

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B**

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on
FFY18**



PART B DUE February 3, 2020

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Rhode Island has worked diligently to maintain and improve outcomes for students with disabilities. Executive Summary for our Indicators:

Indicator 1: The target graduation rate for the 2017-2018 school year is 66.9%. Using the 4-year cohort, the target was not met however, no slippage occurred from the previous year and remained at 63%. Using the 5-year cohort, at a 70.4% rate, Rhode Island exceeded the target by 3.5 percentage points.

Indicator 2: The target graduation rate for the 2017-2018 school year is 17.7%. For FFY 2018, Rhode Island's dropout rate is 6.48% exceeding the target by 11%.

Indicator 3 : In five years, RI students have transitioned from NECAP to PARCC to RICAT and the SAT's. Thus, the state summative assessments are inconclusive as to the achievement of RI students with IEPs. It is important for parents to gauge their student successes by their daily school work and by formative assessments as well as the state summative results.

Indicators 4a and 4b: There were no districts with a significant discrepancy in rates of suspension of more than 10 days out of school for students with IEPs compared to students without IEPs, including by race/ethnicity. There were no districts that met the "n" size of having at least 10 students with IEPs suspended more than 10 days out of school.

Indicator 5 :The OSCAS and RIDE continue to monitor the improvements in LRE throughout RI schools. At this time, the USDOE requires no action for Indicator #5

Indicator 6: Over the last several years, RIDE has reported a steady increase in the percentage of young children attending and receiving the majority of their special education and related services in regular early childhood programs. Although this year remained stable at 49%, RI has witnessed a 7% increase over the last 5 years. RIDE is equally pleased to report a steady decrease in the percentage of young children attending separate special education classes, separate schools and residential facilities. RI has witnessed a 7.6% decrease over the last 5 years, with a decrease from 13.73% in FFY 2017 to 12.58% in FFY 2018. With support from RIDE, we expect to continue witnessing improvement.

Indicator 7: RI is pleased to report that the FFY 18 data represents the third year where RI moved from the use of Teaching Strategies GOLD to the successful implementation of the COS process as a means of collecting the federally mandated Child Outcomes data. The Rhode Island COS process, which was developed in conjunction with Early Intervention, continues to be supported by the new policies, protocols and professional development to ensure fidelity to a Child Outcomes system that supports both families and all stakeholders. In FFY 2017, RIDE reported on 768 preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs that were assessed using the COS process. Providing both technical assistance and professional development to all districts during FFY2018, RIDE was able to increase the number of children assessed by 43.1%. This significant increase may account for slippage in A1, A2, B2 and C1.

Indicator 8: Parent Involvement: For the first time, the same survey was delivered to parents of students receiving general education and special education. The response group included parents of students with disabilities of every grade level from Pre-Kindergarten to 12th grade and was representative of the state population of students with disabilities for gender, race/ethnicity and English language learner (ELL) status. A total of 24,688 surveys were sent to all parents. The response rate substantially increased from spring 2018 (2,936 responses) to 2019 (5,074 responses) from parents of students with IEPs for an overall return rate of approximately 17%. Of the surveys submitted, 83.4% were completed online and 16.6% were returned by paper. The number of respondent parents who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities was 2,068. The percent of respondent parents who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities divided by the total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities, times 100, totals the Indicator 8 percentage of 32.09%.

Indicator 9: One district was found to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification of children with disabilities by race/ethnicity under all disabilities reported for Indicator 9.

Indicator 10: No districts were found to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification in discrete disability categories.

Indicator 11: The Special Education Initial Evaluation System is on eRIDE and every local education agency must enter their data through this system. All children with parental consent for an initial evaluation to determine eligibility for special education services must be reported on this system. The purpose of this system is to ensure that all children for whom parental consent to evaluate, were evaluated within 60 calendar days (not business days) as stated under Regulation 300.301 of Rhode Island's Regulations Governing The Education Of Children With Disabilities. FFY2018 rate of compliance was 99.35% an increase of .14 from the prior year of FFY2017 when the rate of compliance was 99.21%

Indicator 12: Although Rhode Island did not meet 100% compliance, the FFY 2018 data once again represents a very high percentage 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. RI is pleased to report 98.4% compliance.

Indicator 13: For FFY 2018, Rhode Island has a 99.98% compliance rate, improved over the 98.21% compliance baseline established in FFY 2009. Indicator 13 continues to demonstrate solid and continuous improvement in both compliance and quality.

Indicator 14: For FFY 2018, although Rhode Island did not meet measurement targets for Indicator 14, Measurement A increased by 3.02% which may be a potential reason for the slippage in Measurement B and slight slippage in Measurement C. Survey response and engagement rate remain

consistent with the previous year which has reflected stronger survey efforts and improved implementation of postschool outcome strategies and evidenced based practices.

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 2018 there were 11 resolution sessions in which 6 of were resolved through settlement agreements. The FFY 2018 target was 56% and the FFY 2018 data percentage is 54.55% thus resulting in "slippage."

Indicator 16: The percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. In FFY 2018 the Rhode Island Department of Education received 40 requests for mediation. Out of the 40 requests for mediation, 27 mediations were held. Out of those 27 mediations, 25 resulted in agreements, 1 being related to due process complaints. The FFY 2018 target was 91%. The FFY 2018 actual data percentage is 92.59% resulting in "No slippage."

Indicator 17: FFY 2019 target is 11.8%. 1.3% of Black or Hispanic students with learning disabilities in Grades 3–5 met or exceeded expectations on the RICAS mathematics assessment in 2019. Although this represents a 0.2 percentage point increase from 2018, it does not meet the target of 11.8% on the SiMR. With last year's new baseline of 1%, performance for the SiMR population continues to be an area of significant need. The State engaged in technical assistance activities in 19 schools in 9 districts, representing sites from 3 cohorts. A leadership PLC occurs in addition to other training and coaching activities to support changes in systems and adult behaviors driven by site-based needs assessments and improvement plans.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

62

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 Differentiated Monitoring: School Support System (SSS)

Rhode Island's Collaborative System of Differentiated Monitoring: School Support System (SSS) incorporates a variety of instruments and procedures that are utilized to ensure performance and compliance with state and federal laws and regulations. The process is an ongoing and focused 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 Differentiated Monitoring: School Support 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 occurs if performance and/or compliance data indicate a need for on-site review, RIDE will initiate such a review. FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR). Upon completion of an 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: www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/SchoolSupportSystem.aspx. In addition, reports for recent on-site visits and support plans are available for public review.

Dispute Resolution Center. 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 preventative approach, the system promotes an understanding that relationships and trust are the core of partnership; that conflict is not a necessary result of differences; 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 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: [hp://www.ride.ri.gov/StudentsFamilies/SpecialEducation/WhenSchoolsandFamiliesDoNotAgree.aspx](http://www.ride.ri.gov/StudentsFamilies/SpecialEducation/WhenSchoolsandFamiliesDoNotAgree.aspx)

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 indicator. 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

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. In addition to the OSCAS staff engaged in technical assistance, OSCAS maintains a number of contracts which deliver technical assistance and training statewide.

Technical Assistance Sources and the Actions the State Took as a Result of the Technical Assistance

Rhode Island (RI) has greatly benefited from a number of technical assistance entities and sources. All of which has informed and shaped our work. RI is part of the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL) Collaborating States Initiative. We have been receiving technical assistance from them throughout the year. This has involved attendance at national meetings, access to resources and consultants regarding Social and Emotional Learning (SEL). Research shows that students with SEL instruction have less discipline problems including suspension. The State has hosted SEL Community of Practice meetings to share information and highlight effective practices taking place throughout the state. The State has developed a statewide SEL Advisory Committee and a list serve for SEL to continue to share information and keep districts up to date on the latest SEL news and research

RI has also received technical assistance from NCSI through the cross state learning collaborative monthly virtual meetings plus face to face meetings 2x a year. We've also participated in technical assistance with NCII and will continue to do so in upcoming years regarding data-based individualization and delivery of intensive instruction for children with persistent academic and behavioral needs. We're participants in CEEDAR technical assistance with a focus on special education teacher prep programs. As a result, we're redesigning our approach to build coaching capacity in schools in districts, improving capacity to implement intensive math instruction for children with disabilities through targeted technical assistance to schools, and supporting higher education teacher preparation programs to revise syllabi in special education preparation programs. Additional technical assistance comes from the IDEA Data Center which helps districts identify the root cause of disproportionality.

