correction plan as part of the Due Process system. The evidence of individual student correction was submitted to the state for review and verification by RIDE personnel as part of that process. The State determined that the districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements and corrected individual cases of noncompliance.

Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: 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.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2008

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data					67.86%	88.16%	98.23%	99.21%	99.29%	99.44%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
3,601	3,585	99.44%	100%	99.56%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	16
---	----

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

In school year 2014-2015 there were (3601 - 3585=16) 16 children whose evaluations were not completed within the 60 day timeline. These 16 children were included in a) Number of Children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received but not included in b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within the 60 days. There were 16 children who did not receive a timely initial evaluation.

The range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed was between 2 day and 82 days over the 60 day time line. The system requires local education agencies to provide an explanation for any child's "Date Last Assessment/Evaluation Was Completed" exceeds the 60 day time line. Explanations from the local education agencies were as follows: Not Completed by summer team, snow days and school was cancelled, summer vacation and school was closed, attempted and child was noncompliant, one of the assessments was not completed in time, multiple snow days, student outplaced due to behavior.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The Rhode Island Department of Education utilizes a web-based eRIDE Special Education Evaluation System to annually collect data for reporting purposes on Indicator 11. This system is inclusive of all applicable local education agencies. Data is not obtained by sampling. The eRIDE Special Education Evaluation System was modified to meet the simplified measurement of Indicator 11.

To ensure that the data is accurate, reliable and valid, the system has built in reports, tools and required documentation to assist the local education agencies with the reporting requirements. The system validates the data upon input into the system via data validation rules to ensure that the data is within system specifications. The system has built in maintenance reports, to ensure the data is cleaned, accurate and reliable. Rhode Island Department of Education provides local education agency personnel with technical assistance and professional development opportunities to ensure ease of use of the system and data reliability.

The system has verifying mechanisms that were developed to ensure that local education agencies are reporting all relevant students and not only those students whose initial evaluation data falls within the 100% compliance rate. The first method starts with the current Special Education Census System (state wide database). The current school year's Special Education Census is compared with the previous year's Special Education Census. Any student who only appears in the current year's Special Education Census (state wide database) and was not reported in the previous year's Special Education Census, is listed on Maintenance Report 42. Report 42 captures students who are Not in the June 2014 Special Education Census and **currently** in the Special Education Census **without** an Evaluation Record. This maintenance report appears on the two separate systems- the current eRIDE Special Education Census as well as on the eRIDE Special Education Evaluation System (Indicator 11). All students on Maintenance Report 42 must be accounted for on the eRIDE Special Education Evaluation System by their local education agency. Until the local education agency accounts for all students on Report 42, by recording the student appropriately on the Special Education Evaluation System, the student will continue to appear on Maintenance Report 42. The logic behind this report is simple, any student who appears only on the current Special Education Census, most likely had an initial evaluation recently and was determined eligible for special education services, but was not recorded.

Another feature of the Special Education Evaluation System is the quarterly reporting. The Special Education Evaluation System generates cumulative Local Education Agency Percentage Rate Report, the Randomly Selected Student Record Report and the Students Missing Data reports. The system automatically emails these reports to the appropriate personnel in each local education agency. Rhode Island Department of Education's Data Manager is automatically sent a cumulative summary of all of these reports for review. These automated features have improved efficiency and serve as a reminder for the local education agency to review their data reporting and they are required to submit the appropriate documentation to Rhode Island Department of Education. The following requirements for each local education agency are as follows:

1. Each local education agency must submit a District Action Plan to Rhode Island Department of Education. Each quarter the local education agency must review their District Action Plan. If the local education agency is not at 100% compliance, the local education agency must add or revise steps to the District Action Plan to explain what modifications or additional steps they will implement ensure 100% compliance.
2. The Special Education Evaluation System generates an Indicator 11 report for each local education agency with their cumulative percentage rate of compliance at the close of each quarter. This report is automatically emailed to each local education agency for review.
3. In turn, the local education agency is required to submit a Quarterly Report to Rhode Island Department of Education inclusive of their cumulative percentage rate at that point in time and status of their District Action Plan. If the local education agency has met 100% compliance, no revisions are required to their District Action Plan for that quarter. The local education agency simply records their percentage rate on the appropriate quarterly report and checks off a box that states "I have reached 100% compliance and will maintain my District Action Plan and will not add or revise any action steps this quarter". If a local education agency has not met 100% compliance revisions to the District Action Plan are required. The local education agency simply records their percentage rate of noncompliance on the appropriate

quarterly report, checks off the box that states “I have NOT reached 100% compliance and will revise my District Action Plan as follows by adding or revising the following steps” in order to meet 100% compliance. A local education agency is required to revise or add steps to their District Action plan each quarter as to ensure the local education agency is focused on the present data in the system and has a plan toward the target of 100% compliance on Indicator 11 by the close of the year. This Quarterly Report is dated and submitted to Rhode Island Department of Education by the Special Education Administrator from each local education agency at the end of every quarter. The local education agencies who were 100% compliance in the previous school year receive their Quarterly Report via email each quarter, but they are exempted from the Quarterly Report submitted to Rhode Island Department of Education.

