

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2020**

Rhode Island



PART B DUE February 1, 2022

**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: OSEP has revised the calculation method for Indicator 1 reported in the FFY 2022 submission. The indicator was revised to require States to report the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA. Using the section 618 exiting data source for this indicator allows direct focus on the outcomes of students with disabilities who received special education and related services at the time they exited high school based on the same standards and criteria for graduation that students without disabilities are required to meet. Given this change by OSEP, a new baseline and targets have been established with feedback from critical stakeholders and technical assistance of the IDEA Data Center.

Indicator 2: The target dropout rate for the 2019-20 school year is 15.7%. For FFY 2020, Rhode Island's dropout rate is 4.53% exceeding the target by 11%.

Indicator 3: 3a target was not met for participation. 3b targets for proficiency for reading and math (grade level academic achievement standards) were not met. 3c. Proficiency for children (alternate academic achievement standards) target were met or nearly met. 3d. Gaps in proficiency rates (grade level academic achievement standards) were met or nearly met. RI continues to make progress in closing gaps.

Indicator 4: There were 0 LEAs with a significant discrepancy in suspensions greater than 10 days. 0 LEAs met the n size for 4A and 4B.

Indicator 5: Educational Environment. This is the first year (2020) for the change in the measurement to include 5 year olds in kindergarten.

Indicator 6: Although RI had witnessed a significant increase in percentage A and decreases in percentage B over many years, challenges brought on by the pandemic have disrupted this progress. Unfortunately, this year percentage A has seen a 1.91% decrease to 52.69% and percentage B a 1.91% increase to 12.72%. RI also reports .53% of children in 6C, children receiving services in their homes. Through stakeholder input, targets were set to ensure that percentages return to pre-pandemic performance and then continue to improve moving forward.

Indicator 7: FFY 2020 RI continued to use the Child Outcome Summary (COS) process to collect the federally mandated Child Outcomes data. In outcome A, 70.01% of children were identified in summary statement #1 and 45.32% in summary statement #2. In outcome B, 67.42% of children were identified in summary statement #1 and 28.88% in summary statement #2. In outcome C, 69.14% of children were identified in summary statement #1 and 50.98% in summary statement #2. Through stakeholder input, 2020 data was determined to be the new baseline, and targets were set to ensure that percentages continue to improve moving forward.

Indicator 8: 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 2,760. The total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities was 6,602. The calculation for this Indicator is 41.81% which is an increase from FFY 2019 (32.12%). Rhode Island did not meet target (50.25%) for this indicator although, did not have slippage from the previous year.

Indicator 9: No districts were found to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification of children with disabilities by race/ethnicity under all disabilities.

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 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 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. Compliance Rate for FFY2020 was 98.62%.

Indicator 12: Due to the continued challenges associated with the pandemic, RI did not meet 100% compliance, the FFY 2020 data indicates that 93.16% of children referred by Part C and found eligible for Part B had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. The 4.1% decrease from FFY 2018 can be attributed directly to the continued complications of the pandemic, including those attributed to Early Intervention challenges also brought on by the pandemic. RIDE is dedicated to supporting LEAs and our EI partners and increasing compliance with indicator 12.

Indicator 13: For FFY 2020 APR, Rhode Island has a 99.87% 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. Additionally, beginning this school year, stakeholders and LEA personnel discussed OSEP's revision of this indicator, clarifying that there must be evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. As with other monitor procedures we utilize for secondary transition requirements, RIDE will utilize the special education census collection, individual student record reviews and onsite monitoring to ensure that there is evidence of the measurement clarification as required now by OSEP.

Indicator 14: For the FFY 2020 APR, despite slippage in Measures A and Measure B and only 1% slippage in Measure C, RI maintains a stable overall engagement rate that remains higher than the most recent national data for this measure. RIDE has worked diligently with local schools districts to improve response rates providing technical assistance and tools from the National Postschool Outcomes Center. Currently RI's survey response rate is higher than the most recent national median response rate.

Indicator 15: For FFY 2020 the target was 57.25% and the data was 63.64% resulting in slippage but meeting target. The total number Complaints filed in FY2020 was 15 and the number of resolution sessions that were held was 11 (an increase from FFY 2019 which was 7). The number of written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings was 7 (an increase from FFY 2019 which was 3). The total number of due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing) was 13 which positively reflects Rhode Island's ability to collaborate and resolve issues before they go to a formal hearing.

Indicator 16: FFY 2020 the target was 80.00% and the data was 61.29% resulting in slippage and not meeting target. The reason for slippage is that there was an increase in the number of mediations held and thus impacting the calculation for this indicator. There was a positive upward trend in that there was increase in the utilization of the mediation process from the prior fiscal year and this process is the most utilized process in Rhode Island above due process complaints and state complaints. The calculation of this indicator does not incorporate the number of mediation requests that were withdrawn or not held.

Indicator 17: 33% of 8th grade students with disabilities with growth data on the 2021 administration of math statewide assessment demonstrated typical or high growth. This number reflects a new baseline and adjustment to the SIMR.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

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 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, and IDEA Differentiated Monitoring which is called the School Support System (SSS).

Rhode Island's Collaborative System of 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 reviews occur when performance and compliance data indicate a need for on-site review. 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 practices. In addition, the district's 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: <https://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 include: 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; as well as meeting reporting requirements for data and fiscal reporting. Submitting applications for IDEA part B funds and ensuring the appropriate use of the funds in including early intervening services. Partnerships with parent and advocacy organizations: Cosponsoring events and providing assistance with specific request for clarification of regulations and effective strategies to support students with disabilities. Participating on work groups to develop initiatives and grant applications. OSCAS staff serve on over 40 advisory committees statewide. Organizational support and communication (correspondence, web site support, etc.) for: RI State Special Education Advisory Committee (state advisory panel for Part B) RI Vision Services Advisory Board Each member of the OSCAS IDEA team (currently eight full time employees) is assigned to a number of LEAs as the primary contact for technical assistance. Each team member has an area(s) to which they are assigned based on a specific function in Part B. In addition to the OSCAS staff engaged in technical assistance, OSCAS maintains a number of contracts which deliver technical assistance and training statewide.

RI is part of the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL) Collaborating States Initiative and receives On-going technical assistance from them. This involves national meetings, resources and consultants regarding Social and Emotional Learning (SEL). Research shows that students with SEL instruction have less discipline problems including suspension. RI is part of the SEL Research Alliance through the Regional

Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands (REL-NEL). The State has hosted SEL Community of Practice meetings to share information and highlight effective practices taking place in the state and developed a statewide SEL Advisory Committee and a list serve to share information on the latest SEL news and research. RI received technical assistance from NCSI through the cross state learning collaborative monthly virtual meetings plus face to face Zoom meetings 2x a year. RI received technical assistance from NCII and the Progress Center regarding SDI, data-based individualization and delivery of intensive instruction for children with persistent academic and behavioral needs and RI participates 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.

RI also participates in NASDE's legal and regulatory group. 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 -The Collaborative (NTACT:C) to support the improvement of secondary transition indicators. The State has participated in NTACT:C webinars, one to one consultation, several Community of Practice groups and attends the National Capacity Building Institute. The State has received direct technical assistance from NTACT:C on the implementation of evidenced based practices to increase post-school outcomes for youth on IEPs. RI 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 utilized NTACT:C to provide professional development on parent engagement and increasing collaboration with families through the IEP process, particularly at the middle school level. Additionally, RI has continued to receive direct technical assistance from TransCen content experts to provide parent professional development, state partnership collaboration, and educator professional development, specifically in the areas of parent engagement. The state has received consultation from a number of national content experts to support Person Centered Planning, Progress Monitoring and Data Collection, Virtual Resources and Assistive Technology. Results of this technical assistance has provided educators with multiple strategies to improve parent engagement beginning in the middle school years; an increase in collaboration with the State Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Division of Developmental Disabilities resulting in an expansion of Pre-Ets services for youth in RI; improved strategies for educators to support students in person centered planning, new initiatives related to Discovery and Customized Employment; and the development of resources and surveys to analyze access and equity for students with disabilities in Career & Technical Education. Rhode Island's 619 Coordinator manages all technical assistance (TA) activities related to the implementation of early childhood special education. RIDE has provided individual and group TA to districts relative to early childhood environments, child outcomes, and EI transition. Technical assistance around EC environments includes efforts to promote the RI-Itinerant Early Childhood Special Education Service-Delivery Model (RI-IECSE). The model allows children with disabilities to access high-quality general education settings while receiving the necessary special education & related service embedded into their everyday activities. RIDE offers a monthly community of practice, and bi-monthly leadership support, as well as individual and ongoing district-based TA. Additionally, RIDE provides TA to LEAs relative to Child Outcomes, with a current focus on providing more comprehensive information on child functioning, as well as valid age-anchoring and determinations of overall ratings. Finally, RIDE provides extensive TA relative to EI to ECSE transitions. RIDE partners with our Early Intervention partners out of the Executive Office of Health & Human Services to ensure EI providers and districts are providing a seamless transition for eligible students and their families. RIDE provides individual technical assistance to districts throughout the year and on an ongoing basis to ensure systems are in place and compliance is met.

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 children 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 continued 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. The Data-based individualization (DBI) work with NCII is currently being woven into RI's online learning management system BRIDGE-RI in alignment to MTSS. 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 called the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (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/EducatorCer?caon.aspx>.

Rhode Island's 619 Coordinator manages all professional development (PD) activities related to the implementation of early childhood special education. RIDE has created comprehensive asynchronous learning modules to support early childhood special education teachers and therapists in implementing the Child Outcomes Measurement System.

<https://www.ride.ri.gov/InstructionAssessment/EarlyChildhoodEducation/EarlyChildhoodSpecialEducation/MeasuringChildOutcomes.aspx>

Additionally, RIDE provides comprehensive and ongoing PD relative to the Rhode Island Itinerant Early Childhood Special Education Service-Delivery Model (RI-IECSE). The model allows children with disabilities to access high-quality general education settings while receiving the necessary special education & related service embedded into their everyday activities. RIDE provides an 18-hour PD for ECSE teachers and therapists and a 6-hour PD for general EC educators.

<https://www.ride.ri.gov/InstructionAssessment/EarlyChildhoodEducation/EarlyChildhoodSpecialEducation/ParticipationinGeneralEarlyChildhoodPrograms.aspx>

Finally, RIDE provides ECSE PD opportunities relative to social-emotional learning and literacy development.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community

conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022. As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability - Information & Accountability User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also 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 5 Part B 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 and SSIP 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/ In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

653

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

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 5 Part B 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 is involved in target setting analyzing data, developing improvement strategies and evaluating progress. 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).

In May of 2021 with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for disabilities in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021 and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement to socialize the Blueprint into 2022.

As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education

(8%), and others (13%). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

RIDE in collaboration with RIPIN and AIR disseminated a broad parent survey and focus groups in Spanish and English to determine experiences and needs to better refine project improvement activities and implementation strategies to support families. Activities include online parent toolkits, online toolkits to support educators in engaging families in math intervention activities, bilingual tip sheets for families to use when participating in intensive intervention meetings. Additional surveys and meetings with RISEAC and the project PLC shared project and outcome data seeking feedback on revisions to SSIP implementation activities with the SiMR adjustments. RIDE through the Regional Transition Center contracts has partnered with the parent advocacy organization: LAZO, that provides brokerage services for persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities, specifically transition age youth. The multilingual and multicultural staff employed by this organization will provide direct outreach, guidance and support to our multilingual learners and their families to improve the transition from public education to adult services. The Executive Director of this organization also is also an active member of the State Transition Council.

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. Planning for stakeholder sessions included identifying how best to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents in supporting the development and implementation of activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. RIDE supported three different opportunities to engage ECSE stakeholders during the fall and winter of 2021 into the early days of 2022.

One of the ECSE sessions took place at an Early Intervention Interagency Coordination Council (ICC) Meeting. The ICC is an advisory council to assist the Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS), the lead agency for the Early Intervention (EI) Program, with program implementation. The ICC also acts as a sounding board for families and providers to discuss challenges and successes. It is composed of representatives from organizations that serve the EC population and parents of children who are currently or formerly enrolled in EI. <https://ripin.org/icc/>

Another ECSE session took place through a collaboration with Parents Leading for Educational Equity (PLEE) and the RI Parent Information Network (RIPIN).

https://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Instruction-and-Assessment-World-Class-Standards/early%20childhood/ECSE/RIPIN.PLEE.RIDE%201.10.2021%20Event%20Flyer_English.pdf?ver=2021-12-22-103609-380

https://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Instruction-and-Assessment-World-Class-Standards/early%20childhood/ECSE/RIPIN.PLEE.RIDE%201.10.2021%20Event%20Flyer_Spanish.pdf?ver=2021-12-22-103714-953

PLEE's mission is to demand a high-quality public-school education for every child of color and be a voice for parents, & caretakers when policy decisions are being made at the local and state level. <https://www.pleer.org/>. RIPIN is RI's Parent Training and Information Center (PTIC) that guides families in actively participating and making informed decisions about their child's education and navigating the special education process. <https://ripin.org/special-education-programs/>

The stakeholder session with the ICC had about 10 parents who are either currently involved in EI or those that have already transitioned to Special Education. The stakeholder session with PLEE/RIPIN had about 15 parents with children actively or formerly receiving ECSE services. The PLEE/RIPIN stakeholder session was focused on parents of color in the state's four core cities (Providence, Pawtucket, Central Falls, and Woonsocket) and provided support for families so everyone could participate. Such support included access to computers and the internet, providing English and Spanish materials before the session, and Spanish interpretation during the event.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

RIDE continues to seek the input of stakeholders with a vested interest in these measures and invites interested individuals to submit comments. The Community Engagement Slide deck can be found at: http://www.eride.ri.gov/SPED_PublicReporting and the RIDE community Engagement.

Indicator 1: Specific feedback sessions for Indicator Secondary Transition Indicators 1,2,13 and 14 were conducted between Sept.-Dec. 2021 with the following stakeholder groups: The RI State Transition Council, The Regional Transition Centers, The Regional Transition Advisory Committees, The RI Parent Information Network, RI Parent Support Network, students and parents. The IDC's "A How to Webinar- Setting SPP/APR Targets" as well as historical, current and disaggregated data analysis review were mechanisms used to have informed discussion with stakeholders to set rigorous, relevant and achievable baseline and targets. These sessions also included discussions regarding the previous results of improvement activities related to all transition indicators and the possible need for continued or different strategies and interventions. Stakeholders suggested a variety of possible strategies and activities that are noted within each indicator. Progress reviews occur throughout the year as the above stakeholders have at minimum, monthly meetings and a responsible interest in improving Secondary Transition services.

Indicator 2: See Indicator 1

Indicator 3: In addition to the RI Special Education Advisory Board and Differently Abled Blueprint Stakeholder groups there are RIDE cross office teams that review assessment data for all students including those specific measurements outlined in Indicator 3. This group also includes parents of students with disabilities.

Indicator 4: Indicators 4A and 4B were discussed with the Statewide Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Advisory Committee to solicit their input regarding the indicators and target for 4A, resulting in the committee recommending the target for 4A be changed to 0%. The committee includes representatives from general and special education, higher education, administrators and related service providers, and two different parent organizations, the Rhode Island Parent Information Network (RIPIN) and the Parent Support Network (PSN). The group discusses research, activities and strategies related to positive behavioral supports and social and emotional learning.

Indicator 5: In addition to the RI Special Education Advisory Board and Differently Abled Blueprint Stakeholder groups there are RIDE cross office teams that review assessment data for all students including those specific measures outlined in Indicator 5. This group includes parents of students with disabilities.

Indicator 6: Extensive stakeholder input was sought relative to ECSE, including indicators 6, 7, & 12. RIDE began considering various mechanisms for engaging stakeholders back in the summer of 2021. Although in-person meetings were offered and discussed with stakeholders, their clear preference was to hold virtual meetings as the primary vehicle for gathering feedback and for making the results known to the public. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. Planning for stakeholder sessions included identifying how best to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents in supporting the development and implementation of activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. RIDE began actively engaging specific ECSE stakeholders in September 2021.

Indicator 7: See Indicator 6

Indicator 8: Family engagement is an essential focus. RISEAC, RIPIN focus groups, CADRE workgroups, and RIDE.

Indicator 9 & 10: RIDE website, RISEAC, CEEDAR State Leadership Team for reviewing data, strategies, and progress since targets are mandated at 0.

Indicator 11: Stakeholder input was gathered via Zoom meetings and improvement strategies and additional training was provided to districts to improve and ensure timely assessments, especially during this time of Covid.

Indicator 12: See indicator 6

Indicator 13: See Indicator 1

Indicator 14: See Indicator 1

Indicator 15: RISEAC - Monthly meetings; RIPIN - Daily communications; CADRE - quarterly meeting focusing on SE Dispute Resolution System Improvement Strategies; Daily internal collaboration with RIDE colleagues; Weekly Commissioner's Field Memos; Weekly OSCAS updates via Memos to over 120 colleagues in the field.

Indicator 16: See indicator 15.

Indicator 17: Public input on Indicator 17 state assessment data was collected in Dec 2021 being delayed a year due to the pandemic. Indicator 17 data on fidelity of implementation, formative measures, training outcomes, collaboration and beliefs surveys was included in public input session through both 2019-20 and 2020-21 schools years by accessing various stakeholder groups such as CEEDAR SLT, RISEAC, State Math Advisory, Directors of Special Education, the SSIP PLC consisting of participating schools and districts' leadership, and posting publicly on the RIDE and project websites.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

RIDE publicly reported on the public target setting process, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies and education and evaluation RIDE continued to solicit input for the performance measures of the state performance plan (SPP). RIDE has analyzed data, examined trends in performance and has set draft targets for the 17 Indicators established by the US Department of Education. Data visualizations of these Indicators can be found <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx>. RIDE continued to seek the input of stakeholders with a vested interest in these measures and invites interested individuals to submit comments. The Community Engagement Slide deck can be found at: http://www.eride.ri.gov/SPED_PublicReporting and the RIDE community Engagement.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 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/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, 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>. RIDE continued to seek the input of stakeholders with a vested interest in these measures and invites interested individuals to submit comments. The Community Engagement Slide deck can be found at : <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx> . This slidedeck is for Indicators 1-17.

In addition to the community engagement slidedeck for indicators 1-17, RI has Indicator 17 reporting and project materials available to the public in 3 locations online: annual federal reports are uploaded to <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx#41831746-federal-reporting> The RIDE page <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx#41831741-project-resources> links to the Project page <https://sites.google.com/view/rimathproject/home> . RI's online learning management system includes project math courses across the Tiers of MTSS <https://mtssri.org/course/index.php?categoryid=26>

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 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 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

These are the technical assistance sources and actions that the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: RIDE receives technical assistance from the National Technical Assistance Center -The Collaborative (NTACT:C) to support the

improvement of secondary transition indicators. The State has received one to one consultation, participates in several Community of Practice groups and attends the National Capacity Building Institute. RIDE received direct technical assistance from NTACT:C in implementing evidenced based practices to increase post-school outcomes and supported LEA's in using tools to improve both compliance and quality of IEPs. RIDE utilized NTACT:C to provide professional development to districts on parent engagement particularly at the middle school level. Additionally, RI continues to receive direct support from TransCen content experts providing parent-educator training for district professionals and parent center staff. RIDE receives consultation from a number of national content experts to support Person Centered Planning, Progress Monitoring and Data Collection, Virtual Resources and Assistive Technology. Results of this technical assistance has provided educators with multiple strategies to improve parent engagement beginning in the middle school years; an increase in collaboration with the State Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Division of Developmental Disabilities resulting in an expansion of Pre-Ets services for youth in RI; improved strategies for educators to support students in person centered planning, and new initiatives related to Discovery and Customized Employment.

Indicator 2: (See descriptor under Indicator 1 for Secondary Transition Indicators (1,2,13,14))

Indicator 3: RIDE avails itself of the CAST (AEM Center: The National Center on Accessible Educational Materials for Learning at CAST) which provides valuable TA with evidence based instructional practices. We also utilize the Center on Inclusive Technology and Education Systems (CITES) at CAST to enhance the use of technology to support student success. Rhode Island also participates in the SETT for Success which partners with TA provides to support teacher trainers in the area of alternate assessment.

Indicator 4: The target is set by OSEP but reviewed /discussed at all relevant internal and external stakeholder meetings throughout the year.

Indicator 5: RIDE avails itself of the CAST (AEM Center: The National Center on Accessible Educational Materials for Learning at CAST) which provides valuable TA with evidence based instructional practices. We also utilize the Center on Inclusive Technology and Education Systems (CITES) at CAST to enhance the use of technology to support student success.