Rhode Island's 619 Coordinator sits on the Executive Council of NASDSE's 619 Affinity Group. The Executive Council, through NASDSE, coordinates in an ongoing way with OSEPs Early Childhood technical assistance partners, including Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) and the Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC). Rhode Island has benefited from such collaboration, especially in the areas of data quality and infrastructure of the early childhood systems. We will also participate in NASDE's legal and regulatory group which plans to meet later in the 2019 year. This group encourages cross state dialogue on regulatory systems and best practice structures.

Further, the State receives technical assistance from the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) to support the improvement of secondary transition indicators. The State has participated in NTACT webinars, one to one consultation and attended at the National Capacity Building Institute. The State has received direct technical assistance from NTACT on the implementation of evidenced based practices to increase post-school outcomes for youth on IEPs (particularly Indicator 14) resulting in the development of a 'Transition Gradebook' to support data collection and tracking at the district level. The State continues to receive technical assistance on both the compliance and quality of secondary IEPs (Indicator 13) resulting in the continued implementation of an Indicator 13 rubric to measure IEP quality. The State has also received technical assistance from two other states regarding the collaboration of special education and career and technical education to support student's post school outcomes well as increased access and opportunity. The State has also received direct technical assistance from the Pacer Center and the University of Oklahoma to support increased parent engagement at the secondary level resulting in the development of an annual Transition Parent 101 Conference, inclusion of parent representation on district teams at the RI Statewide Transition Institute as well as increased parent training on secondary IEPs.

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 had a sufficient supply of qualified teachers for many years. There are currently no significant 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, EL teachers and occasionally teachers for low incidence disability populations. . In 2005, RIDE launched an aggressive effort to recruit and certify an adequate number of teachers of the visually impaired 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 Sherlock 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: [hp://www.ride.ri.gov/TeachersAdministrators/EducatorCer?caon.aspx](http://www.ride.ri.gov/TeachersAdministrators/EducatorCer?caon.aspx).

Stakeholder Involvement

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

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 RISEAC 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: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx> 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: http://www.eride.ri.gov/SPED_PublicReporting/

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 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 2017 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 2017 APR in 2019, 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. All indicators are a part of this reporting. <http://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx> and http://www.eride.ri.gov/SPED_PublicReporting/

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2018 and 2019 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2019 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Rhode Island (RI) has greatly benefited from a number of technical assistance entities and sources. All of which has informed and shaped our work. Rhode Island is part of the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL) Collaborating States Initiative. We have been receiving technical assistance from them throughout the year. This has involved attendance at national meetings, access to resources and consultants regarding Social and Emotional Learning (SEL). Research shows that students with SEL instruction have less discipline problems including suspension. The State has hosted SEL Community of Practice meetings to share information and highlight effective practices taking place throughout the state. The State has developed a statewide SEL Advisory Committee and a list serve for SEL to continue to share information and keep districts up to date on the latest SEL news and research Rhode Island has also received technical assistance from NCSI through the cross state learning collaborative monthly virtual meetings plus face to face meetings 2x a year. We've also participated in technical assistance with NCII and will continue to do so in upcoming years regarding data based individualization and delivery of intensive instruction for children with persistent academic and behavioral needs. We're participants in CEEDAR technical assistance with a focus on special education teacher prep programs. As a result, we're redesigning our approach to build coaching capacity in schools in districts, improving capacity to implement intensive math instruction for children with disabilities through targeted technical assistance to schools, and supporting higher education teacher preparation programs to revise syllabi in special education preparation programs. Additional technical assistance comes from the IDEA Data Center which helps districts identify the root cause of disproportionality. Rhode Island's 619 Coordinator sits on the Executive Council of NASDSE's 619 Affinity Group. The Executive Council, through NASDSE, coordinates in an ongoing way with OSEPs Early Childhood technical assistance partners, including Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) and the Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC). Rhode Island has benefited from such collaboration, especially in the areas of data quality and infrastructure of the early childhood systems. We will also participate in NASDSE's legal and regulatory group which plans to meet later in the 2019 year. This group encourages cross state dialogue on regulatory systems and best practice structures. Further, the State receives technical assistance from the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) to support the improvement of secondary transition indicators. The State has participated in NTACT webinars, one to one consultation and attended at the National Capacity Building Institute. The State has received direct technical assistance from NTACT on the implementation of evidenced based practices to increase post-school outcomes for youth on IEPs (particularly Indicator 14) resulting in the development of a 'Transition Gradebook' to support data collection and tracking at the district level. The State continues to receive technical assistance on both the compliance and quality of secondary IEPs (Indicator 13) resulting in the continued implementation of an Indicator 13 rubric to measure IEP quality. The State has also received technical assistance from two other states regarding the collaboration of special education and career and technical education to support student's post school outcomes well as increased access and opportunity. The State has also received direct technical assistance from the Pacer Center and the University of Oklahoma to support increased parent engagement at the secondary level resulting in

the development of an annual Transition Parent 101 Conference, inclusion of parent representation on district teams at the RI Statewide Transition Institute as well as increased parent training on secondary IEPs. 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, EL 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 Sherlock Center at Rhode Island 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>. Rhode Island's SSIP is ongoing in its efforts. It will be submitted on April 1, 2020. This submission will include the SSIP prior FFY required actions.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2018 and 2019 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 20, 2019 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target.

Intro - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

OSEP notes that one or more of the attachments included in the State's FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	58.70%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	61.90%	62.90%	63.90%	64.90%	65.90%
Data	59.22%	59.98%	67.57%	59.38%	62.98%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	66.90%	67.90%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 RISEAC 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:

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	1,043

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	1,672
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	62.38%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,043	1,672	62.98%	66.90%	62.38%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

If extended, provide the number of years

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

The Rhode Island Diploma System: Preparing all students for success in college, careers, and life
 Rhode Island has implemented a statewide diploma system to ensure access for all middle and high school students to rigorous, high quality, personalized learning opportunities and pathways. The awarding of a high school diploma 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. 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.

The Diploma System:

- *Supports multiple viable pathways toward a high school diploma including career and technical education and blended or online learning.
- *Provides each student with individual learning plans and a personalized learning environment to help them succeed.
- *Provides multiple opportunities and measures for students to demonstrate proficiency and graduation readiness.
- *Promotes an aligned system of state and local policies.

Regulations and Guidance :

The Council on Elementary and Secondary Education 2016 Secondary Regulations set the framework for implementing the RI Diploma System. These regulations require all school districts to develop and implement a comprehensive secondary diploma system for middle and high schools that includes: student and teacher supports, local aligned policies, multiple learning opportunities for all students, and multiple measures for determining graduation readiness. These regulations reflect key design elements and principles that have been identified since the 2003 secondary school regulations including: proficiency-based graduation requirements; comprehensive supports to students including literacy, numeracy, and personalization; common planning time and professional development support for teachers. Two key concepts permeate the Regulations: proficiency and personalization.

These concepts reflect the beliefs that:

- 1) All students must attain an acceptable level of academic achievement in each of the six core academic areas, integrated with applied learning skills in order to be successful in college and careers; and
- 2) Effective instructional delivery demands an understanding of the needs of each individual student and supports that will help students attain at least the minimum level of proficiency.

*The Council on Elementary and Secondary Education Secondary School Regulations - February 2015 (Regulations in effect through the graduating class of 2020.)