4. The Special Education Evaluation System generates and emails to each local education agency, a Student Record Verification report each quarter, which randomly selects students that were entered on the Special Education Evaluation System. The local education agency is required to submit a **Quarterly Student Record Verification Sheet** on the selected students to Rhode Island Department of Education, in order to verify the student information entered on the system. (Those local education agencies who were 100% compliant in the previous school year are exempt from this student record verification requirement.) The Student Record Verification Sheet submitted from the local education agency to Rhode Island Department of Education includes a summary of the student information for the selected students and the relevant supporting documentation. This verification method is utilized to ensure accuracy and reliability of the data on the system for the local education agencies. In addition, during Rhode Island Department of Education School Support System visits to the local education agencies, a number of student records are selected for review and verification. This verification of selected student records is another effort utilized to ensure a comprehensive and reliable data system.
5. The Special Education Evaluation System generates and emails to the local education agency each quarter the **Report of Students Missing Data**. This report serves two purposes. It is a reminder that there are students on the system who are still in the process and their evaluations have not been completed or the data was not yet recorded on the system. The report displays the number of days since the ‘date of receipt of the parental consent’ to the date the report was generated. Local education agencies can use this report to ensure they are staying within the 60 day time line for each student.

The data is collected electronically via the eRIDE Special Education Evaluation System on July 30th to allow a month beyond the completion of the school year to ensure that all pertinent data is recorded. In a case where a child’s evaluation information has not been completed and the child’s data is still in process when the data is collected, their records are not closed out on the system, but carried forward until the evaluation process is completed and the completion date is entered into the Special Education Evaluation System. This useful function is built into the database itself. The data is reviewed by the Rhode Island Department of Education on a quarterly basis and reminders are sent to Special Education Administrators to address such scenarios. Special Education Administrators have access to their local education agency’s time line information on a daily basis via the eRIDE system. The eRIDE Special Education Evaluation System provides each local education agency with an Indicator 11 report which displays their percentage rate of compliance at any given time. This affords each local education agency to be apprised of their compliance rate at any time during the school year.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified	Findings of Noncompliance	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
--------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------	--

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	as Corrected Within One Year	Subsequently Corrected	
5	5	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

There are no remaining findings of noncompliance from previous APR Reporting periods. All noncompliance has been corrected within the required timeline. The State has verified that the local education agencies are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based upon a review of updated data subsequently collected through the eRIDE Special Education Evaluation data system and 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 local education agencies, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The State verified that the local education agency corrected each individual case of noncompliance through the eRIDE Special Education Evaluation System. The State engaged in specific actions to verify the correction. The State provided a template for the District's Action Plan which specified technical assistance and training needed to enable the schools and district to correct policies and procedures for the identification of students with disabilities to determine eligibility for special education and related services within the 60 day timeline. Resources were identified and made available to the district to assist in carrying out the District's Action Plan.

The system has verifying mechanisms that were developed to ensure that all individual cases in local education agencies are reported and all relevant students and not only those students whose initial evaluation data falls within the 100% compliance rate are reported on the system. The current school year's Special Education Census is compared with the previous year's Special Education census. Any student who only appears in the current year's Special Education Census (statewide database) and was not reported in the previous year's Special Education Census, is listed on Maintenance Report 42 which captures students who are not in the June 2014 Special Education Census and **currently** in the Special Education Census **without** an Evaluation Record.

This maintenance report (Report 42) appears on the two separate systems-the current eRIDE Special Education Census as well as on the eRIDE Special Education Evaluation System (Indicator 11). Each individual student on Maintenance Report 42 must be accounted for on the eRIDE Special Education Evaluation system by their local education agency. Until the local education agency accounts for each individual student on Report 42, by recording the student appropriately on the Special Education Evaluation System, the student will continue to appear on Maintenance Report 42. the logic behind this report is simple, any student who appears only on the current Special Education Census, most likely had an initial evaluation recently and was determined eligible for special education services, but was not recorded.