Indicator 6: RIDE continued to participate in weekly ECTA/NASDSE 619 Affinity Group collaborative discussions focusing on a variety of ECSE topics. The content relative to EC Environments directly impacted the TA RIDE was able to provide to LEAs, especially that around LRE during the pandemic and collaborating with families. Additionally, ECTA and DaSY have provided significant support to RI's 619 Coordinator relative to LRE.

Indicator 7: RIDE continued to participate in weekly ECTA/NASDSE 619 Affinity Group collaborative discussions focusing on a variety of ECSE topics. The content relative to Child Outcomes directly impacted the TA RIDE was able to provide to LEAs, especially that around virtual assessments and collaborating with families. Additionally, ECTA and DaSY have provided significant support to RI's 619 Coordinator relative to the COS process.

Indicator 8: RIDE has confirmed with its vendor, Panorama Education, that its webpage is in compliance with Section 508 and FFY 2019 results can be found here: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/informationAccountability/RIEducationData/SurveyWorks.aspx>. Individuals may click on survey results for 2020 to view all survey questions and results. To assure that Rhode Island complies with Section 508 its response and course of action is to delete the attachment as the same information can be accessed on the webpage at the link provided (survey content/question and all data results) which is 508 compliant. It is not a requirement that the same information be found as an attachment v. information that is already available for public view.

Indicator 9: RIDE engaged in technical assistance sessions with the IDC as part of peer virtual meetings and data quality sessions. As a result of the TA, RIDE is examining ways to improve reporting to the districts. RIDE collaborated with the IDC to provide a short series of TA sessions to an LEA requesting assistance.

Indicator 10: RIDE engaged in technical assistance sessions with the IDC as part of peer virtual meetings and data quality sessions. As a result of the TA, RIDE is examining ways to improve reporting to the districts. RIDE collaborated with the IDC to provide a short series of TA sessions to an LEA requesting assistance.

Indicator 11: Zoom meeting trainings were provided this year to provide further clarification on data reporting requirements. Maintenance reports added as discussed in the Data Managers group. Special attention was kept on the timelines and specific districts were contacted to ensure that the students received their assessments within the specified timeline.

Indicator 12: RIDE continued to participate in weekly ECTA/NASDSE 619 Affinity Group collaborative discussions focusing on a variety of ECSE topics. The content relative to Part C to Part B transitions directly impacted the TA RIDE was able to provide to LEAs, especially that around virtual assessments, timeline requirements, and collaborating with families. Additionally, ECTA and DaSY have provided significant support to RI's 619 Coordinator relative to timely transitions during the pandemic.

Indicator 13: (See descriptor under Indicator 1 for Secondary Transition Indicators (1,2,13,14))

Indicator 14: (See descriptor under Indicator 1 for Secondary Transition Indicators (1,2,13,14))

Indicator 15: RIDE works with CADRE to continually improve in this area.

Indicator 16: RIDE works with CADRE to continually improve in this area.

Indicator 17: RIDE participated in NSCI EBP collaborative sessions online including a book study on Coherence. RIDE also participated in CEEDAR and Progress Center technical assistance opportunities. Materials and resources from the TA have been shared with LEAs, project partners engaging in SSIP activities, and included in RIDE guidance and website materials. These resources were instrumental in engaging stakeholders and revising the SSIP logic model.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, 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.

Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, 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) exiting special education due to graduating 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 under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	79.64%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	63.90%	64.90%	65.90%	66.90%	67.90%
Data	67.57%	59.38%	62.98%	62.38%	64.41%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	79.64%	80.14%	80.64%	81.14%	81.64%	82.14%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022. As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability - Information & Accountability User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also 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 5 Part B 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 and SSIP 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/

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback.

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described in the Introduction section, specific feedback sessions were conducted (Sept.- Dec. 2021) focused on Indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14 facilitated with members of the following: State Transition interagency Council, Regional Transition Centers, Regional Transition Advisory committees (largely LEA personnel and adult provider agencies), RI Parent Information Network, Parent Support Network, students and parents. Three parents and one student reside on the State Transition Council; one parent liaison within the Regional Transition Centers who specializes in Secondary Transition and six parents as part of the development of the RI DAS Blueprint contributed to the setting of baselines, targets and discussions related improvement activities. IDC's "A How to Webinar"- Setting SPP/APR targets as well as the indicator's historical, current and disaggregated data analysis were reviewed with stakeholders.

Given the new calculation method for Indicator 1, RI analyzed the 618 exiting data for the past ten years as well as growth/change data from year to year. Stakeholders expressed concerns about the future fluctuation in the data and a potential need to review again in the next two years. Additionally, stakeholders expressed wanting to reset the baseline and selected using the historical data point 79.64% (FFY 2019) (lag data 2018-2019) as this is the more closely aligned data to the median historical data. Stakeholders also expressed concerns regarding the potential impacts of the Covid 19 pandemic as well as the demonstrated historical fluctuation in the data based on the new calculation method. Targets demonstrate incremental growth based on analysis and progress over baseline. Baseline and targets were set with all stakeholder feedback and considerations.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,125
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	101
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	38
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	60

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1,125	1,324	64.41%	79.64%	84.97%	Met target	N/A

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

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 and beyond.) 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.*Districts may include additional expectations or requirements such as additional coursework requirements or community service learning. Currently RIDE is in the process of hosting a series of meetings with stakeholders to help RIDE learn how we can reimagine the high school experience and graduation requirements to better meet the needs of our students as we begin to revise the secondary regulations in Rhode Island.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Since OSEP changed the data source for this indicator, requiring a new baseline, RI calculated, reviewed and analyzed the 618 exiting data for the past five to ten years as well as growth/change data from year to year. Stakeholders expressed concerns about the potential fluctuation in the data and possible need to review again in the next two years. Additionally, stakeholders expressed wanting to reset the baseline and selected using the median historical data point of 79.64% (FFY 2019) (lag data 2018-2019). Stakeholders also noted concerns regarding the potential impacts of the Covid 19 pandemic as well as the potential of data fluctuation. Targets demonstrate incremental growth based on analysis and progress over baseline. Baseline and targets were set with all stakeholder feedback and considerations. At this time, it does not appear that the data completeness, validity and reliability has been impacted by the Covid 19 pandemic but since OSEP changed the data source for this year, the state will continue to consider potential impacts in the upcoming years.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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 who exited special education due to dropping out. (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 FS009.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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 exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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.

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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	27.11%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	20.70%	19.70%	18.70%	17.70%	16.70%
Data	12.03%	7.33%	8.19%	6.48%	6.01%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	15.70%	14.70%	13.70%	12.70%	11.70%	10.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies

for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022. As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability - Information & Accountability User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also 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 5 Part B 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 and SSIP 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/ In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback.

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described in the Introduction section, specific feedback sessions were conducted (Sept. - Dec. 2021) focused on Indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14 facilitated with members of the following: State Transition Interagency Council, Regional Transition Centers, Regional Transition Advisory Committees (largely LEA personnel and adult provider agencies), RI Parent Information Network, Parent Support Network, students and parents. Three parents and one student reside on the State Transition Council; one parent liaison within the Regional Transition Centers who specializes in Secondary Transition and six parents as part of the development of the RI DAS Blueprint contributed to the setting of baselines, targets and improvement activities. IDC's "A How to Webinar"- Setting SPP/APR targets as well as the indicator's historical, current and disaggregated data analysis were reviewed with stakeholders. RI continues to use the 618 exiting data to calculate Indicator 2. Stakeholders considered review of all data and proposed the baseline data remain the same as well as incremental target growth of 1.0% over the next five years.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,125
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	101
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	38
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	60

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
60	1,324	6.01%	15.70%	4.53%	Met target	N/A

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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

For FFY 2020, RI continues to use the 618 exiting data to calculate Indicator 2. Stakeholders considered review of all data and proposed the baseline data remain the same as well as incremental target growth of 1.0% over the next five years. It does not appear that there was any impact of Covid 19 on the data collection or performance.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

A. 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. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, 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.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	90.09%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	78.53%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	75.61%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	89.92%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	78.28%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	74.52%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022. As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability - Information & Accountability User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also 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 5 Part B 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 and SSIP 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/ In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

03/30/2022

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	1,651	1,794	1,562
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	698	747	416
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	685	545	643
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	108	120	122

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

03/30/2022

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	1,653	1,796	1,562
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	380	602	409
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1,002	687	633
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	108	120	122

*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,491	1,651		100.00%	90.31%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	1,412	1,794		100.00%	78.71%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	1,181	1,562		100.00%	75.61%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,490	1,653		100.00%	90.14%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	1,409	1,796		100.00%	78.45%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	1,164	1,562		100.00%	74.52%	N/A	N/A

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 assessment results of student with disabilities who have participated in the regular assessment with accommodations here. Step 1. go to link: <https://www3.ride.ri.gov/ADP>. Step 2: To access this data, under subject choose RICAS (there are two options for math and ELA). Step 3: Then choose the correct year. Step 4: Then under compare results, choose accommodations. This will compare those who took the regular test with accommodations and those who took the regular test without accommodations.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In March of 2020, due to the global COVID pandemic, Rhode Island (RI) went to remote learning. The State assesment in the spring of 2020 was cancelled due to the COVID pandemic. In the fall of 2020, there was a late "in person" start to school due to very high COVID infection rates in RI. On and off throughout the 2020-2021 school year, Rhode Island students participated in both in person and remote learning due to intermittently high COVID infection rates. The spring of 2021 State assessments were held. RI continues to review State assessment data to determine any potential impact.

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards)}}{\text{(total \# of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)}} \right]$. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	5.57%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	2.17%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	9.73%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	3.26%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	1.47%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	2.40%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	11.00%	12.00%	13.00%	14.00%	15.00%	16.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	11.50%	12.00%	13.00%	14.00%	15.00%	16.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	10.00%	11.00%	12.00%	13.00%	14.00%	15.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	30.00%	31.00%	32.00%	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	13.00%	14.00%	15.00%	16.00%	17.00%	18.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	6.00%	7.00%	8.00%	9.00%	10.00%	11.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022. As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with

subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability - Information & Accountability User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also 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 5 Part B 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 and SSIP 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/

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	1,383	1,292	1,059
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	47	20	35
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	30	8	68

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	1,382	1,289	1,042

b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	32	12	6
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	13	7	19

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	77	1,383		11.00%	5.57%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	28	1,292		11.50%	2.17%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	103	1,059		10.00%	9.73%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	45	1,382		30.00%	3.26%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	19	1,289		13.00%	1.47%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	25	1,042		6.00%	2.40%	N/A	N/A

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 assessment results of student with disabilities who have participated in the regular assessment with accommodations here. Step 1. go to link: <https://www3.ride.ri.gov/ADP>. Step 2: To access this data, under subject choose RICAS (there are two options for math and ELA). Step 3: Then choose the correct year. Step 4: Then under compare results, choose accommodations. This will compare those who took the regular test with accommodations and those who took the regular test without accommodations.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1.) Rhode Island has revised the baseline due to an OSEP required change in the measurement.

2.) In March of 2020, due to the global COVID pandemic, Rhode Island (RI) went to remote learning. The State assesment in the spring of 2020 was cancelled due to the COVID pandemic. In the fall of 2020, there was a late "in person" start to school due to very high COVID infection rates in RI. On and off throughout the 2020-2021 school year, Rhode Island students participated in both in person and remote learning due to intermittently high COVID infection rates. The spring of 2021 State assessments were held. RI continues to examine the State assessment data to determine any potential impact.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 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 for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	18.50%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	20.00%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	28.70%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	35.20%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	11.65%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	21.50%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	18.50%	18.75%	19.00%	19.25%	19.50%	19.75%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	20.00%	20.25%	20.50%	20.75%	21.00%	21.25%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	28.70%	28.95%	29.20%	29.45%	29.70%	29.95%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	35.20%	35.45%	35.70%	35.95%	36.20%	36.45%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	11.65%	11.90%	12.15%	12.40%	12.65%	12.90%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	21.50%	21.75%	22.00%	22.25%	22.50%	22.75%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022. As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability - Information & Accountability User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also 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 5 Part B 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 and SSIP 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/ In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	108	120	122
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	20	24	35

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

03/03/2022

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
-------	---------	---------	----------

a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	108	120	122
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	38	14	26

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	20	108		18.50%	18.52%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	24	120		20.00%	20.00%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	35	122		28.70%	28.69%	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	38	108		35.20%	35.19%	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	14	120		11.65%	11.67%	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	26	122		21.50%	21.31%	N/A	N/A

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 assessment results of student with disabilities who have participated in the regular assessment with accommodations here. Step 1. go to link: <https://www3.ride.ri.gov/ADP>. Step 2: To access this data, under subject choose RICAS (there are two options for math and ELA). Step 3: Then choose the correct year. Step 4: Then under compare results, choose accommodations. This will compare those who took the regular test with accommodations and those who took the regular test without accommodations.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1.) Rhode Island has revised the baseline due to an OSEP required change in the measurement.

2.) In March of 2020, due to the global COVID pandemic, Rhode Island (RI) went to remote learning. The State assesment in the spring of 2020 was cancelled due to the COVID pandemic. In the fall of 2020, there was a late "in person" start to school due to very high COVID infection rates in RI. On and off throughout the 2020-2021 school year, Rhode Island students participated in both in person and remote learning due to intermittently high COVID infection rates. The spring of 2021 State assessments were held. RI continues to examine the State assessment results to determine any potential impact.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children 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 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children 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.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	49.20
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	38.25
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	83.55
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	23.05
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	17.65
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	33.45

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	49.20	48.95	48.70	48.45	48.20	47.95
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	38.25	38.00	38.75	38.50	38.25	38.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	83.55	83.30	83.05	82.80	82.55	82.30
Math	A <=	Grade 4	23.05	22.80	22.55	22.30	22.05	21.80
Math	B <=	Grade 8	17.65	17.40	17.15	16.90	16.65	16.40
Math	C <=	Grade HS	33.45	33.20	32.95	32.70	32.45	32.20

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use

of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022. As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability - Information & Accountability User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also 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 5 Part B 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 and SSIP 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/ In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback.

FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

03/03/2022

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	9,232	9,105	9,085
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,383	1,292	1,059
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,188	2,599	4,122
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	79	22	262
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	47	20	35
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	30	8	68

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	9,237	8,981	9,049
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,382	1,289	1,042
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1,845	1,428	2,263
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	79	14	123
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	32	12	6
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	13	7	19

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	5.57%	35.39%		49.20	29.82	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	2.17%	28.79%		38.25	26.62	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	9.73%	48.26%		83.55	38.53	N/A	N/A

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	3.26%	20.83%		23.05	17.57	N/A	N/A
B	Grade 8	1.47%	16.06%		17.65	14.58	N/A	N/A
C	Grade HS	2.40%	26.37%		33.45	23.97	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In March of 2020, due to the global COVID pandemic, Rhode Island (RI) went to remote learning. The State assessment in the spring of 2020 was cancelled due to the COVID pandemic. In the fall of 2020, there was a late "in person" start to school due to very high COVID infection rates in RI. On and off throughout the 2020-2021 school year, Rhode Island students participated in both in person and remote learning due to intermittently high COVID infection rates. The spring of 2021 State assessments were held. RI continues to examine the State assessment data to determine any potential impact.

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

The State has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3D - 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 local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell 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 LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 (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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2016	100.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Data	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%		0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022. As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability - Information & Accountability User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also 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 5 Part B 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 and SSIP 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/ In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback. Indicators 4A and 4B were discussed with the Statewide Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Advisory Committee to solicit their input regarding the indicators and target for 4A. The discussion resulted in the committee recommending the target be changed to 0%. The State has agreed and made the recommended change. The committee includes representatives from two different parent organizations, the Rhode Island Parent Information Network (RIPIN) and the Parent Support Network (PSN). RIPIN is the Rhode Island's Parent Training and Information Center, providing information and resources for families of children with disabilities. PSN specializes in assisting families of children with behavioral health issues.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

62

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0.00%	0.00%		N/A	N/A

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

Comparison of the risk of a district's special education students to be suspended out of school for more than 10 days to the risk of the district's general education students to be suspended out of school 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 n 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 2020 using 2019-2020 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 suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs compared to children without IEPs so there were no reviews 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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs 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 "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs totally 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs 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 LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 (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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

62

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0		0%		N/A	N/A

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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, 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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. 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

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2019	Target >=	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%
A	71.00%	Data	69.51%	69.69%	70.11%	70.22%	71.03%
B	2019	Target <=	13.50%	13.00%	12.50%	12.00%	11.50%
B	11.00%	Data	13.17%	12.77%	12.72%	12.57%	11.44%
C	2019	Target <=	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	4.00%	3.50%
C	5.60%	Data	5.63%	5.25%	4.86%	4.62%	5.66%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	76.50%	77.00%	77.50%	78.00%	78.50%	79.00%
Target B <=	11.00%	10.50%	10.00%	9.50%	9.00%	8.50%
Target C <=	3.50%	3.00%	2.50%	2.00%	1.50%	1.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022. As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the

RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability & Accountability User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also 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 5 Part B 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 and SSIP 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/

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	21,865
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	15,667
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,376
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	1,125
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	78
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	16

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten)	15,667	21,865	71.03%	76.50%	71.65%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day							
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,376	21,865	11.44%	11.00%	10.87%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	1,219	21,865	5.66%	3.50%	5.58%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In March of 2020, due to the global COVID pandemic, Rhode Island (RI) went to remote learning. In the fall of 2020, there was a late "in person" start to school due to very high COVID infection rates in RI. On and off throughout the 2020-2021 school year, Rhode Island students participated in both in person and remote learning due to intermittently high COVID infection rates. RI continues to examine the education environment data to determine any potential impact.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(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

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \times 100 \right]$
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \times 100 \right]$
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \times 100 \right]$

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). 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 IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	47.00%	48.00%	49.00%	50.00%	50.50%
A	Data	46.96%	48.40%	49.02%	49.03%	54.60%
B	Target <=	18.00%	17.00%	16.00%	15.00%	12.00%
B	Data	15.78%	14.78%	13.73%	12.58%	10.81%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022. As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress

on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability - Information & Accountability User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also 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 5 Part B 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 and SSIP 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/

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback.

Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Stakeholder Input:

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive stakeholder input was sought relative to ECSE, including indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus. RIDE began considering various mechanisms for engaging stakeholders back in the summer of 2021. In addition to RIDE's general engagement efforts, a decision was made to create additional opportunities to focus on the three ECSE indicators. Although in-person meetings were offered and discussed with stakeholders, their clear preference was to hold virtual meetings as the primary vehicle for gathering feedback and for making the results known to the public. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. Planning for stakeholder sessions included identifying how best to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents in supporting the development and implementation of activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. RIDE began actively engaging specific ECSE stakeholders in September 2021. The stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback. RIDE supported three different opportunities to engage ECSE stakeholders during the fall and winter of 2021 into the early days of 2022.

- **ECSE Leadership Meeting-** The ECSE Leadership Meeting is a bi-monthly opportunity for district-level ECSE leaders to come together with state partners to hear about the current state-level initiatives, to build an understanding of the ECSE requirements and best practices, and to discuss and analyze data and to set goals for improvements.
- **Early Intervention Interagency Coordination Council (ICC)-** The ICC is an advisory council to assist the Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS), the lead agency for the Early Intervention (EI) Program, with program implementation. The ICC also acts as a sounding board for families and providers to discuss challenges and successes. It is composed of representatives from organizations that serve the EC population and parents of children who are currently or formerly enrolled in EI. <https://ripin.org/icc/>
- **Parents Leading for Educational Equity (PLEE)/RI Parent Information Network (RIPIN)-**
https://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Instruction-and-Assessment-World-Class-Standards/early%20childhood/ECSE/RIPIN.PLEE.RIDE%201.10.2021%20Event%20Flyer_English.pdf?ver=2021-12-22-103609-380
https://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Instruction-and-Assessment-World-Class-Standards/early%20childhood/ECSE/RIPIN.PLEE.RIDE%201.10.2021%20Event%20Flyer_Spanish.pdf?ver=2021-12-22-103714-953

PLEE is an organization that was founded and led by parents. PLEE's mission is to demand a high-quality public-school education for every child of color and be a voice for parents, & caretakers when policy decisions are being made at the local and state level. pleeri.org. RIPIN is a Parent Training and Information Center (PTIC) that guides families in actively participating and making informed decisions about their child's education and navigating the special education process. <https://ripin.org/special-education-programs/>

All sessions began with a broad overview of the individual ECSE SPP/APR indicator(s), highlighting what was most relevant to each stakeholder group, discussion of the historical data, potential targets, improvement strategies, and vehicles for evaluating progress. The stakeholder session with the ICC had about 10 parents who are either currently involved in EI or those that have already transitioned to Special Education. The stakeholder session with PLEE/RIPIN had about 15 parents with children actively or formerly receiving ECSE services. The PLEE/RIPIN stakeholder session was focused on parents of color in the state's four core cities (Providence, Pawtucket, Central Falls, and Woonsocket) and provided support for families so everyone could participate. Such support included access to computers and the internet, providing English and Spanish materials before the session, and Spanish interpretation during the event. The feedback from all sessions was captured through online recording or meeting minutes and analyzed thoroughly. Considering stakeholder input, no changes were made to baselines for indicators 6A & 6B, and 2020 will serve as the baseline for the new indicator, indicator 6C. Stakeholders felt that the impacts of COVID relative to indicator 6 were long-term and had a multi-year impact. Targets were identified through stakeholder input allowing time for the implementation of new strategies and ensuring that percentages return to pre-pandemic performance and then continue to improve moving forward. The family feedback itself proved critical. Improvement strategies included increasing collaboration with IHE, expanding free high-quality PreK/childcare, providing transportation, increasing funding for RI-IECSE services & TA, providing parent training regarding available support and special education rights, increasing collaboration with families, increasing cultural and linguistic responsiveness, increasing behavioral supports and district accountability.