*The Council on Elementary and Secondary Education Secondary School Regulations - October 2016 (Regulations go into effect July 1, 2017 for the graduating class of 2021.) Graduation requirements are set at a level to provide students the skills and knowledge to successfully enter and complete a rigorous post-secondary academic or technical program, join the military, and/or obtain a job that leads to a rewarding and viable career. The Rhode Island Council on Elementary and Secondary Education, through the Secondary School Regulations set the minimum requirements for earning a RI high school diploma, including:

*Rhode Island's Board of Education adopted the state's most innovative and collaborative strategic plan yet, 2020 Vision for Education: RI's Strategic Plan for PK-12 & Adult Education, 2015-2020. In the spirit of adopting the values and tenets of this strategic plan, RIDE has aligned our Secondary School Regulations and high school graduation requirements to be even more supportive of RI's vision for successful graduates of our schools.

Secondary School Regulations Revision Process:

*Demonstrated proficiency in 6 core areas (English Language Arts, math, science, social studies, the Arts and technology)

*Successful completion of 20 courses (at a minimum)

*Completion of 2 performance assessments (exhibitions, portfolios and/or comprehensive course assessments)*Districts are required to communicate specific graduation expectations to families and students by October 1 of the ninth grade, or upon entrance or transfer to the school district.

*The Secondary School Regulations strive to increase and improve equitable learning opportunities for every student through personalization, graduation by proficiency, and multiple pathways. All learning experiences should be facilitated in a way that allows students to find relevance and applicability to their own life, interests, and / or previous knowledge. Students should have opportunities for choice in how, when, and in what ways they learn and demonstrate their learning. Learning opportunities should be diverse, rigorous, and connected to the world outside the school. By ensuring that

learning is relevant, students are more likely to find joy in the learning process and want to continue to learn throughout their lives. Further, by learning how to make well-informed decisions in the secondary grades, students will be more adept at advocating for themselves as adult learners and citizens. As part of the revised diploma system outlined in the Secondary School Regulations, the Council Designations serve as a means to personalize the diploma. Each Council Designation externally validates achievements of high school students, through flexible and personalized high school learning experiences, to allow public recognition of specific skills and to incentivize students to meet additional high standards beyond those needed to earn a high school diploma. The following three Council Designations have been adopted by the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education and will be made available to students who meet the defined criteria for each, beginning with the graduating class of 2021: The Commissioner's Seal Council Designation certifies that a student is proficient in standards aligned to high school expectations in English Language Arts and Mathematics, as confirmed by external evidence. The Seal of Biliteracy Council Designation certifies that a student has demonstrated skill in the use of the English language and one or more other world languages. The Pathway Endorsement Council Designation certifies that a student has accomplished deep learning in a chosen area of interest and is prepared for employment or further education in a career path.

*These minimum requirements are in effect through the graduating class of 2020.

*Districts may include additional expectations or requirements such as additional coursework requirements or community service learning.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Baseline for the percent of students in special education graduating with a regular high school diploma as established in 2007 APR at 55.9%. The target graduation rate for the 2017-2018 school year is 66.9%. Using the 4 year cohort, the target was not met, however, no slippage is reported from the previous year. Using the 5 year cohort at 70.4% graduation rate, Rhode Island exceeds the target by 3.5% percentage points. Additionally, the 2017-18 5 year graduation rate showed an increase of 2.7% from the 2016-17 school year with both years exceeding the four year target. Given the opportunity of a fifth year, more students with IEPs are graduating with a diploma. The Rhode Island High School regulations speak to the need for schools to create alternative pathways for students to meet 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 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.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	27.11%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	22.70%	21.70%	20.70%	19.70%	18.70%
Data	17.15%	15.74%	12.03%	7.33%	8.19%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	17.70%	16.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 RISEAC 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: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx> 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: http://www.eride.ri.gov/SPED_PublicReporting/

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	985
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	100
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	108
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	83
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	5

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
83	1,281	8.19%	17.70%	6.48%	Met Target	No Slippage

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

XXX

If yes, provide justification for the changes below.

XXX

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

XXX

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

XXX

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

XXX

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

For purposes of this collection, a dropout is defined as a student who:

- *Student was enrolled in school at some time during the school year and was not enrolled on October 1 of the following school year, or
- *Student was not enrolled on October 1 of the school year although was expected to be in membership (i.e., was not reported as a dropout the year before), and
- *Student has not graduated from high school or completed a state or district–approved educational program, a
- *Student did not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: *
- *Transfer to another public school district, private school, or state– or district–approved educational program;
- *Temporary school–recognized absence due to suspension or illness; or death.
- *Left school without diploma or other certification after passing age up to which the district was required to provide a free, public education.
- *Is gone; status is unknown.
- *Moved to another district in this or some other state, not known to be in school.
- *Is in an institution that is NOT primarily academic (military, possibly Job Corps, corrections, etc.) and does not offer a secondary education program.
- *Is NOT in school but known to be ill, NOT verified as legitimate.
- *Is NOT in school but known to be suspended or expelled and their term of suspension or expulsion is over.
- *Is NOT in school but known to be expelled with NO option to return.
- *Is in a nontraditional education setting, such as hospital/homebound instruction, residential special education, correctional institution, community or technical college where the program is classified as adult education that is not approved, administered or tracked by a regular school district

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The target dropout rate for the 2017-2018 school year is 17.7%. For FFY 2018, Rhode Island's dropout rate is 6.48% exceeding the target by 11%.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Grade 3	X										
B	Grade 4		X									
C	Grade 5			X								
D	Grade 6				X							
E	Grade 7					X						
F	Grade 8						X					
G	Grade 11									X		
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3	2005	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
A	Grade 3		Actual	98.14%	90.38%	95.59%	96.13%	94.51%
B	Grade 4	2005	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
B	Grade 4		Actual	98.46%	90.02%	94.83%	96.84%	96.13%
C	Grade 5	2005	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

C	Grade 5		Actual	99.28%	91.03%	95.41%	95.24%	96.86%
D	Grade 6	2005	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
D	Grade 6		Actual	99.30%	86.62%	94.62%	96.28%	96.77%
E	Grade 7	2005	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
E	Grade 7		Actual	98.67%	86.43%	94.33%	94.72%	96.22%
F	Grade 8	2005	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
F	Grade 8		Actual	98.10%	83.23%	91.64%	94.20%	94.87%
G	Grade 11	2005	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
G	Grade 11		Actual	92.55%	70.45%	85.48%	88.06%	88.10%
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3	2005	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
A	Grade 3		Actual	98.01%	90.57%	95.42%	96.26%	95.17%
B	Grade 4	2005	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
B	Grade 4		Actual	98.46%	90.55%	94.65%	96.72%	96.62%
C	Grade 5	2005	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
C	Grade 5		Actual	99.28%	91.59%	95.13%	95.49%	97.65%
D	Grade 6	2005	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
D	Grade 6		Actual	99.17%	86.53%	94.57%	96.22%	97.01%
E	Grade 7	2005	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
E	Grade 7		Actual	98.74%	86.69%	93.91%	94.67%	96.68%
F	Grade 8	2005	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
F	Grade 8		Actual	97.78%	82.85%	91.10%	93.20%	94.89%
G	Grade 11	2005	Target >=	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
G	Grade 11		Actual	94.18%	72.04%	89.15%	96.47%	87.02%
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					

L			Target >=				
L			Actual				

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 4	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade 5	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	D >=	Grade 6	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	E >=	Grade 7	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	F >=	Grade 8	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	G >=	Grade 11	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Grade 3	100.00%	100.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 4	100.00%	100.00%
Math	C >=	Grade 5	100.00%	100.00%
Math	D >=	Grade 6	100.00%	100.00%
Math	E >=	Grade 7	100.00%	100.00%
Math	F >=	Grade 8	100.00%	100.00%
Math	G >=	Grade 11	100.00%	100.00%
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 RISEAC 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: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx> 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: http://www.eride.ri.gov/SPED_PublicReporting/

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	1,861	1,664	1,654	1,774	1,725	1,733			1,389		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	996	705	730	925	952	980			449		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	713	806	751	678	562	530			660		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	121	126	154	129	142	131			129		