Another feature of the Special Education Evaluation System is the **quarterly reporting**. The Special Education Evaluation System generates a cumulative Local Education Agency Percentage Rate Report, the Randomly Selected Student Record Report and the Students Missing Data Reports. The system automatically emails these reports to the appropriate personnel in each local education agency. Rhode Island Department of Education's Data Manager is automatically sent a cumulative summary of all of the reports of each individual student for review. These automated features have improved efficiency and serve as a reminder for the local education agency to review their data reporting and they are required to submit the appropriate documentation to the Rhode Island Department of Education.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		60.00%	77.00%	83.00%	87.00%	97.00%	96.00%	97.00%	98.00%	98.41%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,040
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	243
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	748
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	37
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	4

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
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. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	748	756	98.41%	100%	98.94%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	8
--	---

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

Although RI has not met the target of 100% compliance, the 98.94% again represents an improved percentage over the last FFY.

The data below represents the 8 students, from 7 LEA's, who did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	< 10 days	10-20 days	21-30 days	31-40 days	41-60 days	> 60 days
Delayed notification from EI- less than 90 days before the 3 rd birthday 1 (not referred late to EI)		1		1	2	
Hospitalization	2					
IEP needed to be rescheduled	1					

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The Department of Education uses one of the LEA applications for federal funds, the Preschool Performance Report, to collect data for this indicator. In 2007, an electronic Consolidated Resource Plan (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 was collected. In 2009 the CRP was modified to more accurately align and report data regarding delay factors and corresponding lengths of delays. Again in 2012 the CRP was modified and separated into several more manageable applications, including today’s preschool performance report. The Executive Office of Health & Human Services (EOHHS), the current lead agency for Part C, shares LEA notification data on a quarterly basis to assist RIDE in identifying students that were found eligible for Part C less than 90 days before their birthday.

For the past seven years, the state has continued to work on a data collection effort focused on collaborating with the Department of Human Services and more recently the Executive Office of Health and Human Services to issue a unique student identifier (SASID) to all children enrolled in Early Intervention. RIDE is happy to finally see this goal come to fruition as at present all children entering Early Intervention receive a SASID. The expectation is that this change will not only significantly reduce the effort to identify the children who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday but it should increase the reliability of the data collected and reported.

RIDE is also investigating the possibility of building a transition data portal into a currently existing state database. By allowing the LEA’s to input data directly into the database and link through the SASID to the relevant EI information, the reliability of the data will be further enhanced.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	6	0	3

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Each of the nine (9) LEAs identified as out of compliance in the FFY 2013 findings were contacted individually and in writing by the Rhode Island Department of Education. The LEAs were required to conduct an analysis of barriers to compliance and to develop a corrective action plan addressing the quality of the data collection and prevention of delayed transitions. LEAs were required to submit these plans specifying goals, improvement activities, date of implementation and monitoring strategies. The Department of Education offered technical assistance to support these districts in identifying barriers to 100% compliance, making necessary changes in protocol, making use of the recommended tracking form and coordinating with early intervention programs. These corrective action plans were reviewed and approved by the Department of Education.

The Rhode Island Department of Education uses the data available in the preschool performance reports to confirm that each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected and that the LEA's are now correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b), (i.e., achieving 100% compliance).

RIDE has verified that each individual case of noncompliance in the FFY 2013 findings was corrected and that each child, although late, had an IEP developed and implemented.

According to FFY 2014 data, six (6) of these nine (9) LEAs are now correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b), (i.e., achieved 100% compliance). Although three (3) districts continued to be out of compliance in FFY 2014, it should be noted that each of the three (3) had only one (1) student that did not have an IEP developed and implemented by his third birthday and that each child, although late, had an IEP implemented within 60 days of his birthday.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

As reported there were twelve (12) children in the FFY 2013 findings who were found eligible for Part B who did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday due to delay factors not allowed by OSEP. The state has verified through the data provided in the FFY 2013 preschool performance report that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance. For any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, the district reported the specific delay factor and the corresponding length of time until the individual IEP's were implemented.

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Although, three (3) of the nine (9) LEAs identified as not reaching 100% in the FFY 2013 findings continue to reflect under 100% compliance in 2014. It is important to note that RIDE has verified that each individual case of noncompliance in the FFY 2013 findings was corrected and that each child, although late, had an IEP developed and implemented. It is also important to note that in FFY 2014, each of the three (3) LEA's had only one (1) student that did not have an IEP developed and implemented by his third birthday and that each child, although late, had an IEP implemented within 60 days of his birthday. In addition, two (2) of the three (3) LEA's increased their compliance rate from the last fiscal year to 97% and 91%, with the third demonstrating a lower compliance rate (88%) due to a low number of children transitioning from EI.

