

## Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006

### Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

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

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

### Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion

#### Measurement:

**A. Percent = 6% [(3 districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year) divided by (50 districts in the State)] times 100.**

Therefore, 94% of districts in the state have rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities that are **not significantly discrepant** from the mean of all district rates.

**Significantly Discrepant (new): comparison of the risk of a district's special education students to be suspended for more than 10 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 would be considered significantly discrepant. (original definition: one standard deviation above the mean of all districts' suspension rates)**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006	88% of districts in the state will have rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities that are <b>not</b> significantly discrepant from the mean of all district rates.

**Actual Target Data for (2006):**

School Year	# Districts with Significant Discrepancy	Total # of Districts	Percent of Districts with Significant Discrepancy	Percent of Districts NOT Significantly Discrepant
06-07	3	50	6%	94%

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (2006):**

According to the 2005-2006 data collected, five LEAs (14%) were discrepant. The districts submitted action plans for reducing the rate of suspension of children with disabilities. Action plans are monitored through the Consolidated Resource Plan and through onsite School Support Focused Monitoring visits. Activities also included the participation of several districts in the statewide Positive Behavior Intervention and Support Project (PBIS), and SEA interaction with discrepant districts to support district self-analysis and improvement planning. The decrease in the number of districts that are significantly discrepant for suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days is likely explained by the implementation of action plans and participation in the PBIS project.

Additional improvement activities at the state level involved the improvement in the accuracy of discipline data through additional data verification practices.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (2006)**

*[If applicable]*

No revisions at this time