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	1,861	1,664	1,660	1,774	1,731	1,735			1,389		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	592	313	383	589	665	775			446		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1,124	1,194	1,098	1,014	850	749			651		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	121	125	155	129	142	131			129		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	1,861	1,830	94.51%	100.00%	98.33%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B	Grade 4	1,664	1,637	96.13%	100.00%	98.38%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C	Grade 5	1,654	1,635	96.86%	100.00%	98.85%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
D	Grade 6	1,774	1,732	96.77%	100.00%	97.63%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
E	Grade 7	1,725	1,656	96.22%	100.00%	96.00%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
F	Grade 8	1,733	1,641	94.87%	100.00%	94.69%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
G	Grade 11	1,389	1,238	88.10%	100.00%	89.13%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Grade 3	XXX
B	Grade 4	XXX
C	Grade 5	XXX
D	Grade 6	XXX
E	Grade 7	XXX
F	Grade 8	XXX
G	Grade 11	XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	1,861	1,837	95.17%	100.00%	98.71%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B	Grade 4	1,664	1,632	96.62%	100.00%	98.08%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C	Grade 5	1,660	1,636	97.65%	100.00%	98.55%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
D	Grade 6	1,774	1,732	97.01%	100.00%	97.63%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
E	Grade 7	1,731	1,657	96.68%	100.00%	95.73%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
F	Grade 8	1,735	1,655	94.89%	100.00%	95.39%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
G	Grade 11	1,389	1,226	87.02%	100.00%	88.26%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Grade 3	XXX
B	Grade 4	XXX
C	Grade 5	XXX
D	Grade 6	XXX
E	Grade 7	XXX
F	Grade 8	XXX
G	Grade 11	XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

The state has reported the number of children with disabilities who have participated in the regular assessment with accommodations here <https://reportcard.ride.ri.gov/201819/StateAssessments> when using the dropdown menu entitled "View Performance and Participation By:" and choose "Students with Disabilities."

Additionally, this information can be found on this website: <https://lms.backpack.education/public/ride> when you click on interactive reports in the upper left hand of the screen, choose a test, choose the subgroup special education.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2019 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2017, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2018.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

<https://lms.backpack.education/public/ride>

When clicking on this link, in the upper left hand corner there are two tabs: one named "Quick Reports," and one named "Interactive Reports." Click on "Interactive Reports." Once there you can choose the test you would like to view and the subgroup "Special Education." Finally, click "View Results" in the green box on the right side of the screen to view how many children with disabilities participated and how they performed on statewide assessments.

3B - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP's response to the State's FFY 2017 SPP/APR required the State within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2019 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2017, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). The State provided none of the required information.

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

3B - Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2020 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2017, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2019.

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2020 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2018, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2019.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Grade 3	X										
B	Grade 4		X									
C	Grade 5			X								
D	Grade 6				X							
E	Grade 7					X						
F	Grade 8						X					
G	Grade 11									X		
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3	2015	Target >=	39.00%	10.00%	10.50%	14.00%	15.00%
A	Grade 3	11.83%	Actual	33.50%	12.83%	11.83%	14.11%	10.24%
B	Grade 4	2015	Target >=	33.00%	5.00%	5.50%	6.00%	7.00%
B	Grade 4	8.09%	Actual	25.44%	8.19%	8.09%	7.65%	6.80%
C	Grade 5	2015	Target >=	32.00%	4.50%	5.00%	6.00%	8.00%

C	Grade 5	8.51%	Actual	27.34%	7.15%	8.51%	8.47%	4.75%
D	Grade 6	2015	Target >=	27.00%	3.00%	3.50%	4.00%	5.00%
D	Grade 6	6.95%	Actual	30.10%	5.95%	6.95%	7.02%	4.29%
E	Grade 7	2015	Target >=	26.00%	6.00%	6.50%	7.00%	7.50%
E	Grade 7	8.29%	Actual	25.78%	9.19%	8.29%	8.35%	4.11%
F	Grade 8	2015	Target >=	29.00%	5.00%	5.50%	6.00%	6.50%
F	Grade 8	8.39%	Actual	34.61%	8.04%	8.39%	6.60%	5.87%
G	Grade 11	2015	Target >=	27.00%	5.50%	6.00%	7.00%	8.00%
G	Grade 11	7.06%	Actual	47.08%	8.25%	7.06%	7.19%	12.50%
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Grade 3	2015	Target >=	37.00%	12.00%	12.50%	13.00%	14.00%
A	Grade 3	17.27%	Actual	28.20%	14.13%	17.27%	18.30%	10.14%
B	Grade 4	2015	Target >=	32.00%	4.00%	4.50%	5.00%	6.00%
B	Grade 4	9.99%	Actual	25.24%	6.55%	9.99%	7.84%	5.56%
C	Grade 5	2015	Target >=	30.00%	3.50%	4.00%	5.00%	6.00%
C	Grade 5	7.26%	Actual	20.83%	6.18%	7.26%	7.71%	3.27%
D	Grade 6	2015	Target >=	23.00%	2.00%	2.50%	3.00%	4.00%
D	Grade 6	5.99%	Actual	18.68%	5.06%	5.99%	4.57%	2.49%
E	Grade 7	2015	Target >=	21.00%	2.50%	3.00%	4.00%	5.00%
E	Grade 7	7.56%	Actual	19.74%	5.77%	7.56%	6.07%	2.91%
F	Grade 8	2015	Target >=	22.00%	3.00%	3.50%	4.00%	5.00%
F	Grade 8	7.91%	Actual	17.79%	6.35%	7.91%	7.62%	3.45%
G	Grade 11	2015	Target >=	9.00%	2.00%	2.50%	3.00%	4.00%
G	Grade 11	4.83%	Actual	9.36%	4.76%	4.83%	6.53%	3.98%

H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Grade 3	16.00%	17.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 4	9.00%	11.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade 5	9.00%	10.00%
Reading	D >=	Grade 6	8.00%	11.00%
Reading	E >=	Grade 7	9.00%	10.50%
Reading	F >=	Grade 8	9.00%	11.50%
Reading	G >=	Grade 11	9.00%	10.00%
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Grade 3	18.00%	22.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 4	18.00%	30.00%
Math	C >=	Grade 5	8.00%	10.00%
Math	D >=	Grade 6	7.00%	10.00%
Math	E >=	Grade 7	9.00%	13.00%
Math	F >=	Grade 8	9.00%	13.00%
Math	G >=	Grade 11	5.00%	6.00%
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 RISEAC 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: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx> 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: http://www.eride.ri.gov/SPED_PublicReporting/

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	1,830	1,637	1,635	1,732	1,656	1,641			1,238		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	190	43	42	47	28	42			39		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	51	34	34	19	12	23			62		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	20	25	47	20	35	33			40		

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	1,837	1,632	1,636	1,732	1,657	1,655			1,226		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	148	28	35	34	35	28			15		

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	52	36	28	20	13	12			16		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	20	24	26	11	4	11			14		