The Rhode Island Department of Education recognizes however that these three (3) LEAs identified as not reaching 100% in the FFY 2013 findings continue to reflect under 100% compliance according to the FFY 2014 data and are therefore not yet correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b). The three (3) LEAs will be contacted individually and in writing by the Rhode Island Department of Education. They will be required to take part in individual technical assistance to analyze barriers to 100% compliance and identify necessary changes in protocol. Each LEA will be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan addressing the identified issues. The plans will need to specify goals, improvement activities, date of implementation and monitoring strategies. The RI Department of Education will review and approve each plan. Additional technical assistance will be provided as necessary.

RIDE will use the data available in the FFY 2015 preschool performance report to confirm that each of the three (3) LEA's are then correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b), (i.e., achieving 100% compliance).

Explanation of Alternate Data

Two (2) of the three (3) LEA's identified above were also found out of compliance in FFY 2012 and are not yet reaching 100% compliance. Although RIDE does not have *alternate* data, additional information on the individual cases of non-compliance are available in the FFY 2014 preschool performance report. Each district had only one (1) student that did not have an IEP developed and implemented by his third birthday and although late, each had an IEP implemented within 60 days of his birthday. One LEA increased their compliance rate from the last fiscal year to 97%. Although the other district had a decreased compliance rate of 88%, it was due to a decreased population of children transitioning from EI.

FFY 2012 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected*Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected*

The two districts identified above, who were also found out of compliance in FFY 2012, each took part in individualized technical assistance during the last year. This TA provided the necessary support to analyze barriers and to identify necessary changes in protocol. Each LEA developed a detailed and specific corrective action plan addressing the identified issues. The plans specified goals, improvement activities, dates of implementation and monitoring strategies. Both districts welcomed the support and were eager to create plans which would lead to 100% compliance. The RI Department of Education reviewed and approved each plan.

Unfortunately due to the timing of reporting on this indicator, the transition issues recognized in this year's APR took place prior to the individualized technical assistance and creation of action plans. RIDE looks forward to 100% compliance from each of these two LEA's during the next fiscal year.

It is important to recognize that RIDE has verified that each individual case of noncompliance (1 child in each of two districts) was corrected and that each child, although late, had an IEP developed and implemented within 60 days of his birthday. In addition, one of the two LEA's increased their compliance rate from the last fiscal year to 97%, and the other demonstrated a lower compliance rate (88%) due to a low number of children transitioning from EI.

Due to the inability of these LEA's to reach 100% compliance, each of the two districts will be required to forward quarterly transition data to RIDE. This will allow RIDE more timely monitoring and the opportunity to provide additional and necessary technical assistance. In addition, as discussed previously, RIDE is investigating the possibility of building a transition data portal into a currently existing state database. This would allow RIDE the opportunity to continuously monitor data and provide more timely support.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						98.21%	98.40%	99.45%	99.98%	99.93%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
5,432	5,433	99.93%	100%	99.98%

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Overview of Indicator 13:

Rhode Island's Collaborative System of Tiered Monitoring: School Support System (SSS) incorporates a variety of instruments and procedures that are utilized to ensure compliance with state and federal laws and regulations. Currently, Rhode Island examines student records through this process and completion of the transition page of the Rhode Island Individualized Education Plan (IEP) is part of the record review. Reviewers will look at a sample of student records on a monitoring visit and will record the completion of IDEA and state required information. If required information is missing, the district will be notified of non-compliance and improvement plans/corrective actions will be undertaken. Prior to IDEA 2004, Rhode

Island required that the transition goals on the IEP be student driven (based on student's preferences and interest) and were linked to annual goals and objectives (where appropriate). Rhode Island did not centralize the collection of this specific data but would use the results in reporting to the district for compliance and improvement. Rhode Island has chosen not to utilize the SSS to obtain data for Indicator 13. There are simply not enough records reviewed annually in this small state to draw reasonable conclusions about all districts compliance on this indicator. However, RIDE utilizes the special education census as a means to monitor compliance with this indicator for all students using a census approach. As the data is collected by each district's IEP forms and entered into the RIDE census data system, RIDE has been able to target LEA's with poor compliance for this indicator and provide targeted interventions. Training and technical assistance has continued. Additional maintenance reports added to the special education census system are available to assist LEA's in assuring compliance with all measures of this indicator.