RIDE will be following up with each of the stakeholder groups in the spring of 2022 by identifying the final 2020-2025 targets, improvement strategies,

and vehicles for evaluating progress. In an ongoing matter, RIDE will follow up with each stakeholder group at least annually to look at the current data, report progress, and identify any necessary modification to targets and/or improvement activities.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2019	54.60%
B	2019	10.81%
C	2020	0.53%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	52.69%	52.69%	52.69%	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%
Target B <=	12.72%	12.72%	12.72%	12.00%	11.50%	10.50%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	0.53%	0.53%	0.53%	0.52%	0.51%	0.50%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	613	1,003	468	2,084
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	265	558	275	1,098
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	74	123	45	242
b2. Number of children attending separate school	8	8	7	23
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	2	8	1	11

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

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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	1,098	2,084	54.60%	52.69%	52.69%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	265	2,084	10.81%	12.72%	12.72%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	11	2,084		0.53%	0.53%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Although Rhode Island (RI) witnessed a significant increase in percentage A and decreases in percentage B in recent years, challenges brought on by the pandemic disrupted this progress. Until this year, RIDE 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. Rhode Island witnessed a 9.6% increase over the last five years, with a substantial 5.6% increase in FFY 2019 to 54.6%. RI also witnessed a steady decrease in the percentage of young children attending separate special education classes, separate schools, and residential facilities with an 8% decrease over the last five years, and a 1.8% decrease in FFY 2019 to 10.81%. Much of these improvements can be attributed to the implementation of the Rhode Island Itinerant Early Childhood Special Education Service-Delivery Model (RI-IECSE). The model allows children with disabilities to access high-quality general education settings while receiving the necessary special education & related service embedded into their everyday activities and routines. RIDE continues to offer PD for ECSE professionals and general EC educators, a monthly community of practice, leadership meetings, and ongoing district-based technical assistance. Unfortunately, this year due to the pandemic, percentage A has seen a 1.91% decrease to 52.69% and percentage B a 1.91% increase to 12.72%. As evident in the data, RI served 266 fewer children during FFY 2020 as opposed to FFY 2019 likely as a direct result of the pandemic, parental choice, dissatisfaction with virtual instruction, or fear of in-person schooling. Additionally, LEAs relied more heavily on separate settings due to the lack of participation of children without IEPs in district-based integrated programs and restrictions regarding special education personnel entering general EC programs. RIDE provided technical assistance to districts, providing guidance and support during this challenging time. RI also reports .53% of children in 6C, children receiving services in their homes. Although this is the first year OSEP is looking specifically at this data, looking back, it is clear that this is an increase over previous years' data and likely another outcome of the pandemic.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State has established the baseline for 6C, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2020	Target >=	76.50%	80.13%	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%
A1	70.00%	Data	78.35%	80.13%	79.28%	71.08%	67.69%
A2	2020	Target >=	60.00%	48.66%	49.50%	50.00%	50.50%

A2	45.30%	Data	59.57%	48.66%	52.08%	48.41%	47.78%
B1	2020	Target >=	78.00%	68.17%	69.00%	69.50%	70.00%
B1	67.40%	Data	75.22%	68.17%	79.45%	72.53%	66.94%
B2	2020	Target >=	62.50%	38.50%	39.00%	39.50%	40.00%
B2	28.90%	Data	60.00%	38.50%	44.40%	38.13%	34.65%
C1	2020	Target >=	75.00%	86.04%	86.50%	87.00%	87.50%
C1	69.10%	Data	72.08%	86.04%	80.88%	74.71%	69.13%
C2	2020	Target >=	66.00%	55.35%	56.00%	56.50%	57.00%
C2	51.00%	Data	63.14%	55.35%	60.03%	59.60%	58.11%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	70.00%	70.00%	70.00%	70.50%	71.00%	71.50%
Target A2 >=	45.30%	45.30%	45.30%	46.00%	46.50%	47.00%
Target B1 >=	67.40%	67.40%	67.40%	67.50%	68.00%	68.50%
Target B2 >=	28.90%	28.90%	28.90%	29.50%	30.00%	30.50%
Target C1 >=	69.10%	69.10%	69.10%	69.50%	70.00%	70.50%
Target C2 >=	51.00%	51.00%	51.00%	51.50%	52.00%	52.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022. As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability - Information & Accountability User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also 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 5 Part B 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 and SSIP 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/

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought

relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback.

Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Stakeholder Input

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described in the Introduction section, extensive stakeholder input was sought relative to ECSE, including indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus. RIDE began considering various mechanisms for engaging stakeholders back in the summer of 2021. In addition to RIDE's general engagement efforts, a decision was made to create additional opportunities to focus on the three ECSE indicators. Although in-person meetings were offered and discussed with stakeholders, their clear preference was to hold virtual meetings as the primary vehicle for gathering feedback and for making the results known to the public. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. Planning for stakeholder sessions included identifying how best to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents in supporting the development and implementation of activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. RIDE began actively engaging specific ECSE stakeholders in September 2021. The stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback. RIDE supported three different opportunities to engage ECSE stakeholders during the fall and winter of 2021 into the early days of 2022.

- **ECSE Leadership Meeting-** The ECSE Leadership Meeting is a bi-monthly opportunity for district-level ECSE leaders to come together with state partners to hear about the current state-level initiatives, to build an understanding of the ECSE requirements and best practices, and to discuss and analyze data and to set goals for improvements.
- **Early Intervention Interagency Coordination Council (ICC)-** The ICC is an advisory council to assist the Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS), the lead agency for the Early Intervention (EI) Program, with program implementation. The ICC also acts as a sounding board for families and providers to discuss challenges and successes. It is composed of representatives from organizations that serve the EC population and parents of children who are currently or formerly enrolled in EI. <https://ripin.org/icc/>

- **Parents Leading for Educational Equity (PLEE)/RI Parent Information Network (RIPIN)-**
https://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Instruction-and-Assessment-World-Class-Standards/early%20childhood/ECSE/RIPIN.PLEE.RIDE%201.10.2021%20Event%20Flyer_English.pdf?ver=2021-12-22-103609-380

https://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Instruction-and-Assessment-World-Class-Standards/early%20childhood/ECSE/RIPIN.PLEE.RIDE%201.10.2021%20Event%20Flyer_Spanish.pdf?ver=2021-12-22-103714-953

PLEE is an organization that was founded and led by parents. PLEE's mission is to demand a high-quality public-school education for every child of color and be a voice for parents, & caretakers when policy decisions are being made at the local and state level. pleeri.org. RIPIN is a Parent Training and Information Center (PTIC) that guides families in actively participating and making informed decisions about their child's education and navigating the special education process. <https://ripin.org/special-education-programs/>

All sessions began with a broad overview of the individual ECSE SPP/APR indicator(s), highlighting what was most relevant to each stakeholder group, discussion of the historical data, potential targets, improvement strategies, and vehicles for evaluating progress. The stakeholder session with the ICC had about 10 parents who are either currently involved in EI or those that have already transitioned to Special Education. The stakeholder session with PLEE/RIPIN had about 15 parents with children actively or formerly receiving ECSE services. The PLEE/RIPIN stakeholder session was focused on parents of color in the state's four core cities (Providence, Pawtucket, Central Falls, and Woonsocket) and provided support for families so everyone could participate. Such support included access to computers and the internet, providing English and Spanish materials before the session, and Spanish interpretation during the event. The feedback from all sessions was captured through online recording or meeting minutes and analyzed thoroughly. The baseline was identified using stakeholder input, with RI ultimately deciding to use the 2020 data as the indicator 7 baseline. Stakeholders felt that the impacts of COVID relative to indicator 7 were long-term and had a multi-year impact. Targets were identified through stakeholder input allowing time for the implementation of new strategies and ensuring that percentages return to pre-pandemic performance and then continue to improve moving forward. The feedback itself proved critical, especially relative to the creation of improvement efforts identified by parents and families. Improvement strategies identified through Stakeholder feedback sessions included increasing collaboration with IHE, expanding free high-quality universal PreK/child care, providing transportation, increasing funding for RI-IECSE services & in-district technical assistance, providing parent training regarding what is available and how to access it, as well as special education rights, increasing collaboration with families, increasing cultural and linguistic responsiveness, increasing supports for children with behavioral needs and district accountability.

RIDE will be following up with each of the stakeholder groups in the spring of 2022 by identifying the final 2020-2025 targets, improvement strategies, and vehicles for evaluating progress. In an ongoing matter, RIDE will follow up with each stakeholder group at least annually to look at the current data, report progress, and identify any necessary modification to targets and/or improvement activities.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

921

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	221	24.07%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	281	30.61%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	235	25.60%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	181	19.72%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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>	516	737	67.69%	70.00%	70.01%	N/A	N/A
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>	416	918	47.78%	45.30%	45.32%	N/A	N/A

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	1	0.11%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	289	31.38%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	365	39.63%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	235	25.52%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	31	3.37%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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>	600	890	66.94%	67.40%	67.42%	N/A	N/A
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	266	921	34.65%	28.90%	28.88%	N/A	N/A

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	1	0.11%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	211	22.98%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	238	25.93%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	237	25.82%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	231	25.16%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	475	687	69.13%	69.10%	69.14%	N/A	N/A
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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	468	918	58.11%	51.00%	50.98%	N/A	N/A

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

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

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

YES

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)

The 2019-2020 school year was the last year that the Child Outcomes Summary (COS) data was submitted to the RI Department of Education (RIDE) annually as part of the preschool performance report. In July of 2020, RIDE moved the data to a new data collection system within the existing Special Education Census. FFY 2020 served as the first-year districts were able to enter all relevant COS data into the new data collection system with an automatic upload to RIDE's Special Education Census. RIDE provided extensive training and professional development to all LEAs during the 2019-2020 SY before implementing the new data collection system and provided individual technical assistance to districts when the new system went into effect. Because of the significant changes in how Rhode Island now collects indicator 7 data, and after stakeholder feedback, the decision was made to change baselines to 2020.

Additionally, RI reported on 115 fewer children in FFY 2020 than in FFY 2019, with the greatest reduction from RI's largest school district. This can be attributed to the new data system and challenges brought on by COVID, such as data-entry staffing issues. RIDE worked extensively with districts and specifically our largest LEA to assist in the entry of the COS data into the new system. As 2020-2021 was the first year with the new collection, the data system itself accounted for some data entry errors which led to the removal of some child-level data. Based on the analysis of the data, RIDE has since worked to create additional data entry validation rules within the census and to support the LEA to ensure all data can be entered and the child counts return to pre-pandemic levels. Ultimately, RIDE believes that the data accuracy will be greatly increased with the new data collection system in place.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

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 and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

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

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom 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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022. As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability - Information & Accountability User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also 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 5 Part B 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 and SSIP 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/ In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback. The Rhode Island Parent Information Network ("RIPIN") (<https://ripin.org/>) partners and works in collaboration with RIDE to produce the annual Indicator 8 family survey. During FFY 2020 and within this focus group are RIPIN employees who are also parents of students receiving special education services. Approximately 65 percent of RIPIN staff (out of 114 employees) are caregivers/parents of a loved one, of an individual with a disability. 51 percent of RIPIN's Board Members are parents of a child with a disability between the ages of birth to 26 are or have received special education services. Employees within this category collaborate with RIDE annually in providing feedback on draft Indicator 8 family survey questions. Feedback on baseline targets was additionally gained. RIPIN is also provided with information regarding the survey upon release and aids families through its Call Center in completing the survey.

Annually, in collaboration with RIDE and RIPIN, the Rhode Island Special Education Advisory Committees (SEANs) are provided with information and with the opportunity to provide feedback on Indicator 8 family survey questions. The SEANs are also provided with final survey data. Technical assistance on the subject matter is made available through RIDE and RIPIN.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2006	26.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	43.00%	45.00%	47.00%	50.00%	51.00%
Data	63.37%	61.81%	70.44%	32.09%	32.12%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	50.25%	50.50%	50.75%	60.00%	60.25%	60.50%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
2,760	6,602	32.12%	50.25%	41.81%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 same family survey was distributed to all families in Rhode Island. The same survey questions were asked to families of students receiving special education services and families of students receiving general education services. The TOTAL response group included parents of students with disabilities of every grade level from Pre-Kindergarten to 12th grade within all districts (see below). Public data /survey results:

What grade is your child in?
 Respondent Count Respondent Percentage
 Subgroup with no data 224 1%
 Pre-Kindergarten 544 2%

Kindergarten 2,238 9%
 1st grade 2,371 9%
 2nd grade 2,154 8%
 3rd grade 2,457 10%
 4th grade 2,414 9%
 5th grade 2,132 8%
 6th grade 1,889 7%
 7th grade 1,853 7%
 8th grade 1,804 7%
 9th grade 1,301 5%
 10th grade 1,309 5%
 11th grade 1,256 5%
 12th grade 1,045 4%
 No response 497 2%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

23,949

Percentage of respondent parents

27.57%

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	23.44%	27.57%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

As mentioned, RIDE has once again combined the family survey in that the same survey is distributed to families of students receiving special education services and families of students receiving general education services. This has significantly increased data that districts may use to implement strategies to increase parent engagement since responses to the survey have dramatically increased. The data allows comparisons of survey responses from families of students receiving special education services v. survey responses from families of students receiving general education services.

RIDE has made significant progress increasing response rates as this has been an important focus especially since combining the survey. Response rates have more than doubled within the past few years due to RIDE making efforts to work closely with districts in reaching families. To groups that may be underrepresented RIDE partners with district staff, local advisory committees and administration to promote the survey even such that RIDE has a live response rate platform on its webpage to allow districts to see where response rates are at a school level and district level. This marketing strategies allows for healthy competition to promote the survey with the goal to increase survey response rates.

The RIDE SurveyWorks response rate dashboard may be viewed at:

https://tableau.ride.ri.gov/t/Public/Views/SurveyworksRates_2021/march9final?%3Adisplay_count=n&%3Aembed=y&%3AisGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y&%3Aorigin=viz_share_link&%3AshowAppBanner=false&%3AshowVizHome=n

RIDE distributes several public announcements through the Commissioners Field Memo and on the RIDE webpage (<https://www.ride.ri.gov/Home.aspx>).

The public announcement of the FFY 2020 survey RESULTS was advertised and placed on the RIDE webpage:

"PROVIDENCE, R.I. – Education Commissioner Angélica Infante-Green today announced that the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) has released the results of its 2021 administration of SurveyWorks, its statewide school climate and culture survey. The survey provides valuable insights into what is working and what can be improved in Rhode Island education."

"The data provided by SurveyWorks represents the voices of our school communities and is central to enhancing Rhode Island students' educational experiences and improving outcomes in our schools," said Commissioner Infante-Green. "Despite the challenges sparked by the COVID-19 pandemic, these results show us that our education community is resilient and has fostered a culture of acceptance and support. The snapshot SurveyWorks provides is critical as it will help us assess our education system's strengths and challenges to better serve needs of students across Rhode Island."

This year's results are even more useful because they come in the wake of the statewide shift to distance learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. In all, 73,078 students, 28,027 parents and family members, and 10,972 teachers participated.

To support a survey administration and maximize participation during the pandemic, RIDE made three key changes to support the program this year:

- o Introduced New Content: The RIDE project team introduced a few new items in the survey for inclusion, namely a topic for students, staff, and families titled: Cultural Awareness and Action.
- o Improved Family Survey Accessibility: Previously, all families accessed surveys by entering a custom code. This year, RIDE placed all family surveys behind one link, which ensured ease of access, portability of survey links, and streamlined communication.
- o Incorporated COVID-19 Context: Each survey included the question: "How have you participated/attended in school this year?" to help assess the impact of learning online versus in-school across various topics.

The results of this year's SurveyWorks reveal a consistent theme of respect and sense of belonging amongst all stakeholder groups, while also detailing areas where the education community can focus in years to come including race, ethnicity and cultural awareness. Key findings include:

- o Overall, both students and parents reported more favorable experiences with in-person learning than with online learning.
- o Students in grades 3-12 reported an increased sense of belonging and respect, including a 16% increase in positive responses for students in grades 6-12 when asked how much respect students show one another while in school.
- o Students in grades 3-12 also reported an increase in engagement while in school. The survey revealed a 14% increase for students in grades 6-12 when asked how often teachers seem to be excited while teaching.
- o More than half of teachers reported favorable perceptions about their students Social Emotional Learning. This was highlighted by a 25% positive jump regarding the level of respect students show one another.

- o When thinking about how well a school supports students and staff in learning about, discussing, and confronting issues of race, ethnicity, and culture, nearly 50% of teachers responded favorably to questions about race, ethnicity and culture.
- o 83% of parents feel that students and teachers are respected and culturally aware at school.

"This year's responses from students, parents, and educators are promising as ensuring safety and a sense of belonging in our schools is even more critical for student success in these challenging and uncertain times," added Commissioner Infante-Green. "I'm thankful to all Rhode Islanders inside and out of the classroom who stepped up over the last year and a half to create a welcoming and supportive learning environment for students. Much work remains ahead to get students up to speed but with continued collaboration and support we will continue to make progress."

To learn more or to view your school's or district's full results, visit surveyworks.ride.ri.gov. Join the conversation and encourage your school community to participate using the hashtag, #SurveyWorks.

Another avenue in how RIDE makes efforts to increase response rates is by distributing "Communication Materials" to all Rhode Island districts in English and in Spanish. These materials may continuously be viewed on the RIDE webpage at: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/informationAccountability/RIEducationData/SurveyWorks.aspx#35821543-communications-materials>

RIDE monitors the live response rate dashboard during the course of the family survey open timeframe and individually communicates with those districts who have difficulty reaching parents to complete the survey and whose response rates are low. The live response rate dashboard allows for healthy competition amongst districts. The Commissioner highlights districts in weekly Field Memos to the public who are leading the board with responses to the survey.

A survey of 200 principals was recently conducted titled "How do Schools Improve Response Rates?" It produced the following responses:

- Email - 59
- Regular and constant communication - 49
- Incorporate into fun family events - 34
- Offer prizes/incentives - 34
- Provide devices (laptops, tablets) - 25
- Principal newsletter - 22
- One-on-one outreach - 22
- Communicate the importance - 20
- School-parent platform - 18
- Incorporate into parent meetings - 17
- Text families - 16
- Post on social media - 13
- Use faculty meetings - 12
- Send home backpack letters - 12
- Provide data updates on rates - 12
- Robocall families - 8
- Work with PTO/Parent groups - 7

The remaining responses are accessible to the public and may be viewed at:

<https://www.ride.ri.gov/informationAccountability/RIEducationData/SurveyWorks.aspx#35821332-from-the-field-raising-response-rates>

RIDE will use the responses to the above survey to market the upcoming survey in a successful manner. Those districts that had the highest response rates will be questioned and RIDE will encourage the sharing of information in order to increase response rates in all districts in Rhode Island.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

A full analysis of the response rates can be found below and at:

<https://www.ride.ri.gov/informationAccountability/RIEducationData/SurveyWorks.aspx>

RIDE continues to make efforts to prevent nonresponse bias in that for next FFY the survey will be shortened, expectations will be relayed to districts and families and RIDE will continue to re-examine the timing and distribution methods of the survey. Currently, the survey has gone fully electronic. Assigned "Survey Coordinators" at each district/school within Rhode Island is available to aid families in completing the survey who have difficulties with accessing the internet. Schools allow for the usage, if needed, of computers for families to complete the survey. The Rhode Island Parent Information Network ("RIPIN") also provides assistance with completing the survey. RIDE monitors responses live and reaches out to districts that have low response rates throughout the duration of the survey window. If districts are having difficulty in gaining activity in the community RIDE works with districts in how to reach families in their native language. The RIDE live response rate dashboard aids in boosting response rates.