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	1,830	261	10.24%	16.00%	14.26%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B	Grade 4	1,637	102	6.80%	9.00%	6.23%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C	Grade 5	1,635	123	4.75%	9.00%	7.52%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
D	Grade 6	1,732	86	4.29%	8.00%	4.97%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
E	Grade 7	1,656	75	4.11%	9.00%	4.53%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
F	Grade 8	1,641	98	5.87%	9.00%	5.97%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
G	Grade 11	1,238	141	12.50%	9.00%	11.39%	Met Target	No Slippage
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Grade 3	XXX
B	Grade 4	IN THE PAST FEW YEARS, RI HAS MOVED FROM THE NEW ENGLAND COMMON ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (NECAP) TO THE PARTNERSHIP FOR ASSESSMENT OF READINESS FOR COLLEGE AND CAREERS (PARCC) FOR STATE ASSESSMENT. RHODE ISLAND THEN SWITCHED FROM PARCC TO THE RHODE ISLAND COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (RICAS). THIS IS RI'S SECOND YEAR WITH THE RICAS ASSESSMENT AND THE RAPID ASSESSMENT SYSTEM CHANGES COULD HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE SLIPPAGE.
C	Grade 5	XXX
D	Grade 6	XXX
E	Grade 7	XXX
F	Grade 8	
G	Grade 11	XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 3	1,837	220	10.14%	18.00%	11.98%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B	Grade 4	1,632	88	5.56%	18.00%	5.39%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C	Grade 5	1,636	89	3.27%	8.00%	5.44%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
D	Grade 6	1,732	65	2.49%	7.00%	3.75%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
E	Grade 7	1,657	52	2.91%	9.00%	3.14%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
F	Grade 8	1,655	51	3.45%	9.00%	3.08%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
G	Grade 11	1,226	45	3.98%	5.00%	3.67%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Grade 3	XXX
B	Grade 4	GROUP B SHOWS SLIPPAGE. IN THE PAST FEW YEARS, RI HAS MOVED FROM THE NEW ENGLAND COMMON ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (NECAP) TO THE PARTNERSHIP FOR ASSESSMENT OF READINESS FOR COLLEGE AND CAREERS (PARCC) FOR STATE ASSESSMENT. RHODE ISLAND THEN SWITCHED FROM PARCC TO THE RHODE ISLAND COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (RICAS). THIS IS RI'S SECOND YEAR WITH THE RICAS ASSESSMENT AND THE RAPID ASSESSMENT SYSTEM CHANGES COULD HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE SLIPPAGE.
C	Grade 5	XXX
D	Grade 6	XXX
E	Grade 7	XXX
F	Grade 8	GROUP F SHOWS SLIPPAGE. IN THE PAST FEW YEARS, RI HAS MOVED FROM THE NEW ENGLAND COMMON ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (NECAP) TO THE PARTNERSHIP FOR ASSESSMENT OF READINESS FOR COLLEGE AND CAREERS (PARCC) FOR STATE ASSESSMENT. RHODE ISLAND THEN SWITCHED FROM PARCC TO THE RHODE ISLAND COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (RICAS). THIS IS RI'S SECOND YEAR WITH THE RICAS ASSESSMENT AND THE RAPID ASSESSMENT SYSTEM CHANGES COULD HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE SLIPPAGE.
G	Grade 11	GROUP G SHOWS SLIPPAGE. IN THE PAST FEW YEARS, RI HAS MOVED FROM THE NEW ENGLAND COMMON ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (NECAP) TO THE PARTNERSHIP FOR ASSESSMENT OF READINESS FOR COLLEGE AND CAREERS (PARCC) FOR STATE ASSESSMENT. RHODE ISLAND THEN SWITCHED FROM PARCC TO THE RHODE ISLAND COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (RICAS). THIS IS RI'S SECOND YEAR WITH THE RICAS ASSESSMENT AND THE RAPID ASSESSMENT SYSTEM CHANGES COULD HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE SLIPPAGE.
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
K		XXX
L		XXX

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

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

1.) Assessment Results page on the RIDE website: <http://www.ride.ri.gov/InstructionAssessment/Assessment/AssessmentResults.aspx> and <https://iss.ride.ri.gov/AssessmentResults>

The second link goes to a large excel file that includes subgroups on the tabs.

2.) PARCC Results dashboard: <https://iss.ride.ri.gov/AssessmentResults>

3.) 2015 PARCC results pdf: <http://www.eride.ri.gov/FileExchange/fredDetails.aspx?fileID=33605&download=no>

There is also a 2016 report linked on the Assessment Results page of the RIDE website.

4.) <http://www.ride.ri.gov/InstructionAssessment/Assessment/AlternateAssessments.aspx#3521150-results>

5.) <https://reporting.measuredprogress.org/NECAPpublicRI/>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3C - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

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

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

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	100.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	2.00%	2.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 RISEAC 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: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx> 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: http://www.eride.ri.gov/SPED_PublicReporting/

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

60

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0.00%	2.00%		N/A	N/A

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

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

"Significant discrepancy" is a 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 with IEPs that are suspended greater than 10 days would be considered significantly discrepant.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using FFY17- FFY18 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

No districts had a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs 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 must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

XXX

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- 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))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of 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) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

60

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0	0.00%	0%		N/A	N/A

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

"Significant discrepancy" is a 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 considered significantly discrepant.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

No districts had 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 so there was no review of policies, procedures or practices.

The State DID NOT 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:

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

XXX

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): 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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	82.00%	71.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%
A	65.00%	Data	70.75%	71.05%	69.51%	69.69%	70.11%
B	2005	Target <=	9.50%	14.00%	13.50%	13.00%	12.50%
B	18.00%	Data	11.73%	12.50%	13.17%	12.77%	12.72%
C	2005	Target <=	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%
C	4.50%	Data	6.11%	5.11%	5.63%	5.25%	4.86%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	75.00%	76.00%
Target B <=	12.00%	11.50%
Target C <=	4.00%	3.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 RISEAC 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:

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

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	20,935
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	14,700
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,631
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	878
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	69
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	20

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	14,700	20,935	70.11%	75.00%	70.22%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,631	20,935	12.72%	12.00%	12.57%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	967	20,935	4.86%	4.00%	4.62%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

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

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX
C	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: 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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

Percent = [(# 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 the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	45.50%	46.00%	47.00%	48.00%	49.00%
A	42.72%	Data	42.26%	44.97%	46.96%	48.40%	49.02%
B	2011	Target <=	20.00%	19.00%	18.00%	17.00%	16.00%
B	22.69%	Data	20.17%	18.83%	15.78%	14.78%	13.73%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	50.00%	50.50%
Target B <=	15.00%	12.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 RISEAC 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: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx> 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: http://www.eride.ri.gov/SPED_PublicReporting/

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	3,235
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	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	1,586
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	376
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	31
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,586	3,235	49.02%	50.00%	49.03%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	407	3,235	13.73%	15.00%	12.58%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

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

Provide reasons for slippage for A

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- 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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by ((# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2016	Target >=	75.00%	75.75%	76.50%	80.13%	81.00%
A1	80.13%	Data	75.65%	76.66%	78.35%	80.13%	79.28%
A2	2016	Target >=	57.00%	58.00%	60.00%	48.66%	49.50%
A2	48.66%	Data	57.49%	56.60%	59.57%	48.66%	52.08%
B1	2016	Target >=	76.50%	77.50%	78.00%	68.17%	69.00%
B1	68.17%	Data	77.39%	75.56%	75.22%	68.17%	79.45%
B2	2016	Target >=	61.20%	62.00%	62.50%	38.50%	39.00%
B2	38.50%	Data	60.98%	58.30%	60.00%	38.50%	44.40%
C1	2016	Target >=	74.25%	74.50%	75.00%	86.04%	86.50%
C1	86.04%	Data	67.78%	66.24%	72.08%	86.04%	80.88%
C2	2016	Target >=	64.50%	65.00%	66.00%	55.35%	56.00%
C2	55.35%	Data	61.90%	61.57%	63.14%	55.35%	60.03%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	81.50%	82.00%
Target A2 >=	50.00%	50.50%
Target B1 >=	69.50%	70.00%
Target B2 >=	39.50%	40.00%
Target C1 >=	87.00%	87.50%
Target C2 >=	56.50%	57.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 RISEAC 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: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx> 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: http://www.eride.ri.gov/SPED_PublicReporting/

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

1,099

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	11	1.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	238	21.66%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	318	28.94%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	294	26.75%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	238	21.66%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	612	861	79.28%	81.50%	71.08%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	532	1,099	52.08%	50.00%	48.41%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	3	0.27%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	278	25.30%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	399	36.31%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	343	31.21%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	76	6.92%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	742	1,023	79.45%	69.50%	72.53%	Met Target	No Slippage
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	419	1,099	44.40%	39.50%	38.13%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
program. Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)							