(The Rhode Island state IEP form and instructions may be viewed at:

<http://www.ritap.org/iep/publications/publication.html>)

Rhode Island IEP Page Item Information reported

Rhode Island IEP Page	Item	Information reported
1	Date of Birth = 16 plus	"Percent of youth age 16 and older with an IEP..." (Ind. 13)
2	Student at IEP meeting - Yes/no	Student participation in transition planning (not specific in indicator 13 but illustrates student involvement including consideration of preferences and interest)
3	Assessment Tools - one or more assessment tool listed on IEP Yes/no	Based on age appropriate transition assessment (not specific in indicator 13 but a compliance item in IDEA)
4	Measurable Post-school goals - List one or more Yes/no	"...coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals..." (Ind. 13)
5	Transition services - List one or more Yes/no	"...and transition services..." (Ind. 13)
6 7	Assurance of Transition Services - Assurance checked off with response Yes/no Program of Study List Program of Study Yes/no	"... reasonable enable he student to meet the postsecondary goals." (Ind. 13) Student agrees/disagrees "... including course of study" (Ind. 13)

Through the RIDE School Support System focused monitoring process, RIDE has always monitored LEAs for compliance with the secondary transition requirements of IDEA. This has been completed through record review, student and parent interview and on-site monitoring. LEAs with issues of noncompliance for the transition requirements are notified in the School Support report and are provided a deadline for compliance. RIDE schedules a follow-up verification review to ensure compliance with noncompliant items based on the nature of the issue, but no more than one year from the release of the report. For measures not included in the special education census for Indicator 13 such as the actual invitation of the student to the IEP meeting

(form or letter) and parent/student consent for the representative of a participating agency to attend the IEP meeting (consent form); these will continue to be monitored through the School Support System focused monitoring process.

Rhode Island continues to improve capacity to collect Indicator 13 data through the state special education census. The Regional Transition (Technical Assistance) Centers continue to assist the state in the collection of qualitative evidence on the LEAs results on I-13 in coordination with the state's School Support System. The purpose of the on site evaluation of I-13 evidence is twofold; (a) to verify the data as reported in the special education census related to I-13, (b) identify possible technical assistance needs with the LEA. A rubric was developed based on the NSTTAC I-13 checklist and was piloted in the spring of 2010, revised in 2011 with full implementation starting in Fall 2012. LEA's report that the use of the rubric has effectively assisted in the quality analysis and improvement of student's IEPs.

FFY 2014 (2014-2015)

For FFY 2014, Rhode Island has a 99.98 compliance rate, improved over the 98.21% compliance baseline established in FFY 2009.

For 2014-2015, 1 record was non-compliant in one or more transition requirements as of June 30, 2015. All records have been brought into compliance as of February 2016. These records were corrected and verified as compliant by RIDE. The affected district submitted an updated and corrected, compliant IEP for the initially non-compliant IEP. Based on subsequent collection and review for 2014-2015 every district is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR 300.320 (b) and 300.321 (b), achieving 100% compliance.

Compliance has been excellent, having progressed from 99.45% in FFY 2011 to more than 99.98% in FFY 2014.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	1	-1

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

For FFY 2014, Rhode Island has a 99.98 compliance rate, improved over the 98.21% compliance baseline established in FFY 2009.

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

For 2014-2015, 1 record was non-compliant in one or more transition requirements as of June 30, 2015. All records have been brought into compliance as of February 2016. These records were corrected and verified as compliant by RIDE. The affected district submitted an updated and corrected, compliant IEP for the initially non-compliant IEP. Based on subsequent collection and review for 2014-2015 every district is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR 300.320 (b) and 300.321 (b), achieving 100% compliance.

Compliance has been excellent, having progressed from 99.45% in FFY 2011 to more than 99.98% in FFY 2014.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

For 2014-2015, 1 record was non-compliant in one or more transition requirements as of June 30, 2015. All records have been brought into compliance as of February 2016. These records were corrected and verified as compliant by RIDE. The affected district submitted an updated and corrected, compliant IEP for the initially non-compliant IEP. Based on subsequent collection and review for 2014-2015 every district is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR 300.320 (b) and 300.321 (b), achieving 100% compliance.

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

NA

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- 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.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2009	Target ≥							34.00%	35.00%	36.00%	37.00%
		Data						33.00%	28.60%	34.00%	33.90%	32.27%
B	2009	Target ≥							68.00%	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%
		Data						67.00%	52.80%	64.20%	68.50%	68.90%
C	2009	Target ≥							79.00%	80.00%	81.00%	82.00%
		Data						78.00%	62.40%	79.00%	78.90%	81.51%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	38.00%	39.00%	40.00%	41.00%	42.00%
Target B ≥	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%
Target C ≥	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	766.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	233.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	301.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	77.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	38.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	233.00	766.00	32.27%	38.00%	30.42%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	534.00	766.00	68.90%	72.00%	69.71%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	649.00	766.00	81.51%	83.00%	84.73%

Explanation of A Slippage

Indicator 14

14 A. Percentage of Students Enrolled in Higher Education

Explanation of Slippage:

The baseline established for Measure A was 33.27%, with a first year target of 34% of respondents enrolled in higher education. That first year target was not met, and in fact measure A for FFY 2010 was 28.64%, 4.63% below the baseline established the previous year. For FFY 2011, the rate had improved to 34.03%, a leap of 5.39% over the previous year. In Rhode Island, this rate is clearly subject to considerable variation year to year. Rhode Island continues to lag New England and most of the nation in employment, with the result that families may have limited resources to pay for higher education. Full time tuition at the Community College, our least expensive public institution, was \$3950 in 2014-15. When employment is uncertain, people may be reluctant to incur additional costs, even in the form of student loans.