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

In order to meet the aforementioned federal reporting requirements, the RIDE administered a parent survey 2020 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 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 to 12 from 62 school 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 62 school districts.

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. During FFY 20 there was an increase from parents of students with IEPs between spring 2020 (5,754 responses) and spring 2021(6,602 responses).

Are you responding on behalf of a student with an IEP? Respondent Count Respondent Percentage

Subgroup with no data 417 1%

Yes 6,602 24%

No 21,002 75%

Families had the option to take the survey in one of three languages: English, Spanish, or Portuguese. The percentage of surveys completed in English was approximately 78%, the percentage of surveys completed in Spanish was approximately 21%, and those completed in Portuguese was less than 1%.

The surveys were made available online; 98% of families completed their surveys online.

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 and parent/guardian gender. These disaggregated variables are summarized below. Parents were not asked whether their child qualified for free or reduced-price lunch or whether they were an English Language Learner due to sensitivity concerns. For that reason, that data is unavailable for disaggregation.

Parent survey responses were received from the following student racial/ethnic groups: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and "Two or more Races." The percentage of surveys returned by racial/ethnic breakdown are as follows:

What is your child's race or ethnicity? Respondent Count Respondent Percentage

Subgroup with no data	710	3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	159	1%
Asian	707	3%
Black or African American	1,542	6%
Hispanic or Latino	5,802	21%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	20	0%
White	13,961	50%
Two or More Races/Ethnicities	2,653	9%
No response	2,467	9%

Please note that for this indicator and through the family survey - a child's disability is not questioned on the survey. RIDE had received input from IDC ("IDEA Data Center") in the review of the draft indicator submission and will have a discussion on whether this data should be collected in the future. RIDE purposely does not question the survey respondent of a child's disability as previous stakeholder feedback has shown that having this question within the survey may impose on the comfort of respondents. In Rhode Island the highest number of students fall into the (1) "Learning Disabled" category followed by (2) "Other Health Impaired" and then (3) "Speech/Language Impaired." Per OSEP - states must consider race and ethnicity and at least ONE other category from the following examples:

- Race/ethnicity (required)
- Gender
- Student age
- Disability category
- Geographic location in the state
- Other category selected with stakeholder input

RIDE collects race/ethnicity, student gender, geographic location, student grade, respondent ethnicity, respondent's level of education and respondent's gender thus complying with OSEP's requirements.

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 2761. The total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities was 6,602. 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 42%. This represents an increase of 10% over last year.

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")

Survey responses based on education level:

Respondent Count Respondent Percentage

Subgroup with no data	702	3%
Did not attend school	152	1%
Did not complete 8th grade	435	2%
Completed 8th grade	321	1%
Did not complete high school	1,075	4%
Graduated from high school	3,917	14%
Some college	6,998	25%
Graduated from a 4-year college	6,866	25%
Some graduate school	1,657	6%
Completed graduate school	5,898	21%

What grades do you expect your child to earn in school?

Subgroup with no data 828 3%

F	57	0%
D	110	0%
C	1,197	4%
B	10,510	38%

A 15,319 55%

Person(s) completing the survey – race or ethnicity:

Subgroup with no data 610 2%

American Indian or Alaska Native 124 0%

Asian 821 3%

Black or African American 1,573 6%

Hispanic or Latino 6,152 22%

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander 24 0%

White 15,150 54%

Two or More Races/Ethnicities 1,146 4%

No response 2,421 9%

Gender:

What is your child's gender? Respondent Count Respondent Percentage

Subgroup with no data 544 2%

Female 12,814 46%

Male 13,369 48%

Prefer not to say/Other 1,294 5%

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

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.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Demographic Data:

Of the 6,602 total respondents, RIDE had demographic data from the survey answers via families' selections on certain survey questions. The target group is all families within all demographic categories. Subgroup data is as follows:

Subgroup with no data 591 2%

Female 22,376 80%

Male 3,901 14%

Prefer not to say/Other 1,153 4%

Description of metric used:

RIDE monitors the demographics of respondent families and demographics of students which are reported on through the survey. RIDE then notes comparison data with the special education census. We compared the percentages with a threshold of the percentage to determine representativeness. Comparisons are as follows:

Respondents Respondents' Children Census_Totals RACEETHNIC

60.62% 56.19% 54.56% WH7 (White)

4.59% 10.68% 4.93% MU7 (2 or more races/ethnicities)

24.62% 23.35% 27.76% HI7 (Hispanic)

6.29% 6.21% 9.54% BL7 (Black/African American)

0.10% 0.08% 0.15% PI7 (Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander)

3.29% 2.85% 1.87% AS7 (Asian)

0.50% 0.64% 1.19% AM7 (American Indian or Alaska Native)

Representativeness appears to be consistent with a slight discrepancy in the "Black/African American" category where the special education census provides that 9.54 percent of students in Rhode Island who receive special education are "Black/African American" where 6.21 percent of the total number of respondents to the survey reported that they were responding on behalf of a child in this category.

Additional information:

How has your student attended school this year? Respondent Count Respondent Percentage

Subgroup with no data 409 1%

All online 6,470 23%

Mostly online 4,336 15%

About half online and half in-person 7,788 28%

Mostly in-person 5,806 21%

All in-person 3,212 11%

RIDE will continue to monitor the demographics of respondents to the survey v. demographics of students reported on the survey v. the special education census. If a category appears to have high discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group (demographics on the special education census) the SEA will involve stakeholders in collaborating possibilities to reach subgroups.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES

Survey Question	Yes / No
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The FFY 2020 SurveyWorks revealed progress in key areas, while also detailing areas where the education community can focus in years to come.

Subgroup areas included:

- School Safety
- School Climate
- Family Support
- Social Emotional Learning (SEL)
- Cultural Awareness and Action
- State Initiatives
- Family Engagement

IMPACT OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

In March of 2020, due to the global COVID pandemic, Rhode Island went to remote learning. In the fall of 2020, there was a late "in person" start to school due to very high COVID infection rates. On and off throughout the 2020-2021 school year, students participated in both in person and remote learning due to intermittently high COVID infection rates. Rhode Island, unfortunately, has been known as the State with the highest infection rate (despite high vaccination rates) throughout 2021. Rhode Island believes that despite schools and districts having some students learning via distance learning during the survey window, response rates continued to increase and there was an increase in parent participation (up by 787 submitted surveys) and therefore it does not appear that COVID-19 had a negative impact in gaining responses to the family survey. If anything, families have been forced to access and learn different avenues of technology and this may have aided in the increase in responses. Rhode Island did take measures to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection in that it assured families knew where to locate the electronic survey and how to complete the survey. The RIDE Call Center and RIPIN Call Center were available to walk callers through accessing and navigating the survey. Also, each district is assigned a Survey Coordinator who was available to assist families with the survey and thus survey results increased. Families also had the option of completing the survey at a device within districts if they did not have access to technology.

Having some of the same questions from previous years allowed for comparative data across the board. Utilizing Panorama Education for the survey distribution also allowed for national comparative data as this vendor works with several states.

Data continued as above prevents a character count of above 8000:

What grade is your child in? Respondent Count Respondent Percentage

Subgroup with no data 445 2%

Pre-Kindergarten 525 2%

Kindergarten 1,804 6%

1st grade 2,188 8%

2nd grade 2,449 9%

3rd grade 2,587 9%

4th grade 2,582 9%

5th grade 2,437 9%

6th grade 2,074 7%

7th grade 2,137 8%

8th grade 2,069 7%

9th grade 1,734 6%

10th grade 1,683 6%

11th grade 1,605 6%

12th grade 1,282 5%

No response 420 1%

It is emphasized and encouraged that OSEP access Rhode Island's survey and survey results at:

<https://www.ride.ri.gov/informationAccountability/RIEducationData/SurveyWorks.aspx>

Survey Vendor Webpage:

<https://www.panoramaed.com/>

Results are available on the Panorama platform, which is WCAG/ADA compliant. Results for families can be accessed using this public link (the same one available on the RIDE website): https://secure.panoramaed.com/ride/understand?auth_token=geZrUH8yRr8_Ln_C9LH3

From that link, the viewer can click on the state icon and then the "Family" tab. There's a dropdown menu for the viewer to select the year.

Family Survey questions from previous years can be viewed at these demo survey links (they take you to our survey-taking platform which is also ADA compliant):

2021: https://admin.panoramaed.com/ride/survey/demo_templates/75472?administration_id=48779&term_id=0

2020: https://admin.panoramaed.com/ride/survey/demo_templates/45281?administration_id=29858&term_id=0

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

OSEP notes that the State submitted verification that the attachment complies with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508). However, one or more of the attachments included in the State's FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

RIDE has confirmed with its vendor, Panorama Education, that its webpage is in compliance with Section 508 and FFY 2019 results can be found here: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/informationAccountability/RIEducationData/SurveyWorks.aspx>. Individuals may click on survey results for 2020 to view all survey questions and results. To assure that Rhode Island complies with Section 508 its response and course of action is to delete the attachment as the same information can be accessed on the webpage at the link provided (survey content/question and all data results) which is 508 compliant. It is not a requirement that the same information be found as an attachment v. information that is already available for public view.

Results are available on the Panorama platform, which is WCAG/ADA compliant. Results for families can be accessed using this public link (the same one available on the RIDE website): https://secure.panoramaed.com/ride/understand?auth_token=geZrUH8yRr8_Ln_C9LH3
From that link, the viewer can click on the state icon and then the "Family" tab. There's a dropdown menu for the viewer to select the year.

Family Survey questions from previous years can be viewed at these demo survey links (they take you to our survey-taking platform which is also ADA compliant):

2021: https://admin.panoramaed.com/ride/survey/demo_templates/75472?administration_id=48779&term_id=0

2020: https://admin.panoramaed.com/ride/survey/demo_templates/45281?administration_id=29858&term_id=0

8 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not provide verification that the attachment(s) it included in its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission is/are in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508.

The State did not report the metric used to determine representativeness, as required by the Measurement Table.

8 - Required Actions

OSEP notes that one or more of the Indicator 8 attachment(s) included in the State's FFY 2020 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.

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR The State must report the metric used to determine representativeness, as required by the Measurement Table.

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 the reporting year, 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 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.67%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 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.

3

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3	0	59	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

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 3 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 3 districts (all small 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 3 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 3 districts identified in step 1 of the FFY2020 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, completion of a full and individual evaluation, and re-evaluation processes and practices.

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 2020 and 2021 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 FFY2020

As a result of its extensive verification process, the State found that no districts were noncompliant with the eligibility and evaluation requirements. Accordingly, the State determined that 0 of the 3 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.

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 3 districts identified in step 1 of the FFY2020 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, completion of a full and individual evaluation, and re-evaluation processes and practices.

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 2020 and 2021 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 FFY2020

As a result of its extensive verification process, the State found that no districts were noncompliant with the eligibility and evaluation requirements. Accordingly, the State determined that 0 of the 3 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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

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 2020, 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 specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

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 specific disability categories 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	1.67%	5.45%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2020 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.

4

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
8	0	58	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

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 8 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, most districts met the n size for at least one race/ethnicity group in special education. Only 4 districts (small 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 4 were 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 8 districts identified in step 1 of the FFY2020 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, completion of a full and individual evaluation, and re-evaluation processes and practices.

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 2020 and 2021 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 FFY2020.

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 8 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 8 districts identified in step 1 of the FFY2020 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, completion of a full and individual evaluation, and re-evaluation processes and practices.

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 2020 and 2021 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 FFY2020.

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 8 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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

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

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
 - b. # 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2008	67.86%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.24%	99.84%	99.21%	99.35%	99.05%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3,034	2,992	99.05%	100%	98.62%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

42

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 2020-2021 there were (3034-2992=42) 42 children whose evaluations were not completed within 60 day timeline. These 42 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 42 children who did not receive a timely initial evaluation.

The range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed was between 4 and 154 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: 'Due to Covid 19', 'Team unable to complete evaluation', 'staffing changes at school' and 'testing personnel not available'.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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 2020 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 to 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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

selected students to Rhode Island Department of Education, in order to verify the student information entered on the system. (Those local education agencies who were 100% compliant in the previous school year are exempt from this student record verification requirement.) The Student Record Verification Sheet submitted from the local education agency to Rhode Island Department of Education includes a summary of the student information for the selected students and the relevant supporting documentation. This verification method is utilized to ensure accuracy and reliability of the data on the system for the local education agencies. In addition, during Rhode Island Department of Education School Support System visits to the local education agencies, a number of student records are selected for review and verification. This verification of selected student records is another effort utilized to ensure a comprehensive and reliable data system.

5. The Special Education Evaluation System generates and emails to the local education agency each quarter the Report of Students Missing Data. This report serves two purposes. It is a reminder that there are students on the system who are still in the process and their evaluations have not been completed or the data was not yet recorded on the system. The report displays the number of days since the 'date of receipt of the parental consent' to the date the report was generated. Local education agencies can use this report to ensure they are staying within the 60 day time line for each student.

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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 2019 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 2020 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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that

each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

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

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # 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.

Targets must be 100%.

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.

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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	93.16%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.45%	99.50%	98.87%	98.40%	97.30%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	709
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	96

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	545
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.	15
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	13
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

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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.	545	585	97.30%	100%	93.16%	N/A	N/A

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
40

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 40 students from 8 LEAs who did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their 3rd birthdays.
 22 children delayed due to a Registration Issues: (1) =10 days, (2) 11-20 days, (1) 21-30 & (2) 31-40 days, (1) 41-50 days, (1) 51-60 days, (14) >60 days
 11 children delayed due to Late EI Referral to LEA: (2) 21-30 & (2) 31-40 days, (1) 41-50 days, (1) 51-60 days, (5) >60 days
 3 children delayed due to COVID backlog/restrictions/closures: (1) =10 days, (1) 21-30, (1) >60 days
 1 child delayed due to Awaiting outside testing: (1) 21-30
 1 child delayed due to EI losing contact with the family: (1) >60 days
 1 child delayed due to District error: (1) =10 days
 1 child delayed due to Delayed Bilingual S/L Eval: (1) >60 days

Attach PDF table (optional)

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.

For the first time, during FFY2020, LEAs were able to upload their indicator 12 data directly to the RI Department of Education (RIDE) as part of our Initial Evaluation Collection, formerly only including indicator 11 data. RIDE worked over the last couple of years to create this new data system that can pull multiple data sets including existing special education census data and Early Intervention notification data, as well as allow for LEA inputted data. The Executive Office of Health & Human Services (EOHHS), the lead agency for Part C, shares LEA notification data monthly due to notification requirements and assist RIDE in identifying students 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) is identified. This new data system significantly decreases the necessary effort to identify the children who do not have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays and increases the reliability of the data collected and reported.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Although districts have policies and procedures in place to ensure eligible children transitioning from EI are in service by their 3rd birthday, the impacts of the pandemic have been multi-faceted. Over the last several years, RI has shown an overall consistency in results between 97.3% and 99.5%. Unfortunately, this year the total number of children who did not experience a timely transition almost doubled from 21 children reported last year to 40 this year, resulting in 93.16% compliance. In addition to the decrease in timely transitions, RI witnessed an overall decrease in the number of children served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination, decreasing from 1065 last year to 709 this year, partially due to systemic issues within Early Intervention, as well as a lack of family desire to participate in Early Intervention (EI) and early childhood special education (ECSE) during the pandemic. During the early days of the pandemic, districts worked diligently to create the vehicles, practices, and training to implement virtual assessments, hold virtual meetings, and determine how to provide instruction through distance learning. RIDE provided almost immediate support via virtual meetings and FAQ information disseminated to districts and posted on the RIDE website. Such support focuses on reinforcing the ongoing requirements and offering suggestions for moving to virtual meetings, assessments, and services. Unfortunately, due to the continued complications of the pandemic, including registration issues, delays, backlogs, and restrictions, additional delays were evident and a reduction in compliance was witnessed.

Additionally, it is important to note that this is the first year with a new data system. The 2019-2020 school year was the last year that Early Intervention Transition (Indicator 12) data was submitted to the RI Department of Education (RIDE) annually as part of the preschool performance report. RIDE worked over the last couple of years to create this new data system that can pull multiple data sets including existing special education census data and Early Intervention notification data, as well as allow for LEA inputted data. In July of 2020, RIDE moved the data collection to a new platform within the existing Initial Evaluation Collection, formerly only including indicator 11 data. FFY 2020 served as the first-year districts were able to enter all relevant EI transition data into the new database with an automatic upload to RIDE's Initial Evaluation Collection. RIDE provided extensive training and professional development to all LEAs during the 2019-2020 SY before implementing the new data collection system and provided individual technical assistance to districts when the new system went into effect.

Although the new data system has the potential to increase efficiency in identifying children who do not have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays and increases the reliability of the data collected and reported, LEAs have experienced some expected difficulties in the transition. One LEA had significant difficulty transitioning to the new data system which led to over 50% of the state's noncompliance. This one district represented twenty-five (25) of the forty (40) children identified as late. Twenty-two (22) of those children were late due to registration issues, which have since been resolved. The district leadership is committed to correcting any systemic issues and working with RIDE to ensure compliance moving forward. RIDE has

worked to alleviate challenges witnessed by the LEAs, to ensure a smoother collection during the current year, and to provide individual TA to those having the most difficulty. RIDE is dedicated to supporting LEAs and increasing compliance with indicator 12. Finally, as 2020-2021 was the first year with the new data collection, the data system itself accounted for some data entry errors which led to the removal of some child-level data, with the overall number of children decreasing from 1065 last year to 709 this year. Based on the analysis of the data, RIDE has since worked to create additional data entry validation rules and to support the LEAs to ensure all data can be entered. Ultimately, RIDE believes that the data accuracy will be greatly increased with the new data collection system in place. Because of the significant changes in how Rhode Island now collects indicator 12 data, and after stakeholder feedback, the decision was made to change baselines to 2020.

Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Stakeholder Input

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described in the Introduction section, extensive stakeholder input was sought relative to ECSE, including indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus. RIDE began considering various mechanisms for engaging stakeholders back in the summer of 2021. In addition to RIDE's general engagement efforts, a decision was made to create additional opportunities to focus on the three ECSE indicators. Although in-person meetings were offered and discussed with stakeholders, their clear preference was to hold virtual meetings as the primary vehicle for gathering feedback and for making the results known to the public. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. Planning for stakeholder sessions included identifying how best to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents in supporting the development and implementation of activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. RIDE began actively engaging specific ECSE stakeholders in September 2021. The stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback. RIDE supported three different opportunities to engage ECSE stakeholders during the fall and winter of 2021 into the early days of 2022. All sessions began with a broad overview of the individual ECSE SPP/APR indicator(s), highlighting what was most relevant to each stakeholder group, discussion of the historical data, potential targets, improvement strategies, and vehicles for evaluating progress. Because indicator 12 is a compliance indicator, the stakeholder input was focused on trends over time, improvement strategies, and evaluation methods.

* Due to character count restrictions, please see the details regarding the specific ECSE stakeholder input within indicators 6 & 7.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	4	2	1

FFY 2019 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 seven (7) LEAs with noncompliance in FFY 2019 were identified in the state Consolidated Resource Plan and were required to analyze barriers to compliance and develop a corrective action plan addressing the data collection quality and prevention of delayed transitions. LEAs were required to submit these plans specifying goals, improvement activities, date of implementation, and monitoring strategies. In addition, RIDE offered technical assistance to support the districts in identifying the barriers to 100% compliance, recognizing necessary changes in protocol, using 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 2020) to confirm that each district out of compliance in the previous year is now implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and achieving 100% compliance. Based on the state's review of FFY 2020 data, the state verified that four (4) of the seven (7) LEAs are now correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and have reached 100% compliance. Additionally, two (2) LEAs have subsequently corrected, as evidenced in the data over the past 6 months. The last LEA currently reached 94% compliance, an increase over FFY 2019 findings. Although the one LEA continues to demonstrate non-compliance in the FFY 2020 data, it must be noted that they have improved compliance by 2 percentage points even though they are still encountering significant challenges due to the pandemic. RIDE has provided significant TA to this district to ensure that they can implement IEPs by each child's third birthday, regardless of COVID complications, and will continue to monitor compliance moving forward.