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	5	0.45%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	190	17.29%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	249	22.66%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	327	29.75%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	328	29.85%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the 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.	576	771	80.88%	87.00%	74.71%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
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.	655	1,099	60.03%	56.50%	59.60%	Met Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	FOR OUTCOME A1, THERE WAS AN 8.2% DIFFERENCE FROM THE FFY 2017 DATA. IN RI'S 3RD YEAR OF IMPLEMENTING THE ECO COS PROCESS, RIDE RECOGNIZED THE IMPORTANCE OF WORKING WITH DISTRICTS TO ENSURE THAT ALL ELIGIBLE CHILDREN WERE INCLUDED IN EACH DISTRICT'S REPORTING. IN FFY 2017 RIDE REPORTED 768 PRESCHOOL CHILDREN AGED 3 THROUGH 5 WITH IEPs THAT WERE ASSESSED USING THE COS PROCESS. PROVIDING BOTH TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO ALL DISTRICTS DURING FFY 2018, RIDE WAS ABLE TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN ASSESSED BY 43.1%. THIS SIGNIFICANT INCREASE MAY ACCOUNT FOR THE SLIPPAGE.
A2	FOR OUTCOME A2, THERE WAS A 3.68% DIFFERENCE FROM THE FFY 2017 DATA. IN RI'S 3RD YEAR OF IMPLEMENTING THE ECO COS PROCESS, RIDE RECOGNIZED THE IMPORTANCE OF WORKING WITH DISTRICTS TO ENSURE THAT ALL ELIGIBLE CHILDREN WERE INCLUDED IN EACH DISTRICT'S REPORTING. IN FFY 2017 RIDE REPORTED 768 PRESCHOOL CHILDREN AGED 3 THROUGH 5 WITH IEPs THAT WERE ASSESSED USING THE COS PROCESS. PROVIDING BOTH TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO ALL DISTRICTS DURING FFY 2018, RIDE WAS ABLE TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN ASSESSED BY 43.1%. THIS SIGNIFICANT INCREASE MAY ACCOUNT FOR THE SLIPPAGE.
B1	XXX
B2	FOR OUTCOME B2, THERE WAS A 6.30% DIFFERENCE FROM THE FFY 2017 DATA. IN RI'S 3RD YEAR OF IMPLEMENTING THE ECO COS PROCESS, RIDE RECOGNIZED THE IMPORTANCE OF WORKING WITH DISTRICTS TO ENSURE THAT ALL ELIGIBLE CHILDREN WERE INCLUDED IN EACH DISTRICT'S REPORTING. IN FFY 2017 RIDE REPORTED 768 PRESCHOOL CHILDREN AGED 3 THROUGH 5 WITH IEPs THAT WERE ASSESSED USING THE COS PROCESS. PROVIDING BOTH TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO ALL DISTRICTS DURING FFY 2018, RIDE WAS ABLE TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN ASSESSED BY 43.1%. THIS SIGNIFICANT INCREASE MAY ACCOUNT FOR THE SLIPPAGE.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C1	FOR OUTCOME C1, THERE WAS A 6.18% DIFFERENCE FROM THE FFY 2017 DATA. IN RI'S 3RD YEAR OF IMPLEMENTING THE ECO COS PROCESS, RIDE RECOGNIZED THE IMPORTANCE OF WORKING WITH DISTRICTS TO ENSURE THAT ALL ELIGIBLE CHILDREN WERE INCLUDED IN EACH DISTRICT'S REPORTING. IN FFY 2017 RIDE REPORTED 768 PRESCHOOL CHILDREN AGED 3 THROUGH 5 WITH IEPS THAT WERE ASSESSED USING THE COS PROCESS. PROVIDING BOTH TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO ALL DISTRICTS DURING FFY 2018, RIDE WAS ABLE TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN ASSESSED BY 43.1%. THIS SIGNIFICANT INCREASE MAY ACCOUNT FOR THE SLIPPAGE.
C2	XXX

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Please explain why the State did not include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

If no, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Rhode Island uses the ECO COS process to determine Preschool Outcomes. RI's Child Outcomes Procedures and Protocols, a link to RI's online professional development modules, a family guide and a variety of other forms and resources for educators and families can be found at: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InstructionAssessment/EarlyChildhoodEducation/EarlyChildhoodSpecialEducation/MeasuringChildOutcomes.aspx>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2018 Rhode Island identified the need to ensure that every district reported on all preschool aged children with IEPS using the ECO COS Process. RIDE provided both professional development and technical assistance to all districts and was able to increase the number of children assessed by 43.1%. This significant increase in children assessed may account for RI not meeting all targets and experiencing slippage.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO
If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately?	XXX

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 RISEAC 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: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx> 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: http://www.eride.ri.gov/SPED_PublicReporting/

Historical Data

Baseline	2006	26.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	39.00%	41.00%	43.00%	45.00%	47.00%
Data	41.46%	40.00%	63.37%	61.81%	70.44%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	50.00%	51.00%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,628	5,074	70.44%	50.00%	32.09%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

24,688

Percentage of respondent parents

20.55%

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The total number of responses to the survey increased although slippage resulted due to the number of the responses that reported that schools did not facilitate parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

This was the first year that all parents in Rhode Island received the same survey. Parents then self-reported if they were a parent/guardian of a child with an IEP. The goal of the survey distribution method was to allow for comparable data (families of students with IEPs v. families of students receiving general education services).

Rhode Island calculated the mean score for each respondent, (generally, on the 1-5 strongly disagree/strongly agree scale), excluded participants who didn't respond to any questions, and categorized each respondent as favorable or not based on whether or not their mean score was above 4.0 (an average score of 4 = "agree"). This year's survey content was significantly different than years past and it included 32 questions as opposed to the 7 questions utilized last year.

There were 24,688 students with IEPs. All families had access to the survey.

Of the 24,688 respondents (families of students with and without IEPs):

Subgroup with no data - 501, 2%

Responses from families of students with IEPs - 5,074, 21%

Responses from families of students without IEPs - 19,108, 77%

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 TOTAL response group included parents of students with disabilities of every grade level from Pre-Kindergarten to 12th grade within all districts.

Total number of responses – 24,688 (parents of students receiving special education and parents of students receiving general education).

Please view the the "Family-School Relationship Survey" report in attachments.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Preschool	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
Preschool	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	XXX	XXX
Target B >=	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

The number of School-Age parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

XXX

Percentage of respondent School-Age parents

XXX

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	ride+panorama-results-f8ff9bcf-7d9d-4c37-9c10-944795c7ab4epdf
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

- In order to meet the aforementioned federal reporting requirements, the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) administered a parent survey in Spring 2019 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.”
- Following the survey administration, response data were collected, imported, and analyzed.
- General response group characteristics are summarized below. The response group included parents of students with disabilities of every age group ranging from grades Pre-K in all districts across the state of Rhode Island.
- The response group included parents of students with disabilities of every grade level from Pre-Kindergarten to 12th grade within 61 school districts.
- This year, surveys were not directly mailed or emailed to families. Instead, we incorporated the survey program with the general family survey. Distribution was encouraged and highlighted at the individual school level to all families. Families indicated if they were responding on behalf of a student with an IEP in question 1. This led to a 73% increase from spring 2018 (2,936 responses) to 2019 (5,074 responses) from parents of students with IEPs.
- Each survey included instructions for completing the survey in English, Spanish, and Portuguese. The percentage of paper surveys distributed in English was approximately 84%, the percentage of paper surveys distributed in Spanish was approximately 16%, and those completed in Portuguese was less than 1%.
- In addition to the general response group characteristics detailed above, survey data was disaggregated by the following variables that respondents identified on their surveys: parent race/ethnicity, parent/guardian gender and child gender. These disaggregated variables are summarized below. Notably, this year we did not ask parents whether their child qualified for free or reduced-price lunch or whether they were an English Language Learner due to sensitivity concerns.
- Parent survey responses were received from the following student racial/ethnic groups: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and “Two or more Races.” The percentage of surveys returned by racial/ethnic breakdown are as follows:
 - American Indian or Alaska Native = Less than 1%
 - Asian = 4%
 - Black or African American = 6%
 - Hispanic or Latino = 30%
 - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander = Less than 1%
 - Two or more races = 4%
 - White = 45%
 - No response or blank = 10%
- Respondents indicated that their among their children they were responding on behalf of:
 - 40% are Female
 - 56% are Male
 - 4% are “Prefer not to say/Other”
- Respondents indicated that for their own gender:
 - 78% are Female
 - 18% are Male,
 - 4% are “Prefer not to say/Other”

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Finally, data were categorized based on how parents responded to the items on the survey. The number of respondent parents who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities was 1,628. The total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities was 5,074. The number of respondent parents who reported schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities divided by the total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities multiplied by 100 was 32%.