The trend over the past five years points to slow improvement, with variation year to year. While the status of Measure A indicates slippage, the trend for measure B shows steady behavior, slightly increasing over time. The behavior of measure B is directly attributable to an increase in competitive employment. Rhode Island's unemployment rate has improved over the past year; we anticipate continued improvement in the unemployment rate, and concomitant with that improvement an increase in competitive employment in the future. An improved employment outlook directly affects Measure B, indirectly, over time, should also affect Measure A. As households feel more prosperous they may be more likely to undertake the debt of student loans and also be able to forgo the income of a working student.

Trend Data Display for Measure B:

Please see **Indicator 14 Trend** document for supporting graph.

The single most important data is the downward trend in the rate of students not engaged. The trend for these data is significant, because a student who is enrolled in short term training or some employment is a candidate for more training or competitive employment, becoming more productive. The "Not Engaged" trend has dropped substantially over the past five years, as shown in the "Not Engaged" table in the **Indicator 14 Trend** document.

Although targets for measures A and B were not met, the target for the most inclusive definition of engagement, measure C, was met. The percentage of student who are not engaged has declined to 15%, an improvement of approximately 3%. As the economy improves, more students are competitively employed; the competitive employment rate increased from 37 to 39 percent. This increase is significant, especially considering that Rhode Island continues to have a relatively high unemployment rate.. As the economic environment improves, competitive employment results have improved as well. The results for enrollment in higher education have declined by 2 percent from FFY 2013. This decline mirrors the nation-wide decline in higher education. The United States Census Bureau in release CB14-177 reports that college enrollment declined for the second year in a row in 2013-14 and that Hispanic college enrollment stopped growth in 2013. The Wall Street Journal, December 11, 2014, reported "College and university enrollments slid 1.3% this fall to 19.6 million, dragged down by a 6% decline in students at two-year public schools. There remains a wide gap between men and women enrolled in college, with men comprising just 42.9% of the student population this fall." Our population in Rhode Island is most likely to attend a two year public institution. Although the tuition at the school is unchanged from the previous year, the employment situation is greatly improved, with the expected result that many students will prefer competitive employment. In measurement C overall results are improved over FFY 2013 by 3%. The improvement in measure C results from increases in competitive employment augmented by increases in short term secondary education and other employment.

Was sampling used? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Post School Outcomes in detail

Please see **Indicator 14 Supporting Detail Graphs** document for relevant graphs which illustrate the discussion below.

Outcomes by Gender (Figure 1)

As seen in Figure 1, Post-School Outcomes by Gender, the only significant difference between male and female leavers is between enrolled in higher education and competitive employment. Females were enrolled in higher education more than males, 40% compared to 25% and males were leading in competitive employment at 43% compared to 32% for females. These results reflect the Wall Street Journal report that males comprise only 42.9% of the student population. Our population is 65% male, 35% female. The relatively larger number of females engaged in higher education is a reflection of both the makeup of the population and national trends. The not engaged rate for males and females is modest, 15% for females and 16% for males. In numbers, there are 77 males and 40 females who are not engaged. For those students categorized as engaged in "Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training", of the 43 students, 53 are male and 24 are female.

Outcomes by Disability (Figure 2)

Across the four disability categories, enrollment in higher education ranged from 33-34% of youth in the specific learning disability and all other disabilities categories to 4% of youth with intellectual disability. Competitive employment percentage was highest for both youth with specific learning disability (44%) and those with emotional disturbance (44%). Twenty-four percent of youth with intellectual disabilities were competitively employed, an increase of 2% over last year. The percentage of students enrolled in other postsecondary education or training was highest for youth with intellectual disabilities (37%) and lowest for students with specific learning disability (6%). The percentage of youth in some other employment was low for students with specific learning disability (4%) and all other disabilities (3%). "Some other employment" was higher for students with emotional disturbance (7%) and Intellectual disability (20%).

Students with emotional disturbance increased in both enrollment in higher education and competitive employment on a percentage basis from the previous year. Measurement B statistics for this group in 2009-10 were 40%; in 2010-11 the corresponding statistic is 58%; in 2013-14 the statistic has risen to 77%. In 2010-11 Rhode Island established a student behavioral health network focused on improving interventions and support to teachers and students. The network appears to have helped improve the involvement rate of students with emotional disabilities. In the February 2013 reporting for students who graduated in 2010-11, the not engaged rate was 33%; for students who graduated in 2013-14, the not engaged rate has dropped to 18%, a 4% decrease from 2012-13.