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

RIDE used the data districts enter into the Initial Evaluation Collection data system that is then uploaded into the consolidated resource plan (CRP) to confirm that each individual case of noncompliance, although late had been corrected. As reported, twenty-one (21) children in the FFY 2019 were found eligible for Part B but did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their 3rd birthdays due to delay factors not allowed by OSEP. Through the data provided in the FFY 2019 preschool performance report, the state verified that each of these LEAs corrected the individual cases of noncompliance. For any child with whom implementation was not timely, the districts were 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 2019 FFY findings was corrected and that all 21 children, although late, had an IEP developed and implemented.

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The one (1) district identified above, who was out of compliance in FFY 2019 and is not yet in compliance, will participate in individualized technical assistance during the upcoming year. This TA will provide the necessary support to analyze barriers, including those caused by the pandemic, and to identify essential protocol changes. The LEA will develop detailed and specific corrective action plans addressing the identified issues. The plans will include specific goals, improvement activities, dates of implementation, and monitoring strategies. The RI Department of Education will ensure that the plans meet all requirements and monitor the plans' application throughout the year. The RI Department of Education will continue to conduct subsequent reviews to determine the LEA is correctly implementing regulatory requirements based on 100% compliance. It is important to recognize that RIDE has verified that each individual case of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 was corrected and that each child, although late, had an IEP developed and implemented.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2018	2	2	0

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

FFY 2018

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 two (2) LEAs identified as out of compliance in the FFY 2018 findings were identified in the preschool performance report and were required to analyze barriers to compliance and develop a corrective action plan addressing the data collection quality and prevention of delayed transitions. LEAs were required to submit these plans specifying goals, improvement activities, date of implementation, and monitoring strategies. In addition, RIDE offered technical assistance to support the districts in identifying the barriers to 100% compliance, recognizing necessary changes in protocol, using 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 current consolidated resource plan (FFY 2020) to confirm that each district out of compliance in 2018 is now implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and achieving 100% compliance. Based on the RI Dept of Educations review of FFY 2020 data, the state verified that both LEAs are now correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and have reached 100% compliance.

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

RIDE used the data districts entered into the 2018 preschool performance report to confirm that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected. RIDE has verified that each individual case of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 was corrected and that each child, although late, had an IEP developed and implemented.

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that the remaining two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 and each LEA with remaining 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

Each of the seven (7) LEAs identified as out of compliance in the FFY 2019 findings were identified in the state Consolidated Resource Plan and were required to analyze barriers to compliance and develop a corrective action plan addressing the data collection quality and prevention of delayed transitions. LEAs were required to submit these plans specifying goals, improvement activities, date of implementation, and monitoring strategies. In addition, RIDE offered technical assistance to support the districts in identifying the barriers to 100% compliance, recognizing necessary changes in protocol, using 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 consolidated (FFY 2020) 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 2020 data, four (4) of the four (7) LEAs are now correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and have reached 100% compliance. Additionally, two (2) LEAs have subsequently corrected, as evidenced in the data over the past 6 months. The last LEA currently reached 94% compliance, an increase in compliance over FFY 2019 findings.

Although the one LEA continues to demonstrate non-compliance in the FFY 2020 data, it must be noted that they have improved compliance by 2% even though they are still encountering significant challenges due to the pandemic. RIDE has provided significant TA to this district to ensure that they can implement IEPs by each child's third birthday, regardless of COVID complications, and will continue to monitor compliance moving forward. RIDE used the data districts enter into the Initial Evaluation Collection that is then uploaded into the consolidated resource plan (CRP) to confirm that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected. As reported, twenty-one (21) children in the FFY 2019 were found eligible for Part B but did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their 3rd birthdays due to delay factors not allowed by OSEP. Through the data provided in the FFY 2019 preschool performance report, the state verified 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 2019 FFY findings was corrected and that all 21 children, although late, had an IEP developed and implemented.

The one (1) district that was out of compliance in FFY 2019 and is not yet in compliance, will participate in individualized technical assistance (TA) and monitoring during the upcoming year. This TA will provide the necessary support to analyze barriers, including those caused by the pandemic, and to identify essential protocol changes. The LEA will develop detailed and specific corrective action plans addressing the identified issues. The plans will include specific goals, improvement activities, dates of implementation, and monitoring strategies. The RI Department of Education will ensure that the plans meet all requirements and monitor the plans' application throughout the year. It is important to recognize that RIDE has verified that each individual case of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 was corrected and that each child, although late, had an IEP developed and implemented.

Each of the two (2) LEAs identified as out of compliance in the FFY 2018 findings were identified in the preschool performance report and were required to analyze barriers to compliance and develop a corrective action plan addressing the data collection quality and prevention of delayed transitions. LEAs were required to submit these plans specifying goals, improvement activities, date of implementation, and monitoring strategies. In addition, RIDE offered technical assistance to support the districts in identifying the barriers to 100% compliance, recognizing necessary changes in protocol, using 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 current consolidated resource plan (FFY 2020) to confirm that each district out of compliance in 2018 is now implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and achieving 100% compliance. According to the FFY 2020 data, both LEAs are now correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and have reached 100% compliance.

RIDE used the data districts entered into the 2018 preschool performance report to confirm that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected. RIDE has verified that each individual case of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 was corrected and that each child, although late, had an IEP developed and implemented.

12 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining [1] uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 was corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019: (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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2009	98.21%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.94%	99.96%	99.90%	99.98%	99.98%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
5,340	5,347	99.98%	100%	99.87%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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. 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 NTACT:C (formerly NSTAC) I-13 checklist and districts have been trained on its use. LEA's report that the use of the rubric has effectively assisted in the quality analysis and improvement of student's IEPs.

Question	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 no, please explain

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In addition to broad stakeholder input described in the introduction section, specific feedback session were conducted (Sept. - Dec. 2021) focused on Indicators 1,2,13 & 14 facilitated with members of the following: State Transition interagency Council, Regional Transition Centers, Regional Transition Advisory committees (largely LEA personnel and adult provider agencies), RI Parent Information Network, Parent Support Network, students and parents. Three parents and one student reside on the State Transition Council; one parent liaison within the Regional Transition Centers who specializes in Secondary Transition and six parents as part of the development of the RI DAS Blueprint contributed to the setting of baselines, targets and discussions related improvement activities. Stakeholder input from these individuals has been critical as they are often the front line staff who work directly with students. Their input will drive statewide, regional and local improvement activities, technical assistance and professional development. The Regional Transition Centers continue to provide targeted technical assistance on both compliance and quality of IEPs related to Indicator 13 requirements. Additionally, beginning this school year, stakeholders and LEA personnel discussed OSEP's revision of this indicator, clarifying that there must be evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. As with other monitor procedures we utilize for secondary transition requirements, RIDE will utilize the special education census collection, individual student record reviews and onsite monitoring to ensure that there is evidence of the measurement clarification as required now by OSEP. It does not appear that Covid 19 impacted the data and performance of Indicator 13.

For FFY 2020 (2019-2020 SY), seven initial records/findings within five different school districts were found to be non-compliant in one or more transition requirements as of June 30, 2021. These records have since been brought into compliance by each district as of February 2022. The individual records/findings were already corrected and verified as compliant by RIDE. The affected districts submitted an updated and corrected, individualized, compliant IEP for the initially non-compliant student IEP. It should be noted that all of the errors were clerical errors within the collection system. Based on subsequent collection and review for 2020-2021 SY each 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 99.87% in FFY 2020. As noted above, the state continues to provide technical assistance not only on compliance but also on the quality of students IEPs fostering student voice and engagement of IEP members, particularly caregivers/families.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

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

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

For FFY 2019 (2018-2019 SY), one record/finding was non-compliant in one or more transition requirements as of June 30, 2020. This record has been brought into compliance as of February 2021. This record was corrected and verified as compliant by RIDE. The one affected school district submitted an updated and corrected, compliant IEP for the initially non-compliant IEP. It should be noted this error was a clerical error. Based on the state's

subsequent collection and review for 2020-2021 SY this school district is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR 300.320 (b) and 300.321 (b), achieving 100% compliance. Compliance and quality across the state has been excellent, having progressed from 98.21% baseline to 99.87% in FFY 2020.

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

For FFY 2019 (2018-2019 SY), one record/finding was non-compliant in one or more transition requirements as of June 30, 2020. This individual records was brought been brought into compliance as of February 2021. This individual record/finding was corrected and verified as compliant by RIDE. The affected district submitted an updated and corrected, individualized, compliant IEP for the initially non-compliant IEP. It should be noted that this error on this individual IEP was a clerical error and not a specific transition requirement. Based on the state's subsequent collection, review and verification of the student's individual IEP, the district is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR 300.320 (b) and 300.321 (b), achieving 100% compliance. The district continues to demonstrate both quality and compliance on individual student records.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

FFY 2019 (2019 - 2020 SY): For 2019-2020 SY, one record/finding was initially non-compliant in one or more transition requirements as of June 30, 2020. This record was brought into compliance as of February 2021. 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 2019-2020 SY every district is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR 300.320 (b) and 300.321 (b), achieving 100% compliance.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

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 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 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”:

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 of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). 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

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

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.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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 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. States should consider categories such as race/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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents 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 must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2009	Target ≥	39.00%	40.00%	41.00%	42.00%	43.00%
A	33.00%	Data	31.33%	28.43%	29.03%	32.05%	32.97%
B	2018	Target ≥	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%
B	65.38%	Data	64.70%	70.01%	69.43%	65.38%	48.32%
C	2009	Target ≥	84.00%	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%	88.00%
C	78.00%	Data	84.44%	80.49%	79.47%	77.19%	78.78%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	33.00%	33.42%	33.84%	34.25%	34.67%	35.08%
Target B ≥	65.38%	65.38%	65.88%	66.38%	66.68%	67.38%
Target C ≥	78.00%	78.60%	79.20%	79.80%	80.40%	81.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use

of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022. As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability - Information & Accountability User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also 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 5 Part B 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 and SSIP 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/

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback.

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described in the Introduction section, specific feedback sessions were conducted (Sept.-Dec. 2021) focused on Indicators 1,2,13 & 14 facilitated with members of the following: State Transition Interagency Council, Regional Transition Centers, Regional Transition Advisory Committees (largely LEA personnel), RI Parent Information Network, Parent Support Network, students and parents. Three parents and one student reside on the State Transition Council; one parent liaison within the Regional Transition Centers who specializes in Secondary Transition and six parents as part of the development of the RI DAS Blueprint. contributed to the setting of baselines, targets and improvement activities. IDC's "A How to Webinar"- Setting SPP/APR targets as well as the indicator's historical, current and disaggregated data analysis were reviewed with stakeholders.

Particular analysis of targets and data for Indicator 14 were reviewed with state and regional transition coordinators in consultation with the IDEA Data Center and NTACT:C in preparation for stakeholder input sessions. Stakeholders were able to review and discuss targets and data from the past ten years and discuss the various methods provided by the IDEA data center in which to consider a reset of baselines and targets as necessary. Stakeholders were able to specifically review trend line data, incremental and growth data from year to year, as well as methodology that examines end goal target setting. With stakeholder advice, RI has set new targets for Measures A,B,C that are rigorous and achievable, and show improvement over the baseline. Stakeholders also felt it necessary to set a new baseline for Measure B as the targets have not been reached in the last five years and data has been below the original baseline for three of the five years. Stakeholders felt that setting a new baseline by considering the average of the past five years of Measure B data, specifically the years prior to Covid and chose the FFY 2018 data (65.38%) as a responsible and appropriate baseline reset. Improvement activities and initiatives were also discussed with stakeholders which are detailed in the RI State Transition Plan. Many of these activities include targeted technical assistance to LEA's with the lowest performing data related to Response and Engagement Rates using tools developed by NTACT-C; specific training and technical assistance for the transition outcome survey callers as well as providing best practices and resources to LEAs on this indicator. Stakeholders will continue to be involved in the review of progress over the next several years as we continue to work to improve outcomes for transition age youth.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,116
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	800
Response Rate	71.68%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	232
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	134
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)	60
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).	187

Measure	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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	232	800	32.97%	33.00%	29.00%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	366	800	48.32%	65.38%	45.75%	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)	613	800	78.78%	78.00%	76.63%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	BASED ON SURVEY RESULTS, RI SAW A DECREASE OF 4 PERCENTAGE POINTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION FROM THE PREVIOUS YEAR. HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN RI SAW AN OVERALL DECREASE IN ENROLLMENT OF 13% IN 2020 WITH IN-PERSON LEARNING NOT RETURNING UNTIL JANUARY 2021. ALTHOUGH COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES MAY HAVE PROVIDED INSTRUCTION VIRTUALLY, IT MAY NOT BE MOST CONDUCTIVE FOR MANY STUDENT LEARNING STYLES. ADDITIONALLY, THE COLLEGE PLANNING CENTER IN RI, A RESOURCE HEAVILY USED FOR STUDENTS TRANSITIONING TO POSTSECONDARY, ACCESSING RESOURCES AND ASSISTANCE WITH COMPLETING THE FASFA WAS ONLY OPERATING VIRTUALLY POTENTIALLY IMPACTING MEASURE A AS WELL. THE REGIONAL TRANSITION CENTERS CONTINUED TO SUPPORT ALL STUDENTS, FAMILIES AND EDUCATORS WITH PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, RESOURCES AND EVENTS (COLLEGE FORUM) VIRTUALLY. RI REMAINS FOUR PERCENTAGE POINTS HIGHER IN MEASURE A THAN THE MOST RECENT NATIONAL DATA.
B	RI SAW AN INCREASE OF 2 PERCENTAGE POINTS IN COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT WHILE OTHER EMPLOYMENT REMAINED THE SAME FROM THE PREVIOUS YEAR. THE OVERALL UNEMPLOYMENT RATES IN 2020 SAW CONTINUOUS INCREASES IN APRIL THROUGH JUNE AND CONTINUED EFFECTS ON CURRENT EMPLOYMENT. AS SCHOOLS BEGAN TO RE-OPEN, RESTRICTIONS IN COMMUNITY ACCESS, LIMITED IN-PERSON VOCATIONAL EXPERIENCES AND CHALLENGES IN ADHERING TO MASK REQUIREMENTS MAY ALL BE CONTRIBUTING FACTORS TO THE IMPACT OF COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT AND OTHER EMPLOYMENT CATEGORIES AS WELL AS THE DECREASE IN HIGHER EDUCATION. DESPITE MANY OF THESE CHALLENGES, RIDE AND THE STATE OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION PARTNERED TO PROVIDE AND SUPPORT A VARIETY OF VIRTUAL CAREER AND VOCATIONAL RESOURCES TO STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IN RI.
C	GIVEN THE DECREASES IN MEASURES A AND B, AND THE CHALLENGES THAT COVID 19 HAS PRESENTED, RI HAS SLIPPED SLIGHTLY AS COMPARED TO THE PREVIOUS YEAR, HOWEVER, RI MAINTAINS A STABLE OVERALL ENGAGEMENT RATE THAT REMAINS HIGHER THAN THE MOST RECENT NATIONAL DATA FOR THIS MEASURE.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 2: 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.

Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	73.00%	71.68%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

RI uses the National Post School Outcomes (NPSO) Response Calculator to determine any group that may be underrepresented. Use of this calculator indicates that the most recent survey 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. The data does not identify a specific group that was underrepresented. In the next several years, RI has targeted improvement activities to increase the overall response rate. These strategies include technical assistance and professional development for those LEAs who have the lowest response rates; training for survey callers; and providing best practice techniques to improve both response and engagement rates. Currently, RI's response rate is more than eight percentage points higher than the most recent national median response rate.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Using the NPSO Response Calculator, RI is able to analyze responses by disability category, gender, ELL status, minority, geographic location; and dropout. Strategies to analyze nonresponse bias includes the states online survey and live tracking collection of secure respondent information allowing targeted support to LEA's to improve outreach efforts to specific youth during the survey time. Moving forward RI has begun using tools/strategies provided through the IDEA Data Center to assess nonresponse bias to better understand the differences between responders and non-responders in this survey collection. As part of improvement strategies, RI will promote the use of NPSO's Indicator 14 marketing strategies to LEAs, students and parents to continue to improve outreach and increase the overall state response rate from a broad section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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.

Use of the NPSO 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 considered and is representative of the target leaver groups. The demographics analyzed- disability category, gender, ELL status, minority, dropout, geographic location were all within the threshold (+/- 3% discrepancy) demonstrating representativeness of respondents.

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 left school. (yes/no)

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.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

RI uses the NPSO Response Calculator to determine Representativeness noting that a positive difference indicates over-representation, negative difference indicates under-representation. A difference of greater than +/-3 will be highlighted in red noting a discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group. No differences were noted and 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 left school.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Stakeholders also felt it necessary to set a new baseline for Measure B as the targets have not been reached in the last five years and data has been below the original baseline for three of the five years. Stakeholders felt that setting a new baseline by considering the average of the past five years of Measure B data, specifically the years prior to Covid and chose the FFY 2018 data (65.38%) as a responsible and appropriate baseline reset. Improvement activities and initiatives were also discussed with stakeholders which are detailed in the RI State Transition Plan. Many of these activities include targeted technical assistance to LEA's with the lowest performing data related to Response and Engagement Rates using tools developed by NTACT-C; specific training and technical assistance for the transition outcome survey callers as well as providing best practices and resources to LEAs on this indicator. Stakeholders will continue to be involved in the review of progress over the next several years as we continue to work to improve outcomes for transition age youth.

Impacts of Covid-19: Districts specifically reported challenges in data collection due to intermittent school closures (specifically administrative offices) resulting in lack of access to files to obtain student contact information. Also noted, survey callers often using cell phones, not identifiable school numbers so often students/parents often did not answer the call. The state encouraged all survey callers to make additional attempts to reach students once school buildings re-opened. Programmatically, RI did see the impact of Covid-19 in Measures A (Higher Education) and Measure B (Competitive Employment) as described in the above slippage reasoning for all youth, not solely students with disabilities. The state initiated steps with the state's vocational rehabilitation office offering several virtual services to schools and purchasing several online career exploration programs (ie. Virtual Job Shadow) to mitigate the impact on student progress during Covid-19. Additionally, once school buildings re-opened, the Regional Transition Centers provided targeted technical assistance to support schools in reengaging students back into community programming.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 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 EDFacts 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 and targets 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	11
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	7

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022. As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability & Information User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also 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 5

Part B 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 and SSIP 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.ride.ri.gov/SPED_PublicReporting/ In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback. There was a significant focus of gaining internal and external stakeholder feedback for Indicator 15 during the FFY2020-2021 when considering baseline targets through various stakeholder input, presenting the SPP/APR report to groups in draft form and using the longitudinal data and stakeholder input to develop targets. RIDE first compiled and analyzed data for the development of the SPP/APR and utilizing the expertise of internal RIDE personnel specifically, the IDEA Team comprised of (then) seven team members at the Office of Student, Community, and Academic Supports ("OSCAS") who all have different specialty areas including but not limited to social emotional learning, transition, state monitoring and early childhood education. It shall be noted that during the previous year Rhode Island did not meet the minimum number of resolution sessions (10) where it is required to develop a baseline and target to report on. During the FFY2020-2021 Rhode Island exceeded the requirement number by 1 in that there were 11 resolution sessions.

On December 16, 2021 the SE State Director of OSCAS presented draft targets for Indicator 15 to the RISEAC. 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 (over 50% of the Committee per the By-Laws). Additional information about RISEAC and its membership can be found at: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/StudentsFamilies/SpecialEducation/AdvisoryCommittees.aspx#1260640-special-education-advisory-committee-riseac>.

The RISEAC reviewed draft targets for Indicator 15 and provided suggestions and input. It was acknowledged during the meeting that Rhode Island is a small state that does not have a large amount of litigation in comparison to other states – i.e. New York and California. Special education mediation is the most utilized form of formal dispute resolution in Rhode Island. With that said the RISEAC commented on the low number of resolution sessions that were held during due process complaint filings. Again, specifically relating to proposed baseline targets for this indicator RISEAC was invited to submit more formalized feedback in writing to an IDEA team member.

The following announcement was included in the OSCAS update on December 13, 2021 which includes approx. 104 Rhode Island Special Education Directors and school staff and 26 RIDE employees.

Within RIDE Commissioner Angelica Infante-Green's December 10, 2021 electronic field memo to the entire RIDE and which is made available to the public on the RIDE webpage at <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InsideRIDE/FieldMemos.aspx> stated:

"State Performance Plan 2021-2025 Target Setting Public Input Requested

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires each state to develop a state performance plan/annual performance report (SPP/APR) that evaluates the state's efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of the IDEA and describes how the state will improve its implementation. The SPP/APRs include indicators that measure child and family outcomes and other indicators that measure compliance with the requirements of the IDEA. RIDE is soliciting input for the performance measures of the state performance plan (SPP). RIDE has analyzed data, examined trends in performance and has set draft targets for the 17 Indicators established by the US Department of Education Data visualizations of these Indicators are available. We invite members of the public to review the RIDE Community Engagement 2021 SPP Slide deck and offer comments. Stakeholders with a vested interest in these measures are encouraged to submit comments to Susan.Wood@ride.ri.gov on or before January 15, 2022."