We calculated the mean score for each respondent, (generally, on the 1-5 strongly disagree/strongly agree scale), excluded participants who didn’t respond to any questions, and categorized each respondent as favorable or not based on whether or not their mean score was above 4.0 (an average score of 4 = “agree”). Please note that this year’s survey content was significantly different than year’s past and it included 32 questions as opposed to the 7 from last year. Therefore, the lower percentage of parents who reported favorably has some context to it and is not just a significant drop from last year.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.85%	1.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

2

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 that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4	1	60	0.00%	0%	1.67%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Changes in district leadership heralded changes in policies, procedures, and practice that adversely impacted identification of children with disabilities in one district.

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Disproportionate Representation is defined as a risk ratio of 2.5 or higher for three consecutive years with a minimum n size of 5 students (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 resource plan including the disproportionality report online, and records of complaints, mediations, and hearings.

Step One: Using the criteria established above, the State determined that 4 school districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation. While some districts did not meet the minimum cell size of 5 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 2 districts (both small, newer charter schools of a limited grade range) were excluded from examining disproportionate representation in special education and related services. There were 62 total districts and 2 were excluded due to cell size size. (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 4 districts identified in step 1 of the FFY2018 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 root cause self-assessment and corresponding evidence documents in the June 2018 and 2019 Disproportionality Report of the Consolidated Resource Plans 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 FFY2018

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 4 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.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

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 4 districts identified in step 1 of the FFY2018 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 root cause self-assessment and corresponding evidence documents in the June 2018 and 2019 Disproportionality Report of the Consolidated Resource Plans 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 FFY2018

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 4 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

9 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the district identified in FFY 2018 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	5.45%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	3.70%	0.00%	1.67%	5.45%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

1

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 that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
7	0	61	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Disproportionate Representation is defined as a risk ratio of 2.5 or higher for three consecutive years with a minimum n size of 5 students (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 resource plan including the disproportionality report online, and records of complaints, mediations, and hearings.

Step One: Using the criteria established above, the State determined that 7 school districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation. While some districts did not meet the minimum cell size of 5 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 1 district (a small, newer charter school of a limited grade range) was excluded from examining disproportionate representation in special education and related services. There were 62 total districts and 1 was excluded due to cell size. (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 7 districts identified in step 1 of the FFY2018 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 root cause self-assessment and corresponding evidence documents in the June 2018 and 2019 Disproportionality Report of the Consolidated Resource Plans 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 FFY2018

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 7 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.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

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 7 districts identified in step 1 of the FFY2018 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 root cause self-assessment and corresponding evidence documents in the June 2018 and 2019 Disproportionality Report of the Consolidated Resource Plans 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 FFY2018

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 7 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
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.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2008	67.86%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.44%	99.56%	99.24%	99.84%	99.21%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4,341	4,313	99.21%	100%	99.35%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

XXX

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

28

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 2018-2019 there were (4341-4313=28) 28 children whose evaluations were not completed within 60 day timeline. These 28 children were included in (a) Number of children for whom parent consent to evaluate was received but not included in (b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days. There were 28 children who did not receive a timely initial evaluation.

The range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed was between 2 and 89 days over the 60 day timeline. 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: 'Child was absent and summer break', 'Child hospitalized', 'Holidays, vacations, scheduling; delay for outsourced evaluation', 'Parent out of country' and 'Teacher error'.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

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

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 2018 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

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	9	0	0

FFY 2017 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 Section 300.301 (c)(1)(i.e. achieved 100%compliance) based upon the 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 in 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 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 evaluation 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, not only those students whose initial evaluation data falls within 100% compliance rate are reported in 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 special education census (statewide data base) and was not reported in the previous year's special education census, is listed on Maintenance Report 42 which captures students who were not reported in the June 2018 special education census and currently in the special education census without an Evaluation Record. This Maintenance Report 42 appears on two separate systems; (1) the current eRIDE special education census, as well as, on the (2) 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 listed on Maintenance Report 42 (by recording the student appropriately on the Special Education Evaluation System) the student will continue to appear on the 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 and 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 Student Missing Data Reports. The system automatically sends emails of 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 to 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

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	60.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.41%	98.94%	99.45%	99.50%	98.87%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	996
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	149
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	798

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.	33
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	3
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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.	798	811	98.87%	100%	98.40%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

13

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

The data below represents the 13 students from 4 LEAs who did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their 3rd birthdays.

- (1) child was delayed 10-20 days due to late referral from EI to the LEA (the child was not found eligible for EI late)
- (3) children were delayed 41-60 days due to late referral from EI to the LEA (the children were not found eligible for EI late)
- (4) children were delayed >60 days due to late referral from EI to the LEA (the children were not found eligible for EI late)

(1) child was delayed <10 days due to delayed consent to evaluate

(1) child was delayed 10-20 days due to child illness

(1) child was delayed >60 days due to limited info from EI

(2) children were delayed >60 days due to scheduling due to parent refusal

Attach PDF table (optional)

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

State monitoring

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 continues to use the Preschool Performance Report, one of the LEA applications for federal funds, to collect data for this indicator. In 2007, an electronic Consolidated Resource Plan (CRP) was developed and implemented. It was specifically designed to collect the number of children whose transition from Part C to Part B was delayed and the reason for those delays. 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 altered 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 monthly basis due to notification requirements and to assist RIDE in identifying students that were found eligible for Part C less than 90 days before their birthday. This data can now be paired with RIDE data and a unique student identifier (SASID) identified. This significantly decreased the necessary effort to identify the children who do not have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays and increased the reliability of the data collected and reported.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	4	1	0

FFY 2017 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 five (5) LEAs identified as out of compliance in the FFY 2017 findings were contacted individually and in writing by the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE). 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. In addition, the Department of Education offered technical assistance to support the districts in identifying the barriers to 100% compliance, recognizing necessary changes in protocol, making use of a tracking form and coordinating with early intervention programs. These corrective action plans were reviewed and approved by the department. RIDE used the data available in the most recent preschool performance report (FFY 2018) to confirm that each district out of compliance in the previous year, is now implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and achieving 100% compliance. According to the FFY 2018 data, four (4) of the five (5) LEAs are correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and have reached 100% compliance. The fifth LEA reached 92% compliance. Although one LEA continues to demonstrate non-compliance in the FFY 2018 data, it must be noted that the data was collected before the hiring of their new Early Childhood Coordinator and therefore prior to the implementation of the new transition protocol. Over the last year, this LEA has worked tirelessly with the Department of Education to improve their transitions from EI. The new coordinator, along with the district's special education director, has created a detailed plan and associated action steps which include changes in protocol, making use of a tracking form and coordinating with early intervention programs. District efforts have been extensive and have led to significant improvements, with verified subsequent correction that 100% of children entering school this year having services implemented by their third birthday. This data was reviewed by the LEA for the period between 7/1/2019 and 12/6/2019 and submitted to RIDE. RIDE will continue to work closely with the LEA to ensure continued success and compliance moving forward.

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

RIDE used the data districts entered in the preschool performance reports to confirm that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected. As reported, nine (9) children in the FFY 2017 were found eligible for Part B but did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their 3 birthdays due to delay factors not allowed by OSEP. The state verified through the data provided in the FFY 2017 preschool performance report that each of these LEAs corrected the individual cases of noncompliance. For any child with whom implementation was not timely, the districts are required to report the specific delay factor and the corresponding length of time until the individual IEPs were implemented. RIDE has verified that each individual case of noncompliance in the 2017 FFY findings were corrected, and that each child, although late, had an IEP developed and implemented.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2016	1	1	0
FFY 2015	1	1	0

FFY 2016

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 four (4) LEAs identified as out of compliance in the FFY 2016 findings were contacted individually and in writing by the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE). 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. In addition, the Department of Education offered technical assistance to support the districts in identifying the barriers to 100% compliance, recognizing necessary changes in protocol, making use of a tracking form and coordinating with early intervention programs. These corrective action plans were reviewed and approved by the department. RIDE used the data available in the FFY 2017 preschool performance report to confirm that each district out of compliance in the previous year, was now implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and achieving 100% compliance. According to the FFY 2017 data, three (3) of the four (4) LEAs were correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and have reached 100% compliance. The fourth LEA reached 99% compliance. Although one LEA continued to demonstrate non-compliance in the FFY 2017 data, it must be noted that the data was collected before the hiring of their new Early Childhood Coordinator and therefore prior to the implementation of the new transition protocol. Over the last year, this LEA has worked tirelessly with the Department of Education to improve their transitions from EI. The new coordinator, along with the district's special education director, has created a detailed plan and associated action steps which include changes in protocol, making use of a tracking form and coordinating with early intervention programs. District efforts have been extensive and have led to significant improvements, with verified subsequent correction that 100% of children entering school this year having services implemented by their third birthday. This data was reviewed by the LEA for the period between 7/1/2019 and 12/6/2019 and submitted to RIDE.