Of the 117 youth classified as not engaged, 46 were youth with SLD, 15 youth with ED, 8 youth with ID, and 22 all other disabilities. The percentage of ID students who are not engaged is close to the overall not engaged rate (16% ID, 15% total population). A significantly larger percentage of ID students were enrolled in postsecondary training that is not at the higher education level.

Life skills teachers who work with students with intellectual disabilities continue to report that these students are often engaged and increasing involvement in community based opportunities and increased integrated trial work experiences. Thirty-seven percent of this group is engaged in other post secondary training/education compared to a state average of ten percent.

Youth with specific learning disabilities fare best of the disability categories. They have the second largest representation in higher education (33%), the largest percentage representation in competitive employment (44%), and the smallest percentage of youth who are not engaged (12%). They are also the largest group numerically.

Outcomes by Ethnicity (Figure 3)

Figure 3 presents the outcome for Rhode Island leavers by ethnicity. Of note on this figure are the three major ethnic groups represented in the state; White, African American and Hispanic which represent 96% of the respondents in the outcome data. Of note on this figure are the higher than state average of African American and Hispanic leavers who are not engaged; 18% and 19% respectively compared to the state average of 15%. Also of concern is the lower than state average of African American leavers enrolled in higher education; 23% compared with the state average of 30%. Those students reported as Two or More races have only 22% of students enrolled in higher education. However the population is small; the actual number of such students enrolled in higher education in 2013-14 is 4 compared to an enrollment of 3 in 2012-13. Hispanic students enroll in higher education at a somewhat higher rate, 27%, that is still 3% below the state average. It should be noted that in the general population minority students are less likely to engage in higher education, In particular, Rhode Island's results are consistent with the Census Bureau report that Hispanic college enrollment stopped growth in 2013.

In 2013-14 both African American and Hispanic leavers were not engaged at a substantially higher rate than the general population (18% and 19% respectively compared to an overall non engaged rate of 15%). However, the percentage of not engaged African-Americans fell 9% (from 27% to 18%) and the percentage of not engaged Hispanics dropped 5% (from 24% to 19%).

By actual count, 27 non-Hispanic blacks, 34 Hispanic/Latinos, and 91 white youth were not engaged. The count of students who were not engaged and who fell in all other race/ethnic categories combined is 7. In terms of numbers of individuals not engaged, the largest group is of white leavers, for they are, in fact, the predominant racial group in the survey.

Outcomes by Exit Type (Figure 4)

As seen in Figure 4, Outcomes by Exit Type, the percentage of youth enrolled in higher education ranged from, 34% who exited with a High School Diploma to 2-3% of youth who dropped out or aged out. Fifty percent of students who received a certificate went on to some higher education, probably at an open enrollment institution. However, this group is small (18 students).Of the 66 Students who aged out, 18 (27%) were not engaged. Compared to the 35% non-engagement rate of 2012-13 this is an 8% improvement. However, 25 of the 2013-14 students (38%) were enrolled in some form of postsecondary training. Students who reached maximum age are clearly more engaged this year than last.

Dropouts (30 of 57) are most likely to be in the competitive workplace. A single student was in the higher education category and 5 received some other training.The remaining 21 dropouts (44%) are not engaged at this time.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥				45.00%	45.00%	47.00%		49.00%	50.00%	51.00%
Data		42.00%		39.13%	41.00%	100%	100%	80.00%	54.55%	57.14%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	10	9
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	19	15

Explanation of Alternate Data

The original submission of the number of resolution sessions and number of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements submitted through Ed Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS) was incorrect. The correct data was re-submitted and will be updated in the system.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
9	15	57.14%	52.00%	60.00%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			58.00%	59.00%	100%	61.00%	62.00%	70.00%	75.00%	86.00%
Data		79.00%	80.00%	84.00%	80.00%	69.80%	66.10%	88.46%	84.91%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	87.00%	88.00%	89.00%	90.00%	91.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	n
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	34	33
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1 Mediations held	42	null

Explanation of Alternate Data

The original submission of the number of resolution sessions submitted through Ed Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS) was incorrect. A ticket number was issued and the correct data was re-submitted. Data will be updated on May 9, 2016.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
1	33	42	100%	87.00%	80.95%

Explanation of Slippage

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

In FFY 2014 the Rhode Island Department of Education did not meet its target goal of 87.00%. RIDE missed the goal by 6.05 percentage points. Rhode Island's Department of Education had 57 requests for mediation in the 2014/2015 fiscal year. Upon completion of mediation, 34 resulted in agreements, one being related to a due process complaint. During mediation or upon completion, 8 were unresolved. 15 requests for mediation were withdrawn after being assigned to a mediator and prior to holding a mediation meeting due to lack of parent contact, conflict resolution and/or parent requests to withdraw.