On January 13, 2021 the entire draft SPP/APR report was presented to the RISEAC to review and request final feedback and input prior to submitting a final report to OSEP.

Baseline Target Specifics

The RIDE had provided the target of 57 percent for FFY 2019 for Indicator 15 and OSEP accepted that target. This target was not used due to the number of resolution sessions being below 10. After gaining a large amount of stakeholder feedback (including the above examples) from internal and external partners including the Rhode Island Parent Information Network ("RIPIN"), Rhode Island set new baseline targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 at:

FFY2020, 57.25 percent
FFY2021, 57.50 percent
FFY2022, 57.75 percent
FFY2023, 60.00 percent
FFY2024, 60.25 percent
FFY2025, 60.50 percent

Justification of the proposed and then RIDE accepted baselines is based on a combination of historical data trends, formal dispute resolution anticipated data given the COVID-19 pandemic, and feedback and recommendations from internal and external stakeholders. These baselines are considered realistic targets that the RIDE will strive to meet.

Actual data in FY2020 was 63.64 percent. The target was 57.25%. Rhode Island met target and did not have slippage. The total number of due process complaints filed in FY2020 was 15. The total number of resolution sessions that were held was 11. The number of written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings was 7. The total number of due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing) was 13.

As stated in every SPP/APR reporting period, in Rhode Island there is a close existing collaborative partnership with the RIPIN. The RIDE contract with RIPIN allows for an internal Special Education Call Center Specialist located directed at the RIDE. The Call Center Specialist's goal is to provide preventative resources to callers in attempts to aid in resolving issues at local levels before formal dispute resolution complaints are filed at the RIDE. Daily communications with RIPIN and the SE RIDE Call Center regarding the types of calls received allows for the discussion of trends in the dispute resolution system. All calls at the SE RIDE Call Center and at RIPIN are tracked through a Salesforce software database. This additionally allows for due process complaint data. As noted earlier, a majority of formal complaints are disputed and resolved through the special education mediation process.

Rhode Island continues to have a small number of due process complaints and all parties involved work closely to work towards a resolution during the 30-day resolution session before a hearing officer is formally appointed. Finally, it shall also be noted that the total number of due process complaints that were withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing) was 13. This is a positive number that is not specifically reflected in this indicator's submission.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	42.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%	57.00%
Data	75.00%	53.85%	57.14%	54.55%	42.86%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	57.25%	57.50%	57.75%	60.00%	60.25%	60.50%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
7	11	42.86%	57.25%	63.64%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Description of Stakeholder input continued:

Rhode Island still works closely with the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education ("CADRE") to monitor its special education dispute resolution system. After submitting an application and participating in interviews Rhode Island was selected to be a part of a written state complaint workgroup for improving its overall dispute resolution system (specifically in the area of written state complaints although the workgroup has also allowed for improvements to the state due process complaint system). CADRE has provided technical assistance and recommendations on improvements to the system including database review, tracking input and how to improve the marketing of the overall system. RIDE will continue to work on improvements to the system with CADRE's recommendations and review. Participation in CADRE webinars and workgroups allows for stakeholder feedback from other states and national partners.

Helpful links connected to reporting for this indicator:

-RIDE Webpage titled "When Schools and Families Do Not Agree:"

<https://www.ride.ri.gov/StudentsFamilies/SpecialEducation/WhenSchoolsandFamiliesDoNotAgree.aspx>

-RIDE Commissioner's Field Memos (stated above when collecting public feedback on target baselines):

<https://www.ride.ri.gov/InsideRIDE/FieldMemos.aspx>

-RIDE Webpage titled, "State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report," where the RIDE provided the opportunity for public feedback on baseline setting: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx>

-RIDE Community Engagement Deck for 2021 SPP: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Information-and-Accountability-User-Friendly-Data/Accountability/SPP/RIDCommEngagemt-2021SPP-slidedeck.pdf?ver=2021-12-08-121803-197>

-EMPAS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution, Rhode Island Data (2020-2021: <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/sites/idea-part-b-dispute-resolution>

FFY 2020 IDEA Part B – Dispute Resolution Data

Total # of due process complaints filed: 15

Resolution session meetings: 11

Written settlements agreements reached through resolution sessions: 7

Hearings fully adjudicated: 1

Decisions within extended timeline: 1

Due process complaints pending: 1

Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing): 13

Although OSEP already views this data prior to the submission of the SPP/APR, Rhode Island continues to include this data in its before to show the trend of the low number due process complaints and the high number of due process complaints that are withdrawn or dismissed without a formal hearing which is a positive trend.

IMPACT OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

In March of 2020, due to the global COVID pandemic, Rhode Island went to remote learning. In the fall of 2020, there was a late "in person" start to

school due to very high COVID infection rates. On and off throughout the 2020-2021 school year, students participated in both in person and remote learning due to intermittently high COVID infection rates. Rhode Island, unfortunately, has been known as the State with the highest infection rate (despite high vaccination rates) throughout 2021. Rhode Island believes that despite schools and districts having some students learning via distance learning during, that the COVID-19 pandemic has not had an impact on this indicator as it has met target and there was not any slippage.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

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

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 = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(ii))$ 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 mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	31
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	17

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022. As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability - Information & Accountability User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also 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 5 Part B 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 and SSIP 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/

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback. Specifically relating to Indicator 16 and in analyzing data for special education mediations, a number of sources were utilized in gaining stakeholder input for target setting for this indicator. During the past year there has been a more significant focus of gaining internal and external stakeholder feedback, as encouraged by OSEP, for Indicator 16 when considering baseline targets. RIDE first compiled and analyzed data for the development of the SPP and APR utilizing the expertise of internal RIDE personnel specifically, the IDEA Team comprised of (then) seven team members at the Office of Student, Community, and Academic Supports ("OSCAS"), who all have different specialty areas including but not limited to social emotional learning, transition, state monitoring and early childhood education. Then feedback was gained from other offices within RIDE.

It shall be noted that feedback gained included the calculation of this indicator in that it fails to positively highlight data points relating to special education mediations that are withdrawn, after formally being filed, due to issues being resolved at the local level. The targeted baselines were created and finalized after gaining feedback from internal and external sources and analyzing historical data. Historical data and baseline calculations are based off of the calculation that fails to positively highlight other areas of informal dispute resolution processes that occur including the use of the internal RIDE Special Education Call Center, the Rhode Island Parent Information ("RIPIN") Call Center and multiple efforts by IDEA Education Specialists to resolve issues between LEAs and families before formal dispute resolution avenues are utilized AND during pending special education mediations. It is also important to note that obtaining stakeholder feedback on targeted baselines for this indicator has no impact on the results of the number of special education mediations that occur that result in agreements and therefore has no impact Rhode Island meeting required targets. Improvements were made on preventative measures that may be implemented to informal dispute resolution practices in Rhode Island – before the formal filings of mediations and other processes.

Given OSEP's encouragement in obtaining many sources of feedback for targeted baselines, the following efforts have occurred: The RIDE IDEA Team began the creation of a Differently Abled Student Blueprint ("DAS Blueprint"). This process included monthly, two hour meetings, twice a month, with an internal RIDE Team and an external stakeholder group including approximately 80 plus individuals (teachers, administrators, parents, state partners, service providers...). Historical data for this indicator was presented to stakeholders.

During the course of the year the RIDE Call Center Specialist, in collaboration with agency partners at RIPIN, began to implement a Salesforce database to track inquiries and processed special education mediations. Target baselines were reviewed given data entered into the system and comparative data to RIPIN's Call Center inquiries.

An area of improvement connected to this indicated and gained through stakeholder feedback includes on-going needed quarterly training for special education mediators in Rhode Island with an emphasis on improving outcomes of mediations = agreements. During this fiscal year RIDE also hired a new special education mediator to add to its rotation and has promoted a new payment structure where there is increase in payment to contracted mediators if agreements are reached.

In December, 2021, the SE State Director of OSCAS presented draft targets for Indicator 16 to RISEAC. Additional information about RISEAC and its membership can be found at: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/StudentsFamilies/SpecialEducation/AdvisoryCommittees.aspx#1260640-special-education-advisory-committee-riseac>.

The RISEAC reviewed draft targets for Indicator 16 and provided suggestions and input. It was acknowledged during the meeting that Rhode Island is a small state that does not have a large amount of formal litigation. Special education mediation is the most utilized form of formal dispute resolution thus resulting in higher numbers in this indicator v. indicator 15. With that said, the RISEAC commented on the positive high number of special education mediations v. the high number of due process complaints. When looking at the Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution ("CADRE") data, Rhode Island ranks lower than the national average for all formal dispute resolution processes and special education mediation is the highest utilized formal process. Again, specifically relating to proposed baseline targets for this indicator RISEAC was invited to submit more formalize feedback in writing to an IDEA team member.

On January 13, 2021 the entire draft SPP/APR report was presented to the RISEAC to review and request final feedback and input prior to submitting a final report to OSEP.

Baseline Target Specifics

After gaining a large amount of stakeholder feedback from internal and external partners including RIDE, RIPIN, and RISEAC Rhode Island set new baseline targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 at:

FFY2020, 80.00 percent
 FFY2021, 80.25 percent
 FFY2022, 80.50 percent
 FFY2023, 80.75 percent
 FFY2024, 81.00 percent
 FFY2025, 81.25 percent

Justification of the proposed and then RIDE accepted baselines, is based on a combination of historical data trends, formal dispute resolution anticipated data given the COVID-19 pandemic, and feedback and recommendations from internal and external stakeholders. These baselines are considered realistic targets that the RIDE will strive to meet. The targets were specifically reset given that if current targets continued, the target would be onwads of 100% for this indicator which is not realistic.

Actual data in FY2020 was 61.29 percent. The target was 80.00%. Rhode Island did not meet target and had slippage. The total number special

education mediations FILED in FY2020 was 45. The number of special education mediations there were held was 31. The number of special education mediations that were withdrawn or not held was 14.

Rhode Island still works closely with the CADRE to monitor its special education dispute resolution system. After submitting an application and participating in interviews Rhode Island was selected to be a part of a written state complaint workgroup for improving its overall dispute resolution system (specifically in the area of written state complaints although, the workgroup has also allowed for improvements to the entire state due process complaint system). CADRE has provided technical assistance and recommendations on improvements to the system including database review, tracking input and how to improve the marketing of the overall system. RIDE will continue to work on improvements to the system with CADRE's recommendations and review. Participation in CADRE webinars and workgroups allows for stakeholder feedback from other states and national partners.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	79.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	88.00%	89.00%	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%
Data	82.50%	74.07%	85.00%	92.59%	70.59%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	80.00%	80.25%	80.50%	80.75%	81.00%	81.25%

FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
2	17	31	70.59%	80.00%	61.29%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The reason that Rhode Island experienced slippage for this indicator was due to the decline in the number of SE mediation agreements. The number of SE mediations that were held was 31 and the number of mediation agreements (related to due process hearings during the 30-day resolution period and the number of mediation of agreements not related to due process complaints) was 19. An important data point to mention is that this reporting fails to highlight during the FFY 2020 the number of mediations that were withdrawn or not held was - which was 14. This is a large number and one may have the impression that this number is due to parties resolving issues through the SE RIDE Call Center, RIPIN or at the local level thus resulting in the need not to move forward with a filed SE mediation.

FFY 2020 IDEA Part B – Dispute Resolution Data

Total # of due process complaints filed: 15

Resolution session meetings: 11

Written settlements agreements reached through resolution sessions: 7

Hearings fully adjudicated: 1

Decisions within extended timeline: 1

Due process complaints pending: 1

Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing): 13

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

RIDE has recently hired one new special education mediator due to this avenue being the most utilized formal dispute resolution process in Rhode Island.

Information pertaining to the Rhode Island Regulations Governing the Education of Children with Disabilities can be found at:

<https://www.ride.ri.gov/StudentsFamilies/SpecialEducation/SpecialEducationRegulations.aspx>

Information about the special education mediation process in Rhode Island can be found at:

<https://www.ride.ri.gov/StudentsFamilies/SpecialEducation/WhenSchoolsandFamiliesDoNotAgree.aspx#1228619-special-education-state-mediation>

Helpful links connected to reporting for this indicator:

-RIDE Webpage titled "When Schools and Families Do Not Agree:"

<https://www.ride.ri.gov/StudentsFamilies/SpecialEducation/WhenSchoolsandFamiliesDoNotAgree.aspx>

-RIDE Commissioner's Field Memos (stated above when collecting public feedback on target baselines):

<https://www.ride.ri.gov/InsideRIDE/FieldMemos.aspx>

-RIDE Community Engagement Deck for 2021 SPP: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Information-and-Accountability-User-Friendly-Data/Accountability/SPP/RIDECommEngagemt-2021SPP-slidedeck.pdf?ver=2021-12-08-121803-197>

-EMPAS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution, Rhode Island Data (2020-2021: <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/sites/idea-part-b-dispute-resolution>

IMPACT OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

In March of 2020, due to the global COVID pandemic, Rhode Island went to remote learning. In the fall of 2020, there was a late "in person" start to school due to very high COVID infection rates. On and off throughout the 2020-2021 school year, students participated in both in person and remote learning due to intermittently high COVID infection rates. Rhode Island, unfortunately, has been known as the State with the highest infection rate (despite high vaccination rates) throughout 2021. Rhode Island believes that despite schools and districts having some students learning via distance learning during, that the COVID-19 pandemic has had an impact on this indicator as there has been a decrease in the number of mediations held. It is an assumption that the pandemic is the cause of less mediation requests although, mediations have been and continue to be held virtually and families' obligations during the pandemic included assuring their child receive FAPE and an education first and then disputing over services. RIDE predicts an increase in mediation requests in the upcoming year and hopes to see more agreements through the requests.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

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

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

K-8 students with disabilities will demonstrate improved mathematics achievement, as measured by an increased percentage of 8th grade students with disabilities demonstrating typical or high growth on the math statewide assessment—from 33% to 59% by FFY 2025.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.

System analyses included collaboration with the Office of College and Career Readiness and the Office of Instruction, Assessment and Curriculum at Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) to examine existing initiatives such as the state legislation requirement for all LEAs to adopt high quality curriculum materials by June 2023 and activities within the ReThink USDOE grant, disaggregated statewide mathematics achievement data, and available funding to support implementation. Based on this information and data from stakeholders (see below), the decision was made to continue focusing Indicator 17 on mathematics but adjusting the SiMR in response to the stakeholder engagement.

RIDE engaged in monthly internal meetings over 6 months to examine current state systems in special education with discussion anchored in state and national data exploration. Prior to this work, RIDE engaged in ongoing stakeholder feedback efforts with SSIP project participants, the state Math advisory group, RI State Advisory Council (RISEAC), and through other stakeholder surveys to collect feedback over time on recommended implementation and evaluation activities in addition to the SiMR and subgroup changes.

Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR.

Rhode Island Comprehensive Assessment System (RICAS)—statewide assessment. RIDE examined both proficiency data and growth data.

Historical state APR indicator data compared to national data,
current special education census data enrollment demographic data,
survey works climate data,
survey data collected at stakeholder sessions and through email and online forms, and
historical SSIP project data including formative data and implementation data

Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.

RIDE examined all APR and census data disaggregated by race and disability category and displayed in visualizations in tableau with comparisons to national data where possible with a large group of stakeholders. RICAS assessment growth and proficiency data were disaggregated by race and disability category in comparison to pre-covid data to help determine the potential changes for the SiMR and were considered in connection to the prior 2 years of stakeholder feedback.

RIDE examined statewide assessment data pre- and post-COVID (spring 2019 and spring 2021) to determine appropriate targets and a baseline was established using 2021 data. The FFY 2025 target represents recouping losses because of COVID. Additionally, project participants and stakeholders indicated that they would like to see the SSIP continue to focus on supporting mathematics achievement, but have the SiMR measure growth rather than proficiency and include an expanded focus to all students with disabilities in grade 8, rather than narrowly focusing on students with learning disabilities who are Black or Hispanic in grades 3-5. Growth data are not available for 3rd grade, part of the SiMR originally, and 8th grade improvements in typical or high growth on RICAS math will represent the cumulative impact of on-going work for K-8 children with disabilities in the area of math.

Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.

RIDE surveyed a variety of stakeholders, including parents/families, SSIP project participants, and the RISEAC. Additional interviews/focus groups were conducted with parents/families. Results of these activities are described later in this report.

Stakeholders had opportunities to engage with SiMR and SSIP implementation and outcome data from fall of 2019 to the present. These opportunities collected recommendations for the SiMR:

RIDE engaged in monthly external stakeholder meetings to review the same systems and data;
RIDE and RIPIN distributed a parent survey regarding the SiMR focus to date in math;
RIDE engaged in 2 years (2019-20, 2020-21, even into fall 2021) of seeking feedback from the project professional learning community (PLC), state math advisory, and RISEAC regarding the SiMR measure;
Engagement with multiple RIDE offices and technical assistance providers such as the Center on Assessment and the IDC to examine data and targets that would be reasonable and ambitious

When engaging with any stakeholder groups, SSIP implementation and outcome data were shared and explored in facilitated meetings designed to elicit observations, questions, recommendations, and needs.

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

Students with disabilities in grade 8 who have growth data on the RICAS math state assessment

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

During this reporting period, the previous submission's theory of action (TOA) was followed. Because of the update to the SiMR in this submission, a new TOA was developed. The TOAs are similar, but the new TOA expands the focus to "accessible, evidence-based math instruction, including data-based individualization (DBI)" and an emphasis on all tiers of a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) instead of focusing narrowly on Tier 3/intensive intervention. Additionally, the new TOA specifically calls attention to specially designed instruction (SDI).

Stakeholder feedback and outcome data supported an emphasis on using evidence-based mathematics instruction in MTSS and DBI to ensure SDI happens in the most inclusive environments.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx#41832102-theory-of-action-revisions>

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

Revised Strategy: Based on SSIP participant and stakeholder feedback, the strategies to support educators and students will now incorporate engaging schools in a full continuum of evidence-based math instruction in MTSS to include DBI (past SSIP focus), and math professional learning on BRIDGE-RI with added coaching support and professional learning on specially designed instruction.

A revised Logic Model with activities, outputs, and outcomes can be viewed at

<https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx#41832103-logic-model-revisions>

The Logic Model includes links to new math curriculum frameworks and professional learning resources which are supported with aligned funding from the agency.

Rationale: SSIP work to date has been with a select group of LEAs. To scale and sustain efforts, the new approach involves scaling up professional learning support statewide in an online platform (BRIDGE-RI) to align to professional learning processes in the SPDG focused on literacy. The academic impact from the pandemic is very large and will likely require multiple years and additional educational supports/interventions to recover. The current SSIP professional learning has reached the end of a 5-year contract with one-year extension applied, and RIDE must issue a new RFP in spring 2022 to continue and expand the work. The Logic Model Revisions reflect stakeholder feedback and data analysis of implementation and outcome measures. The revised TOA, logic model, and evaluation plans will be finalized with the new vendor.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	33.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=	33.00%	36.00%	41.00%	46.00%	51.00%	59.00%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

8th grade students with disabilities who demonstrate typical or high growth on math state assessment	8th grade students with disabilities that have growth data on math state assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
394	1,189	0.00%	33.00%	33.14%	N/A	N/A

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

RICAS math state assessment student growth percentile data from spring 2021 and spring 2019 administrations

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

RIDE administers the RICAS assessment statewide and collects results at the individual student level with unique student identifier and data warehouse tools matching to IEP census and enrollment census to examine specific student groups. Assessment growth and proficiency data were disaggregated by race and disability category in comparison to pre-covid data to help determine the potential target for the SiMR. Statistical analysis from the Center on Assessment of Baseline referenced Student growth Percentiles (SGPs) was examined by OSCAS and the Office of Instruction, Assessment, and

Curriculum at RIDE. Data of 8th grade students with disabilities, all races, ethnicities, and disability categories, was reported as low (SGP 1-34), typical (SGP 35-69) and high growth (SGP 70-100) for all students with growth data. RIDE then examined the percent of 8th grade students with disabilities that showed typical or high growth spring 2021 on math RICAS state assessment. This percent (33%) was compared to the 2019 data where 59% of students with disabilities made typical or high growth on the math RICAS state assessment. Data were shared across RIDE offices and with technical assistance providers at the IDC and AIR for input and feedback. A variety of stakeholders were invited to provide input and observations through meetings and online structures.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

Screening/benchmarking data

Using the screening data collection tool described in previous submissions, we calculated the percentage of students in each instructional tier, and percentage changes between fall 2020, winter 2021, and spring 2021. Data was reported for all participating sites, except for one urban school district and one suburban elementary school. Elementary school performance in Grades 3-5 demonstrated an upward trend, with a 6% increase from fall to winter and a 1% increase from winter to spring within Tier 1. Performance decreased by 3% from fall to winter and winter to spring within Tier 2. Interestingly, performance decreased by 4% from fall to winter but increased by 3% from winter to spring within Tier 3. The percentage in Tier 1 for the middle school performance reveals an upward trend, as well, with a 5% increase from fall to winter and a 2% increase from winter to spring. Tier 2 had a performance decrease of 2% from fall to winter and a 1% decrease from winter to spring. For Tier 3, performance decreased by 4% from fall to winter, with no change between winter and spring.