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

RIDE used the data districts entered in the preschool performance reports to confirm that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected. As reported, four (4) children in the FFY 2016 were found eligible for Part B but did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their 3 birthdays due to delay factors not allowed by OSEP. The state verified through the data provided in the FFY 2016 preschool performance report that each of these LEAs corrected the individual cases of noncompliance. For any child with whom implementation was not timely, the districts are required to report the specific delay factor and the corresponding length of time until the individual IEPs were implemented. RIDE has verified that each individual case of noncompliance in the 2016 FFY findings were corrected, and that each child, although late, had an IEP developed and implemented.

FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

FFY 2015

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 three (3) LEAs identified as out of compliance in the FFY 2015 findings were contacted individually and in writing by the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE). 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. In addition, the Department of Education offered technical assistance to support the districts in identifying the barriers to 100% compliance, recognizing necessary changes in protocol, making use of a tracking form and coordinating with early intervention programs. These corrective action plans were reviewed and approved by the department.

RIDE used the data the FFY 2016 preschool performance report to confirm that each district out of compliance in the previous year, was now implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and achieving 100% compliance. According to the FFY 2016 data, two (2) of the three (3) LEAs are correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and have reached 100% compliance. The third LEA reached 99% compliance.

Although one LEA continued to demonstrate non-compliance in the FFY 2016 data, it must be noted that the data was collected before the hiring of their new Early Childhood Coordinator and therefore prior to the implementation of the new transition protocol. Over the last year, this LEA has worked tirelessly with the Department of Education to improve their transitions from EI. The new coordinator, along with the district's special education director, has created a detailed plan and associated action steps which include changes in protocol, making use of a tracking form and coordinating with early intervention programs. District efforts have been extensive and have led to significant improvements, with verified subsequent correction that 100% of children entering school this year having services implemented by their third birthday. This data was reviewed by the LEA for the period between 7/1/2019 and 12/6/2019 and submitted to RIDE.

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

RIDE used the data districts entered in the preschool performance reports to confirm that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected. As reported, three (3) children in the FFY 2015 were found eligible for Part B but did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their 3 birthdays due to delay factors not allowed by OSEP. The state verified through the data provided in the FFY 2015 preschool performance report that each of these LEAs corrected the individual cases of noncompliance. For any child with whom implementation was not timely, the districts are required to report the specific delay factor and the corresponding length of time until the individual IEPs were implemented. RIDE has verified that each individual case of noncompliance in the 2015 FFY findings were corrected, and that each child, although late, had an IEP developed and implemented.

FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: 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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

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) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	98.21%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.93%	99.98%	99.94%	99.96%	99.90%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
5,145	5,146	99.90%	100%	99.98%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

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 monitoring visits 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. 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.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/OSCAS/RI-Secondary-IEP-form_4.pdf)

(See Attachment- Rhode Island IEP Page Item Information reported)

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 NTACTION (formerly NSTAC) 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. See RI IEP Page Item Information document in attachments.

FFY 2018 (2018 - 2019 SY):

For 2018-2019 SY, one record/finding was non-compliant in one or more transition requirements as of June 30, 2019. All records have been brought into compliance as of February 2020. This record/finding was corrected and verified as compliant by RIDE. The one affected district submitted an updated and corrected, compliant IEP for the initially non-compliant IEP. Based on subsequent collection and review for 2018-2019 SY 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 98.21% baseline to more than 99.9% in 2019.

Assessment Tools -

one or more assessment tool listed

on IEP

Yes/no

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

67

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)

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	NO
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	

If no, please explain

Baseline data is only based on youth starting at age 16 to align with federal requirement

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

The five records have been brought into compliance as of February 2019. These records/findings were corrected and verified as compliant by RIDE. The affected two districts were required to submit an updated and compliant IEP for the initially identified non-compliant IEP. Based on subsequent collection and review for FFY 2017 every district is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR 300.320 (b) and achieving 100% compliance.

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

The five records have been brought into compliance as of February 2019. These records/findings were corrected and verified as compliant by RIDE. The affected two districts were required to submit an updated and compliant IEP for the initially identified non-compliant IEP. Based on subsequent collection and review for FFY 2017 every district is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR 300.320 (b) and achieving 100% compliance.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

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

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. 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);
4. 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).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	37.00%	38.00%	39.00%	40.00%	41.00%
A	33.00%	Data	32.27%	30.42%	31.33%	28.43%	29.03%
B	2009	Target >=	71.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%
B	67.00%	Data	68.90%	69.71%	64.70%	70.01%	69.43%
C	2009	Target >=	82.00%	83.00%	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%
C	78.00%	Data	81.51%	84.73%	84.44%	80.49%	79.47%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	42.00%	43.00%
Target B >=	76.00%	77.00%
Target C >=	87.00%	88.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 RISEAC 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: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx> 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: http://www.eride.ri.gov/SPED_PublicReporting/

FFY 2018 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	855
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	274
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	285
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)	47
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).	54

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	274	855	29.03%	42.00%	32.05%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	559	855	69.43%	76.00%	65.38%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
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)	660	855	79.47%	87.00%	77.19%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	RI continues to increase opportunities for youth to access particular pathway programs in high school that partner with postsecondary institutions to foster continued learning in that career pathway. In addition the RI Promise Scholarship that was implemented in 2017 to make it more affordable for youth to pursue a postsecondary credential has also bolstered enrollment to postsecondary. This may be a reason that there was slippage in Measurement B Competitive Employment and an increase in Measurement A Higher Education.
C	Other postsecondary education or training and other employment- Although RI saw a slight slippage of 2% in Measurement C, which excludes higher education, Measurement A increased by 3% from the previous year suggesting that efforts to improve access and pathways to higher education for students with disabilities may be promising.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	transition surveypdf

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

See NPSO Response Calculator regarding Representativeness under Attachments- Use of the NPSO Response Calculator indicates that the response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they exited school. Additionally, post school outcomes by geographic location was also analyzed (see attachment). RI is a small state with the northern and providence regions accounting for 54% of the state's respondent group. The response data is representative of all four geographic regions within the state.

	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	YES

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	11
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	6

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 RISEAC 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: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx> 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: http://www.eride.ri.gov/SPED_PublicReporting/

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	42.00%
----------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%
Data	57.14%	60.00%	75.00%	53.85%	57.14%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	56.00%	57.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
6	11	57.14%	56.00%	54.55%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Rhode Island reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2017. The state is not required to meet its target until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held. During FFY 2018, there were 11 resolution sessions, 6 of which were resolved through settlement agreements. This resulted in a 2.59% slippage from the previous year.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

15 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$ divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	27
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	24

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 RISEAC 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: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx> 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: http://www.eride.ri.gov/SPED_PublicReporting/

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	79.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	86.00%	87.00%	88.00%	89.00%	90.00%
Data	100.00%	80.95%	82.50%	74.07%	85.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	91.00%	92.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1	24	27	85.00%	91.00%	92.59%	Met Target	No Slippage

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Susan Wood, PhD

Title:

Senior Administrator, Quality Assurance Services

Email:

Susan.Wood@ride.ri.gov

Phone:

401-222-8992

Submitted on:

04/29/20 4:15:51 PM