Out of the 8 mediations that were unresolved, 2 were due to parents not showing up to the scheduled meeting and then refused contact. 3 unresolved mediations were due to parents not agreeing. The remaining 3 mediations were unresolved due to unknown reasons. All unresolved mediations had the potential to work off the table to resolve conflicts in an amicable manner although, outcomes are confidential.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2014

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		6.00%
Data	8.00%	7.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	8.80%	9.80%	10.80%	11.80%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Since the state is revising the baseline due to new assessment tools and data, it will need to adjust the targets to reflect growth from the new baseline. The methods the state used to project the initial targets will be used again, but in relation to the new baseline. With the implementation of new statewide assessment in math (PARCC), RI is anticipating steady increases in the % of Black or Hispanic students with LD scoring Approaching Proficiency or better (3, 4, or 5).

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Overview

Given the high level of access to the general education class and the apparent limited impact of attendance and use of assessment accommodations, it is hypothesized that improving intensive and individualized instruction within a systematic framework of culturally and linguistically responsive supports for students with disabilities, particularly elementary Grades 3-5 Hispanic and Black children with specific learning disabilities in urban settings, will improve their performance on State assessments of math by 2% by 2018. As Rhode Island has moved from the NECAP to the PARCC please see **baseline, target, and SIMR update attachment**.

Review of SPP/APR data supports the identification of this area as a potential SiMR. RI has had some of the larger proficiency gaps for 4th and 8th grade children with disabilities on regular statewide assessments compared to states in the region. In reading, the proficiency gap for students with disabilities was 40% which was the second largest percentage point gap in the region. Likewise in math, the proficiency gap was 40% which was the third largest gap in the region. On Indicator 3 (2012-13), students with disabilities missed proficiency targets in both reading and math for 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades. Performance on math is consistently lower.

A focus on data has been a strength but challenges are noted in fidelity of implementation and scale up across districts in initiatives designed to support academic achievement of children with disabilities.

Initiatives such as the Race to the Top Data Use training, data analysis meetings through the School Support System, National Center for Intensive Interventions Data-based Individualization protocols in a structured monthly meeting with onsite coaching, annual data review as part of the Consolidated Resource Plan for federal programs and IDEA Performance reports, the ESEA waiver data dashboard and transformation plan with ongoing district and school data review plus technical assistance from the Office of Transformation staff, ELL ACCESS Growth Data and LADDER training, the SPDG Multitier System of Support technical assistance and training are current and recent initiatives related to this potential SiMR. IDEA data is connected to all these initiatives. IDEA staff lead or participate and collaborate in these initiatives.

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The commitment of the IDEA Part B resources will support the continued building of infrastructure to support the SSIP. Specific investments in Part B discretionary funds over the past several years have laid important groundwork for supporting the SSIP. In the past years, State level IDEA Part B funds have been used to support the development and sustainability of the Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) initiative, the RI Response to Intervention initiative (PBIS and RTI now merged in the State Personnel Development Grant as the RI Multi-Tiered Systems of Support – MTSS initiative), the development of assistive technology and instructional intervention initiatives such as the work in RI schools with the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII). Collectively, these investments have laid important groundwork for the emerging work of the SSIP. Statewide scale up of databased individualization for students with disabilities will ensure equitable distribution of the resources. In addition, MTSS work is open to all districts in RI.

Achievement gaps by race and disability plus lack of trends in the areas of attendance, assessment accommodations, region, LEA type, access to general education, grade level, and compliance data helped to confirm the SiMR.

RIDE's strategic plan and leadership and office goals have consistently included closure of the achievement gap for subgroups of students such as students with disabilities and students of Hispanic and/or Black race/ethnicity.

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Please see attachment for data analysis.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Please see the attached document on infrastructure.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

Given the high level of access to the general education class and the apparent limited impact of attendance and use of assessment accommodations, it is hypothesized that improving intensive and individualized instruction within a systematic framework of culturally and linguistically responsive supports for students with disabilities, particularly elementary Grades 3-5 Hispanic and Black children with specific learning disabilities in urban settings, will improve their performance on Statewide assessments of math by 4% by FFY2018 (2018-2019).

Description

Please see baseline, target, and SIMR update attachment.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Please see attached Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State’s capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

[Theory of Action baseline reset](#) Theory of Action baseline reset



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

See attached Implementation Plan (Phase 2)

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

See attached Implementation Plan (Phase 2)

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).

FFY 2014 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

See attached Implementation Plan (Phase 2)

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

See attached Implementation Plan (Phase 2)

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.