Interim, formative mathematics assessments in use by LEAs: STAR Math, iReady, AIMSWEB, NWEA Math, Monitoring Basic Skills Progress (MBSP) and

Data-Based Individualization (DBI) Case Studies: Three out of the 14 (21%) case study students made ambitious growth toward progress monitoring goals as of May 2021. This rate is much lower than in past years, which parallels RICAS outcomes and suggests the impact of COVID-19 on students.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

Impact: Baseline data was not available for FFY19 as planned due to COVID and FFY20 data must be used for baseline.

A skip year/gap growth analysis of cohort referenced mean of 50 was examined as well as baseline reference student growth percentiles (SGP) using pre-pandemic norms. Academic impact is fairly uniform across the grades and is very large. Prior to COVID, the average student growth percentile was 50. With the most recent 2021 data, average SGP is 32. This deviation from normal growth represents the academic impact showing the extent to which academic growth slowed down from 2019 to 2021. While growth was lower for some race/ethnicity groups, academic impacts (growth difference from 2019) are uniform across race/ethnicity subgroups. Data of 8th grade students with disabilities, all races, ethnicities, and disability categories, was grouped into low (SGP 1-34), typical (SGP 35-69) and high growth (SGP 70-100) for all students with growth data. RIDE then examined the percent of 8th grade students with disabilities that showed typical or high growth spring 2021 on math RICAS state assessment. This percent (33%) was compared to the 2019 data where 59% of students with disabilities made typical or high growth on the math RICAS state assessment.

COVID-19 also caused disruptions in how data were collected on implementation and outcomes. At the site level, implementation fidelity and progress monitoring data were not collected as frequently, and in limited circumstances, were not at all. In addition, even when collected, results should be interpreted with caution because declines in student performance may actually reflect inability to implement EBPs with fidelity due to student/educator absences resulting from quarantines.

Data analysis included steps to mitigate the impact on the data-collection included using a skip year/gap growth analysis of cohort referenced mean of 50 was examined as well as baseline reference student growth percentiles (SGP) using pre-pandemic norms.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

<https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx#41832104-ssip-evaluation-plan-revisions>

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

During this reporting period, the previous submission's evaluation plan was followed. Because of the update to the SiMR in this submission, a new evaluation plan was developed. The evaluation plans are similar regarding the data sources used as evidence, such as needs assessment, end-of-year pulse check, training evaluations and implementation surveys, and math beliefs surveys. A change to the new evaluation plan is collecting state assessment growth data rather than percent proficient to demonstrate the extent to which implementation of intensive math intervention and instruction practices have improved student outcomes. Given the new logic model outcomes, the evaluation questions have shifted to focus on the changes of educator knowledge as well as educator behaviors and practices to evidence-based math instruction from Tier 1 to Tier 3 Data-Based Individualization (DBI) to Specially Designed Instruction (SDI). The new evaluation plan includes families' reports of their awareness of and their own understanding of how to support their child's math instruction. The new evaluation plan will also assess how family and stakeholder beliefs about math instruction have changed over time instead of only focusing on educators' beliefs.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

Stakeholder feedback from parents, RISEAC, state math advisory, SSIP project participants, multiple RIDE offices, technical assistance partners, and special education directors guided revisions to the implementation activities and SiMR. The evaluation plan revisions align with those components and the new TOA and logic model previously described.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

Strategy 1: Align Statewide Initiatives. During this reporting period, RIDE continued working to align other state-level initiatives by identifying common goals. Specifically, infrastructure initiatives were leveraged to ensure that the SSIP project's (i.e., Math Project) core team is building on the success of various implementation efforts, including the state's systems of support (SOS) contract focused on MTSS, the Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability, and Reform (CEEDAR) Center, and NCII. The core team includes RIDE staff from across departments, project staff working directly with the school sites, stakeholders (described later), and key personnel from other RIDE initiatives. The SSIP core team made connections across the initiatives to (a) ensure consistency in how DBI, a process that integrates assessment and intervention for individual students—as a part of an MTSS model—is communicated; (b) revise implementation plans based on lessons learned; (c) connect with key personnel from existing RIDE initiatives on a regular basis; and (d) share ongoing updates with RIDE to facilitate a continuous feedback loop.

Strategy 2: SEA Cross-Office Collaborations. RIDE also made some infrastructure changes, which included implementation of recent state rules on LEA adoption of high-quality curricular materials (HQCM) in mathematics and English language arts. In response to new state rules, RIDE leadership developed a cross-office state team to support LEAs with their selection and implementation of HQCM in mathematics. In addition, RIDE recently received the following grants: ReThink and the State Personnel Development Grant along with additional mental health grants. RIDE continues to implement the School Climate Transformation grant and the Comprehensive Literacy State Development grant as well. In tandem, these grants and the Math Project provide a mechanism for RIDE to ensure that LEAs receive ample opportunity to focus professional learning efforts in the targeted areas of need with a strong focus on MTSS. The SSIP mathematics focus also fostered increased collaboration between staff at RIDE's Office of Student, Community and Academic Supports (OSCAS) and the Office of Instruction, Assessment & Curriculum (OIAC) on not only the Math Project for the SSIP but also general education mathematics initiatives and statewide curriculum work. Additional cross-office work has involved development of the RI Curriculum Frameworks embedding specific focus on students with disabilities. Members of OSCAS regularly collaborate with the Office of Instruction, Assessment & Curriculum along with the Office of College and Career Readiness on the ReThink and Curriculum Frameworks initiatives and will continue those endeavors along with a new math team representing the three offices.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

The collective evidence described below demonstrates the Math Project's progress toward short, intermediate, and long-term outcomes aligned to the project's logic model and TOA: Data related to the progress toward the SiMR were described earlier; the results shared below detail how training and coaching have resulted in changes to educators' beliefs about mathematics education and knowledge and implementation of EBPs to support achievement of the SiMR.

a. Training Evaluations

Between March 2021 and January 2022, the Math Project offered 17 online learning opportunities for educators (n=5), an asynchronous Book Study with Visible Learning text (n=23), and Bridges Math Intervention workshops (n=108). For each training, a common evaluation form was used to collect data on the quality and relevance of the session as well as the extent to which participants gained an understanding of the skills addressed in the session and their intent to apply those skills in their daily practices. Respondents (n=122; 90% response rate) rated their level of agreement with statements using strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For the purposes of analysis, we calculated an overall agreement percentage by aggregating the item responses of strongly agree and agree for each training. For the Book Study, 100% of respondents agreed with the following statements about the activity: "provided me with something (e.g., strategy, process, resource) that I can apply" and "helped me develop implementation plans for making mathematics visible for my students". For the Bridges Math Intervention workshops, 97% of respondents agreed with the same evaluation statements. Respondents also rated the level of relevance of content for each training with statements using very relevant, relevant, slightly relevant, or not at all relevant. For the item, "How relevant was this training module to your current needs," the majority of participants in both the Book Study and the Bridges Math Intervention workshops rated the content as relevant or very relevant (90% and 94%, respectively).

The training module evaluations suggest that participating educators are enhancing their knowledge related to supporting their students, and they also describe how they may apply their learning from the trainings in their classrooms, especially related to the following strategies: (a) addressing nonstrategic learner characteristics, (b) success with differentiation and application of instructional methods, (c) supporting students' mathematical language, (d) supporting English learners, and (e) implementing modifications and accommodations during math instruction.

b. Math Beliefs and Data-Driven Instruction

For the Math Belief survey, the analysis of progress from 2020 to 2021 (year to year) showed that recurring participants of the Math Project continue to maintain or increase their positive math beliefs rating. For the Data-Driven Instruction survey, the examination of comparative results between educators who have participated with the Math Project previously and those who are new affirms that participants' confidence and implementation of data-driven instruction increases as they continue to engage with the Math Project, despite the higher ratings given at the onset of initial project participation. Ratings by participants early on in implementation are often inflated (i.e., they don't know what they don't know and rate themselves higher).

c. Parent and Family Awareness

The Math Project worked with RIPIN to develop and distribute a survey to gather information on parent and family awareness of their child's mathematics instruction and how they support their child's mathematics instruction at home. The survey was available in both English and Spanish. In addition to the survey, participants opted-in to share in-depth explanations of their responses in a follow-up interview. Overall, RI parents and families feel confident about supporting their child's math instruction. Parents and families seek out a variety of additional resources for support, particularly strategies that inform parents on how the "new math" works. During the in-depth interviews, they provided suggested supports, which included effectively communicating information to them, coaching for both students and parents/families, online resources, providing examples of completed problems/answer keys, and support in understanding math instruction.

Progress Toward Intermediate and Long-Term Outcomes

d. DBI Pulse Check

The DBI pulse checks measure educators' perceptions related to their school sites' implementation of DBI (long-term outcome), a focus of project coaching. For school personnel who have participated in the project for at least 1 year, we noticed the overall ratings were higher than recurring participants' ratings on the domains related to educators' knowledge of DBI and educators' application of skills in DBI (intermediate outcomes), which may reflect how educators who are newer to implementing DBI do not understand its complexity and thus their responses appear inflated.

e. Student-Level DBI Case Study

Coaching with sites includes the development of student-level DBI case studies. Through case studies, educators at the SSIP school sites had an opportunity to apply skills and knowledge (intermediate outcome) they gained through the Math Project's training and coaching support. Based on the student-level DBI case study analysis, educators took concepts they learned and applied them into their practice with fidelity (long-term outcome). Because of the continuation of the COVID-19 pandemic, some school sites had low attendance of case study students due to medical absences as well as interventionists having reduced time to implement interventions. Three out of the 14 (21%) case study students made ambitious growth toward progress monitoring goals as of May 2021.

Sustainability of systems improvement efforts are supported by a system change strategy of increasing collaboration and communication within the SEA infrastructure:

f. Communication and Collaboration Survey among and between RIDE Initiatives

In October 2021, a survey was sent to personnel from several departments within RIDE, including OSCAS, where the SSIP work is housed. Thirteen staff members completed the survey. The survey addressed the performance measure regarding effective communication and coordination of SSIP activities and various RIDE initiatives. Most respondents agreed with these aspects of ensuring relevant participation in the SSIP activities. The highest agreement levels were related to facilitating the understanding of diverse perspectives (92%). The majority of personnel agreed that there were opportunities to provide feedback (77%) and to engage in efforts (62%). The stakeholders also rated their perception of the level of engagement related to SSIP activities. More than half of stakeholders (7) perceived that they are collaboratively engaged with SSIP efforts. The response numbers reflect a large turnover in staffing at RIDE related to impacts from the pandemic. Despite these challenges, collaboration efforts remained strong.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

BRIDGE-RI is a website (<https://mtssri.org/>) that houses MTSS content and resources, and is supported by the SOS contract through RIDE. It is also a learning management system designed to support educators with implementing MTSS practices, data, and systems. The BRIDGE-RI Courses are learning opportunities designed to foster active learner engagement, promote implementation of newly learned skills, provide learner choice, and build RI educator community. The courses engage participants through text, video or screencast of content or experts, video or audio from the course facilitator, or links to downloadable resources. The addition of self-reflection opportunities checks for understanding, and elements that allow course participants to interact with each other make courses engaging for the adult learner audience they serve.

In collaboration with BRIDGE-RI, the SSIP Math Project transferred its professional development learning modules into interactive online courses available to all RI educators. Currently there are three self-paced BRIDGE-RI Mathematics Courses: Core Instruction in the Mathematics Classroom, Supporting All Learners in Math: Universal Design, Differentiation, and Scaffolding, and Supporting Language Development in Mathematics. As of December 2021, 34 educators have completed at least one of the BRIDGE-RI Mathematics Courses. When asked, "to what extent did the content in this course advance your understanding of this subject," 59% of participants selected 'Quite a lot,' while 38% chose 'Somewhat.' It appears that the BRIDGE-RI Mathematics Courses are achieving the short-term outcome of increasing educator knowledge of EBP in math. When asked, "how much of what you learned will you apply to your practice," 47% of participants stated they learned some new things and hope to implement at least one of them in the future, while 53% stated they learned several new things and will be applying at least one of them immediately. The results reveal how the BRIDGE-RI Math Courses are demonstrating continued progress toward and achievement of the intermediate outcome of increasing educator application of skills related to EBP in math.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Through the end of its current contract (June 30, 2022), the current Math Project vendor will continue to transition their learning module content to the BRIDGE-RI Math courses to ensure sustainability. RIDE will issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) in early spring 2022 to identify a vendor to support implementation and evaluation of the SSIP, based on the new theory of action and logic model.

<https://www.ride.ri.gov/InformationAccountability/Accountability/StatePerformancePlan.aspx#41832103-logic-model-revisions>

The new logic model includes activities of providing training and resources on evidence-based math instruction and DBI through an online learning management system, BRIDGE-RI. This new model also specifies virtual and in-person coaching of teams on DBI and SDI. Given the new theory of action, the short-term and intermediate outcomes for educators now focus on increasing educator knowledge of and application of skills related to evidence-based math instruction at varying levels of intensity as well as collaboration and teaming practices and structures. For parents and stakeholders, the short-term and intermediate outcomes are to increase their awareness of evidence-based math instruction across all MTSS tiers and to improve their beliefs about math instruction. The long-term outcomes have shifted to improving formative and summative assessment outcomes for all students with IEPs, not only students with learning disabilities who are Black and/or Hispanic/Latino. The long-term outcome of improved fidelity of school-level implementation now includes both MTSS and SDI and acknowledges a shift to more statewide supports. The final long-term outcome also shifted its focus to improving stakeholder engagement to support improved math outcomes for all students with IEPs, not only those in urban settings.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

The following Common Core-aligned EBPs in mathematics across MTSS Tiers are incorporated into training and coaching activities with participating SSIP sites:

Concrete-Representational-Abstract (CRA) using concrete and virtual manipulatives
Clear and concise mathematical language supports
Visual schematic diagramming (e.g., Frayer model, place value thinking squares)
Schema-based instruction for word problem solving
Systematic and Explicit Instruction
Peer-assisted learning strategies (PALS) in mathematics
DBI process (includes evidence-based intensification strategies, including fluency practice)

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

The EBPs selected for implementation listed above were identified using the Institute of Education Sciences (IES)/What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Practice Guides: Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grades (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/26>) and Improving Mathematical Problem Solving in Grades 4 through 8 (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/16>). Each of the strategies has moderate to strong evidence, based on the IES/WWC criteria. Additionally, the Intervention Tools Chart from the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII) was consulted to identify specific programs that incorporate the EBPs (e.g., PALS Math, Pirate Math). The DBI process, is "research-based process for individualizing and intensifying interventions through the systematic use of assessment data, validated interventions, and research-

based adaptation strategies" (NCII, 2021).

For any intervention program selected by individual school sites, the staff coaches help them to determine the level of intensity. For example, the Strategic Math Series from the University of Kansas and the Bridges Math Intervention from the Math Learning Center are intervention platforms comprising EBPs that are based on IES recommendations, as mentioned above.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

The Math Project offers training and coaching to support math EBP implementation to an estimated 296 educators across the state of Rhode Island. Educators directly involved as SSIP participants are from 28 participating schools (20 elementary, 8 middle) through a site cohort and district model. Across sites, there are a total of 3,940 students enrolled. The DBI case study process has been conducted with 43 students since the project's inception in 2016; of those case study students, 2 meet the SiMR population's criteria (Students with learning disabilities in grades 3-5 who are Black and/or Hispanic), representing 5% of the total student population across participating sites. This percentage is consistent with the % of students in the SiMR population statewide. In addition, materials for educators and families and online asynchronous learning are freely available online to all schools and districts in the state and distributed through regular email notices to Special Education directors and also any educators registered with accounts on BRIDGE-RI (currently > 6,000 educators).

Site Cohorts – Three cohorts of schools continue to participate in the RI Math Project, focusing on different aspects of implementation (e.g., learning and implementing evidence-based practices in mathematics, DBI in mathematics). All three cohorts are now focusing on scaling and sustaining implementation since the contract for the current SSIP implementation ends in June 2022. Each site has an action plan that prioritizes two to three goals for the academic year related to not only increasing knowledge and implementation of Common Core-aligned EBPs in mathematics across the tiers but also the structural changes (i.e., teaming processes) required to achieve results. Action plan goals align to the short-term outcome of increasing educator knowledge of DBI for math and intermediate outcome of increased educator application of skills related to DBI for math. Action plans are implemented by the school teams with coaching support from the project.

The Math Project team continues to leverage the asynchronous learning modules on its website as well as the BRIDGE-RI courses as a part of its ongoing professional learning. By completing module professional development sessions and actively participating in coaching activities focused on mathematics instruction progressions and EBPs across the tiers, all cohorts are making progress toward the short-term outcomes related to increasing their knowledge of core mathematics instruction and data-driven processes. In addition, Math Project staff continue to provide coaching support to ensure implementation fidelity of learned EBPs (e.g., PALS) and more use of the CRA approach to build conceptual understanding and the use of Schema-based instruction (e.g., Strategic Math Series, Pirate Math, and. Bridges Math intervention).

District Model: For the district model, each district identified a group of educators across the district that included a combination of the following personnel: administrators, mathematics coaches and coordinators, special education leads, MTSS or RTI leads, and/or curriculum or instructional leads. In this model, participants received training and coaching from a Math Project coach, a mini-grant award to support implementation activities for 2 years, and access to the Math Project's professional learning modules. Teacher-level training/coaching focused on ensuring access for all learners, including increasing participant knowledge of Universal Design for Learning, differentiation, and scaffolding in mathematics instruction. Participants in the district model also received training on how to support students with solving word problems by learning "attack" strategies and schema-based instruction. They will be engaging in virtual training/coaching around Peer Assisted Learning Strategies this Winter/Spring 2022.

Leadership Professional Learning Community (PLC) – For this reporting period, the Math Project continued implementing its PLC for district and building leadership. The Leadership PLC addresses the long-term outcome of improving LEA capacity to support, scale, and sustain improvement efforts. The Math Project hosted a virtual synchronous kick off session introducing accelerated learning. Due to the continuation of the pandemic, staff decided to switch from synchronous sessions to asynchronous learning modules for the other accelerated learning topics. Topics included (a) making acceleration a schoolwide focus (for administrators), (b) developing a yearlong plan using acceleration (for teachers), (c) developing a unit plan using acceleration (for teachers), (d) assessing student needs (for teachers), (e) developing a lesson plan using acceleration (for teachers), and (f) the role of the interventionist in acceleration. Additionally, the PLC group has provided feedback on SSIP implementation and evaluation, marketed the BRIDGE-RI courses for their administrators and educators, and disseminated the infographics for families, as result of feedback from the Parent & Families Survey.

Book Study - The Math Project continued to offer a virtual book study, as it had in the past reporting period. This approach aligns with the Math Project's theory of action and long-term outcomes; it provides a mechanism for school districts to build their internal capacity, take ownership of professional learning activities, and work toward sustaining practices across time. The book study approach has been favorably received by participants. During this reporting period, the book study occurred between February and May 2021, focusing on the text "Visible Learning for Mathematics: What Works Best to Optimize Student Learning." During this reporting period, there were 23 participants from 11 sites, including classroom teachers (both general and special education), math interventionists/coaches, and school administrators. This iteration of the Book Study included an accompanying podcast, "Math Chat Podcast," led by two coaches from the Math Project to help educators better understand the text.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

EBP Fidelity: - The Math Project collects fidelity data on implementation of learned EBPs (e.g., PALS) and instructional strategies geared at increasing student dialogue in the math classroom (e.g., Number Talks) to promote alignment with math content and practice standards. Implementation protocols have been designed to determine the degree to which educators implemented with fidelity the skills attained during trainings. Multiple fidelity monitoring tools are tracking EBP implementation (e.g., teacher self-report, implementation logs, and observations) in a typical year. For teacher self-report, there are five items from the end of year (EOY) pulse check that provide information about the fidelity of overall implementation of project activities. The rating scale for the pulse check is from 1 – 6, with 1 representing "strongly disagree" and 6 representing "strongly agree." For items that provide a more nuanced understanding of implementation (e.g., student-level plans are developed and followed, goals and progress monitoring plans are in place), new participants rated themselves higher (4.08) than returning participants did (3.31). The item with the highest difference in ratings was in relationship to having plans that include goals and progress monitoring plans (new = 5.00 , returning = 3.30). These ratings suggest that new participants may rate themselves higher at initial implementation because they are unaware of what they do not know. In previous years, the Math Project supported implementation fidelity of Number Talks and PALS Math across sites. During this reporting period, coaches were unable to observe teachers during instruction because of the continuation of the COVID-19 pandemic, so we cannot report on observational fidelity data as planned.

DBI Fidelity: To assess overall fidelity of DBI, Math Project staff conduct an EOY pulse check at each site to explore the changes from previous years. Because the pulse check could not be done in-person during this reporting period, the items were included as part of a larger survey. The pulse check measured short-term and intermediate outcomes of educators' DBI knowledge and application as well as the long-term outcome of educators' perceptions related to their school sites' DBI implementation. We present weighted average responses for various survey items. Seventy-nine participants completed the EOY pulse check. Of these, six took survey for the first time, and 73 were returning participants who completed the pulse check at least one other time during the project. We typically compare growth across time from baseline, but COVID-19 continued to affect our ability to

administer surveys at the same time as in past years, so we are unable to report comparative data in this report. Plans to examine data comparatively are in place and will be included in subsequent reports. In addition, we cannot guarantee that these results accurately reflect “typical” responses because participants may have rated items in relationship to current, pandemic-influenced implementation. To determine potential impacts of COVID-19 on a school’s ability to provide intensive mathematics intervention, we included a survey item, “We can’t have regular math intervention activities due to COVID.” Both new and returning participants rated this item the lowest of all survey items (2.20 and 1.25, respectively), suggesting that COVID-19 continues to impact a school’s ability to deliver intervention in mathematics intervention.

Student Plan Implementation Fidelity: Items analyzed in this domain included prompts related to school schedules, resources, and cultural and linguistic considerations when selecting interventions and assessments. Returning participants rated themselves higher on the items related to cultural and linguistic considerations when selecting interventions and assessments and scheduling flexibility, whereas new participants rated themselves higher on items related to student plans and resources. These ratings demonstrate that returning participants are using their gained knowledge to ensure interventions are equitable for all students, which the new participants will learn and implement more as they continue to work with the Math Project.

Data-Driven Instruction Practice Changes: Seventy-nine educators completed the Data-Driven Instruction Survey. Thirty of the 79 respondents (38%) completed this survey for the first time. In all but two items, educators who have participated with the project prior to 2020 rated themselves higher than those who participated beginning in 2020. The two items where recurring participants from 2020 indicated higher weighted averages were (a) I use student data to verify my hypothesis about the causes of student behavior and math performance and (b) I have clear criteria for determining student success in completing instructional activities in math. These findings demonstrate that participants’ confidence and implementation of data-driven instruction increases as they continue to engage with the Math Project. New participants rated themselves higher for all other items in comparison to all recurring participants. These findings are not surprising because many individuals rate themselves higher at initial implementation because they are unaware of what they do not know.

Knowledge of Intensive Intervention Practice Changes: Items analyzed in this domain included prompts related to knowledge of implementation, strategies to identify students in need of intensive intervention, the purpose of progress monitoring and diagnostic data, and developing student-level plans. On all seven items related to participants’ ratings of their knowledge of intensive intervention, new participants rated themselves higher (4.63) than returning participants did (3.72). Although these data may seem contradictory to what we should expect, they suggest that new participants may not fully understand intensive intervention, resulting in their higher ratings.

DBI Pulse Check Survey - As part of the support and planning with cohort sites, Math Project staff conduct an end of year (EOY) pulse check at each site to explore the changes in previous years. Because the pulse check could not be done in-person during this reporting period, the items were included as part of a larger survey. The pulse check measured short-term and intermediate outcomes of educators’ knowledge and application of DBI as well as the long-term outcome of educators’ perceptions related to their school sites’ implementation of DBI.

For this report, we present weighted average responses for various survey items. Seventy-nine participants completed the survey items aligned with the EOY pulse check. Of these, six took survey for the first time, and 73 were returning participants who completed the pulse check at least one other time during the project. We typically compare growth across time from baseline, but COVID-19 continued to affect our ability to administer surveys at the same time as in past years, so we are unable to report comparative data in this report. Plans to examine data comparatively are in place and will be included in subsequent reports. In addition, we cannot guarantee that these results accurately reflect “typical” responses because participants may have rated items in relationship to current, pandemic-influenced implementation. To determine potential impacts of COVID-19 on a school’s ability to provide intensive mathematics intervention, we included a survey item, “We can’t have regular math intervention activities due to COVID.” Both new and returning participants rated this item the lowest of all survey items (2.20 and 1.25, respectively), suggesting that COVID-19 continues to impact a school’s ability to deliver intervention in mathematics intervention.

Please see the final text box on this page for additional data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation to assess practice change.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

Presently, all cohorts continued to make progress toward the logic model’s intermediate outcome, applying learned skills to student-level DBI case studies. The case study protocol included (a) identification of mathematics skill deficit areas based on screening or progress monitoring results, (b) strategies identified to address instruction and behavior, (c) progress monitoring tools used, and (d) results achieved by the students on formative assessments. A critical component of the student-level case study was to select and implement a progress monitoring tool to track growth in students’ mathematical skills and abilities. Tools used to monitor students’ progress were iReady, AIMSweb, STAR Math, Monitoring Basic Skills Progress (MBSP), and Curriculum-Based Measures (Easy CBM). The frequency with which the assessments were conducted varied according to by students’ targeted needs and the progress monitoring measure’s administration recommendations. For example, MBSP is administered weekly, whereas STAR Math typically is administered monthly. Of the 14 case study students, eight made ambitious growth, meaning they achieved more than a year’s worth of growth in a year to close gaps. Three students made moderate growth, one made low or emerging growth, and one had no growth. There was one student whose growth could not be determined due to issues related to progress monitoring administration fidelity. For two of the students who made ambitious growth, it was reported that the students had good attendance and engagement despite absences due to family sickness with COVID. The other students with ambitious growth also had good attendance rates but could only have intervention sessions for 10 minutes every day within their classrooms. Students with moderate to minimal growth tended to have low attendance rates, in part due to constant shifts to distance/virtual learning, resulting in the school’s inability to conduct interventions. Despite the COVID-19 pandemic continuing to cause disruptions, educators continued to apply their learned skills of implementing EBPs in mathematics, resulting in 79% of case study students demonstrating ambitious or moderate growth.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

The following next steps will occur until the closing of the current vendor’s contract with RIDE in June 2022.

For the Site Cohorts and District Model, the Math Project will continue to implement action plans with a focus on scaling and sustaining learned EBPs and/or the DBI process in mathematics. Project staff will implement an additional Book Study this spring, with a focus on scaling up participation beyond SSIP sites. For the Leadership PLC, staff will create a BRIDGE-RI Course based on the previous PLC training sessions that administrators can use to continue building their capacity to support, scale and sustain improvement efforts—especially related to accelerating learning in mathematics. Based on feedback from the parent/family survey and interviews, the Math Project will also begin to build a repository of online resources that parents/families can use to support their child at home. Since the Math Project’s current contract will conclude, the staff will deliver a final report to RIDE that incorporates additional outcome data that remain to be collected and analyzed. RIDE will issue an RFP to continue the math work in alignment with the reported revisions to SiMR, TOA, Logic Model, and Evaluation Plan.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

In July 2020, RIDE launched the development of the Blueprint for Multilingual Learner Success and accompanying Strategic Plan. The MLL Blueprint has become a major strategic policy driver for improvement in Rhode Island for our multilingual learners. Mirroring a similar process of active stakeholder engagement with the support of the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and the IDEA Data Center (IDC), in May 2021, RIDE began the development of the Blueprint for Differently Abled Student (DAS) Success. This process utilized several data driven facilitated community conversations with diverse stakeholders including traditionally underrepresented community members and organizations. Each session included data from the SPP/APR and other DAS performance data to inform facilitated conversations with stakeholders in identifying principles, goals, and strategies for improving outcomes for DAS in Rhode Island. Each session included reflections from national experts sharing evidence-based practices and the use of trained small group facilitators and note takers to collect stakeholder's ideas and recommendations. The design phase of the Blueprint ended in late October 2021, and a draft of the Blueprint will be reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement throughout 2022. As the RIDE team engaged with stakeholders through the Blueprint planning process, feedback related to each of the SPP indicators was obtained and incorporated in the SPP planning process and target setting. Additionally, some of the specific indicators allowed for targeted engagement with subgroups with interest in specific indicators such as secondary transition (indicators 1, 2, 13 & 14), early childhood education (indicators 6, 7, & 12), disproportionality (Indicators 9 & 10), and SSIP Indicator 17 which are described with the indicators. In the Blueprint development stakeholders included parents (16%), students (6%), State Advisory Panel members (4%), LEA and Charter School leaders (16%), Teachers (8%), Special Education Administrators (13%), leaders from Community Based Organizations representing traditionally underrepresented populations (16%), Higher Education (8%), and others (13%). In addition to the stakeholder engagement through the Blueprint design phase, RIDE provided additional opportunities with the RI Special Education Advisory Committee (RISEAC) to review and advise on the SPP targets, improvement strategies and annually evaluating progress on the SPP and APR. To ensure complete engagement, RIDE also published the proposed targets for public inspection and input to the RIDE web site at (State Performance Plan - Accountability - Information & Accountability User-Friendly Data - Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE)). Collectively, this process has ensured maximum community engagement to solicit broad stakeholder input with the SPP targets and improvement strategies to improve outcome for differently abled students in Rhode Island.

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also 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 5 Part B 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 and SSIP 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/

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described above, extensive early childhood special education (ECSE) specific stakeholder input was sought relative to indicators 6, 7, & 12. As part of a continuous engagement plan, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus around the targets and strategies for improvement. RIDE prioritized parents and families, and equity in representation, engagement, and access throughout the process. The three stakeholder feedback sessions took place during a variety of existing early childhood meeting structures, as well as during newly created opportunities focused specifically on the stakeholder feedback.

As described in prior sections of this Indicator, RIDE engaged multiple stakeholders and heard the recommendations to expand the SiMR measurement group with a focus on growth data, while maintaining the mathematics content focus. Additional input to broaden the professional learning from Math DBI to evidence-based math instruction across the Tiers of MTSS and within SDI is reflected in the new TOA and Logic Model. Evaluation plan revisions reflect the input from project participants and technical assistance providers' recommendations to collect both formative and summative data along with implementation and mindset data. Stakeholder input included suggestions for supports such as effectively communicating information to parents and families, coaching for students and parents/families, online resources, providing examples of completed problems/answer keys, and support in understanding math instruction.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

Due to the continuation of the COVID-19 pandemic, the state continues to experience difficulties engaging stakeholders and school sites. For the Math Project, coaches were able to resume in-person coaching supports at a few school sites, but it continues to not be universal across Rhode Island. RIDE began implementing legislature-mandated literacy initiatives in schools, especially during planned professional development days. This has caused many teachers and administrators to be overwhelmed and thus they have no planning time to discuss mathematics instruction. Despite these challenges, the state was still able to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts mentioned below.

Parent & Family Support Survey & Interviews

A critical aspect of improving student outcomes related to mathematics includes connections to parents and families and their awareness of how they might support their students outside of the school day. To address this, the Math Project staff collaborated with the Rhode Island Parent Information Network (RIPIN) to develop and administer a survey to families across Rhode Island to gather information on how parents and families support their child(ren) with math instruction at home. This survey was disseminated through the Math Project's Leadership Professional Learning Community (PLC), RIPIN's email listserv and social media accounts, and RIDE's Office for Student, Community and Academic Supports. The survey was translated into English and Spanish. At the close of the survey, there were 687 responses, with 35 completed using the Spanish translation.

The survey asked questions addressing parents' and families' levels of confidence in providing support to their child, their awareness of specific instructional strategies and supports, and identifying meaningful data for understanding their child's performance. Respondents were permitted to provide responses for more than one child. Based on the results, RI parents and families overall feel confident about supporting their child's math instruction. Parents and families seek out a variety of additional resources for support, particularly strategies that inform parents on how the "new math" works.

As follow-up to the survey, a series of virtual interviews were conducted to further explore parent/family perspectives on supporting their students in mathematics. There were 25 participants, with 17 residing in districts participating in the RI SSIP implementation. Through the interviews, RI parent/family members described their perceptions of their students' attitudes regarding math, ways in which they support their students and struggles they have in doing so, meaningful data for understanding their students' progress, and suggestions for supports in the coming school year. The suggestions for supports included effectively communicating information to parents and families, coaching for students and parents/families, online resources, providing examples of completed problems/answer keys, and support in understanding math instruction.

The results report was shared during a RISEAC meeting as well as the RI-CEEDAR State Leadership Team meeting where participants had the chance to offer feedback and reactions.

State-identified Measurable Results (SiMR) Feedback Survey

To engage external stakeholders on the baseline reset of the State-identified Measurable Results for the SSIP, RIDE and the Math Project developed and administered a feedback survey where participants could select the target group for the next multi-year SiMR focus. The options were as follow: (a) Students with Specific Learning Disabilities who are Black or Hispanic in grades 5-8 (similar to current SiMR), (b) All Students with Disabilities in grade 8 (all races/ethnicities and disability categories aggregated), (c) Students with Disabilities in grades 5-8 who are Native American, multiracial, Hispanic, or Black (all disability categories combined) and students who have Other Health Impairments who are white, (d) Students with Specific Learning Disabilities or have Other Health Impairments for grades 5-8 (all races/ethnicities), and (e) Other (where participants could type in other suggestions). At the close of the survey, there were 20 responses. Many respondents (45%) selected All Students with Disabilities in grade 8 (all races/ethnicities and disability categories aggregated) as the potential SiMR focus group.

Peripheral Stakeholder Engagement Survey

Data to inform the performance measure regarding peripheral stakeholder engagement was collected via a survey to assess the extent to which RIDE engages relevant stakeholders—those who broadly have an interest in/awareness of the SSIP but may not work closely with implementation/evaluation activities. The survey was sent to a broad range of stakeholders in October 2021, and 12 responses were received from representatives from LEAs, schools, charter schools, and advisory council members. For the analysis, we combined the ratings of strongly agree and agree into an overall agreement percentage and the ratings of strongly disagree and disagree into an overall disagreement percentage. Many stakeholders agreed that they had opportunities to provide feedback on SSIP efforts (66%). Most of the stakeholders agreed that RIDE creates opportunities for engagement and works to facilitate understanding of diverse perspectives (66%). The stakeholders also rated their perception of the level of engagement related to SSIP activities. More than half of stakeholders (7) perceived that they are informed about SSIP efforts.

Communication and Collaboration Survey among and between RIDE Initiatives

In October 2021, a survey was sent to personnel from several departments within RIDE, including OSCAS, where the SSIP work is housed. Thirteen staff members completed the survey which addressed the performance measure regarding effective communication and coordination of SSIP activities and various RIDE initiatives. Most respondents agreed with these aspects of ensuring relevant participation in the SSIP activities. The highest agreement levels were related to facilitating understanding of diverse perspectives (92%). The majority of personnel agreed that there were opportunities to provide feedback (77%) and to engage in efforts (62%). The stakeholders also rated their perception of the level of engagement related to SSIP activities. More than half of stakeholders (7) perceived that they are collaboratively engaged with SSIP efforts.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Stakeholder concerns about overall performance being low and effectiveness of current practices in specially designed instruction and general education access are addressed by changes to the Theory of Action and Logic Model.

Based on the Parent and Family Support Survey and Interviews, parents and families are seeking out a variety of additional resources for support, particularly strategies that inform parents on how the “new math” works with the most common strategy being mathematical concept tutorials found on YouTube and Google. As a result of this feedback, the Math Project is beginning to develop a vetted playlist of YouTube videos for parents and families to help them better understand mathematical concepts and methods. Since not all YouTube tutorials are of high quality, the Math Project staff will select or develop videos that align with Common Core mathematical standards and evidence-based practices.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

- Continue implementing action plans with Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 sites, with a focus on scaling and/or sustaining project work, and gradually fade support.
- Implement asynchronous book study using the text “Antiracism and UDL” by Andraetha Fitzgerald, and open participation statewide.
- Administer evaluation protocols and instruments, including fidelity assessments (evaluation methods vary by cohort).
- Conduct site observations, including data team meetings and model with a site-level facilitator how to conduct data-team meetings (pending in-person school restrictions)
- Support teams with taking ownership of the DBI case study process.
- Implement asynchronous leadership PLC modules and synchronous sessions focused on accelerating learning.
- Continue to collaboratively develop online module within the BRIDGE RI learning management system and create more sustainable tools and resources out of existing content.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

The current extended contract that funds the Math Project will terminate in June 2022, so the State will issue an RFP this spring. All the previously mentioned activities will be completed during the spring of 2022. The anticipated data collection and measures and expected outcomes are as follows:

- Training Evaluation – increased educator application of skills related to DBI (intermediate)
- Training Implementation Protocols, including an observational tool – increased educator application of skills related to DBI (intermediate); improved fidelity of school-level implementation of DBI (long term)
- Progress Monitoring data – improved formative assessment outcomes for students receiving intensive math interventions (long term)
- Pulse Check – increased parent/family awareness of intensive intervention and how to support their child (short term), increased educator knowledge of DBI (short term), improved fidelity of school-level implementation of DBI (long term)
- Math Beliefs Survey – increased educator beliefs of DBI (short term)
- Data-Driven Instruction Survey – increased educator beliefs of DBI (short term)
- Coordination and Collaboration Survey – effective communication, coordination, and collaboration among and between RIDE initiatives (short term)
- Interview Protocol with LEA Leadership – improved LEA capacity to support, scale, and sustain improvement efforts (long term)

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Because the contract that funds the Math Project will terminate in June 2022, sites are moving into the final months of support from an external provider (i.e., AIR; Math Project). The Math Project anticipates that the site cohorts will need support with developing processes and procedures to continue scaling and sustaining the work. The Math Project will address this by (a) modeling how to conduct the case study process; (b) releasing data-team meeting facilitation responsibilities to site-level personnel; and (c) supporting sites with developing guidance related to EBP implementation, fidelity monitoring, and how to use the book study and online, self-paced professional learning modules independent from the Math Project’s requirements.

RIDE will leverage funds in a new RFP to continue SSIP math project work with alignment to RIDE supports at BRIDGE-RI and continued cross-office activities on high quality curriculum materials, new curriculum frameworks, school improvement and accountability, and development of a Blueprint and Strategic Plan for students with disabilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

FFY2019 data is listed as 0 since no statewide assessments were administered 2019-20 due to COVID.

Additional text for data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change:

Parent and Family Involvement Practice Changes: Three items from the EOY pulse check measure parent and family involvement in intensive intervention and communication about student progress. For the two items related to communication, new participants rated themselves higher (4.20; 3.80) than returning participants did (3.30; 3.28). On the item related to parents being invited as active participants in mathematics intervention planning, new participants rated their agreement slightly higher (2.60) than returning participants did (2.39). There are not large differences in means noted when comparing results between new and returning participants. Communication, overall, is reported higher than parents being invited to participate in mathematics intervention planning; COVID-19 may impact school teams' ability to invite parents to participate.

Math Beliefs Practice Changes: Aligned with the SSIP TOA, changes in adult behaviors include their beliefs about mathematics. The Math Beliefs Survey includes 39 items designed to assess the level of agreement regarding educators' mathematics beliefs. Seventy-nine educators completed the survey this year. For SSIP reporting, an analysis of progress from 2020 to 2021 was conducted for those who completed the survey in each year. 84% of survey items received maintained or increased positive belief ratings from recurring participants, with the domain area of "entity versus incremental view of intellectual ability (i.e., fixed vs growth mindset) having the highest number of improved ratings. This finding demonstrates that recurring participants continue to have positive math beliefs over time. The survey items with the highest percentage increase were "I don't enjoy math" and "Mathematical ability is something that remains relatively fixed throughout a person's life" (18% and 24%, respectively). This finding shows recurring participants are enjoying math and are developing a growth mindset for themselves and their students.

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

17 - 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 Admin. Quality Assurance Services

Email:

susan.wood@ride.ri.gov

Phone:

4012228992

Submitted on:

04/27/22 5:08:30 PM