

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2021**

Rhode Island



PART B DUE February 1, 2023

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

Introduction

Instructions

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

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

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

Indicator 1: The target graduation rate for the 2020-2021 school year is 80.14%. For FFY 2021, Rhode Island's graduation rate is 86.83% meeting the target and exceeding the target by 7 percentage points.

Indicator 2: The target dropout rate for the 2020-2021 school year is 14.7%. For FFY 2021, Rhode Island's dropout rate is 4.19% meeting the target and exceeding the target by 11 percentage points.

Indicator 3: 3a target was not met for participation. There was no slippage. 3b targets for proficiency for reading and math (grade level academic achievement standards) were not met. Slippage occurred for grade 4 and HS in ELA. 3c. Proficiency for children (alternate academic achievement standards) target were not met. Slippage occurred for grade 4 in ELA and math. Slippage occurred for HS in ELA. 3d. Gaps in proficiency rates (grade level academic achievement standards) were not met. Slippage occurred for grade 4 and 8 in math.

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: 5a- the target of 77% was not met. RIDE was at 71.89% for this indicator. 5b- the target of 10.5% was not met. RIDE was very close with 10.54%. 5c- the target goal of 3% was not met. Currently RIDE is at 5.13%. RIDE will continue to monitor and support LEAs in reducing this percent to avoid slippage in the future.

Indicator 6: Although RI had witnessed a significant increase in percentage A and decreases in percentage B over the last number of years, challenges brought on by the pandemic have disrupted this progress. Unfortunately, over the last two years, due to the pandemic, percentage A has seen a decrease of 3.31 to 51.29%, and percentage B, an increase of 2.07 to 12.88%. RI reports a slight .17 uptick to .7% of children in 6C, children receiving services in their homes. Although this is only the second year OSEP is looking specifically at 6C, looking back, it is clear that this is an increase over previous years' data and likely another outcome of the pandemic. RIDE expects that percentages will return to pre-pandemic performance and then continue to improve in the years ahead.

Indicator 7: In outcome A, 70.90% of children were identified in summary statement #1 and 47.39% in summary statement #2. In outcome B, 73.15% of children were identified in summary statement #1 and 36.14% in summary statement #2. In outcome C, 69.10% of children were identified in summary statement #1 and 51.00% in summary statement #2. RIDE is pleased to announce that all indicator 7 targets were met, without any slippage.

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. The required target of 0% was met.

Indicator 10: No districts were found to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification in discrete disability categories. The required target of 0% was met.

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 FFY2021 improved to 99.35%, with 88% of LEAs at 100% compliance.

Indicator 12: RIDE is pleased to announce that this year, RI was able to reach an overall compliance of 99.22%. RI significantly reduced the number of LEAs out of compliance from 8 during FFY 2020 to 4 during FFY 2021. Additionally, RI drastically reduced the overall number of students not in service by their third birthday from 40 in FFY 2020 to 5 in FFY 2021. Although RI did not meet the targeted 100% compliance rate, we witnessed a significant increase of 6.06 pts and a return to pre-pandemic rates.

Indicator 13: For FFY 2021 APR, Rhode Island has a 99.98% compliance rate, improved over the previous year and above the 98.21% compliance baseline established in FFY 2009. Indicator 13 continues to demonstrate solid and continuous improvement in both compliance and quality. Additionally, discussion continues this school year with stakeholders and LEA personnel regarding 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 2021 APR, RI improved in Measure B and Measure C having slippage in only Measure A. Despite the slippage in Measure A, RI remains above the most recent national average for Measure A. RI continues to maintain a stable overall Response and Engagement Rate. RIDE and the Regional Transition Centers continue to work diligently with local school districts to improve both 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: 49% of 8th grade students with disabilities with growth data on the 2021 administration of math statewide assessment demonstrated typical or high growth. This number exceeds the SiMR target.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

65

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 Tiered 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 Student, Community & Academic 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 coordinated 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 ongoing virtual meetings. 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 special education guidance. 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 participates in NTACT:C webinars, one to one consultation, several Community of Practice groups and attends the annual National Capacity Building Institute. The State continues to receive 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 utilizes 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 continues 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 and employment. The state continues to receive consultation from a number of national content experts to support Person Centered Planning, Progress Monitoring and Data Collection and Assistive Technology. Results of this technical assistance continues to provide 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. The areas where LEAs currently face the greatest strain in recruiting include math and science content teachers, EL teachers and special educators. 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. Continued work with the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII) has allowed the Data-based individualization (DBI) work to be woven into RI's online learning management system BRIDGE-RI in alignment to MTSS. SSIP math intervention training is also built into self-paced online courses in BRIDGE-RI. A series of 5 self-paced courses on science of reading and structured literacy awareness were built into BRIDGE-RI.

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:

150

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 during the 2020-21 school year. 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 has expanded its contract this year 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.pleeri.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: Ongoing feedback and discussion related to Secondary Transition Indicators 1,2,13 and 14 continue throughout the year 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. Discussions regarding the previous results of improvement activities related to all transition indicators and the possible need for continued or different strategies and interventions are shared. Stakeholder feedback is continuously considered as Secondary Transition Indicator progress is reviewed throughout the school year.

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. Based on feedback from LEA and school personnel, parents & families, etc., educators, schools and districts need more support and guidance around SDI. As a result of this feedback, the second iteration of the Math Project has new improvement strategies including establishing a work group and creating additional self-paced learning courses through BRIDGE-RI that will address these specific concerns raised by the stakeholders.

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 2020 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 2020 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 2020 APR in 2022, 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 slide deck 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 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 SETTT 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. Additional monitoring of live data was done at the state level to observe district activity and allow for reminders to districts falling behind or that were in danger of doing so.

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 2021 and 2022 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2022 determination letter informed the State that it 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. The State provided the required information.

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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	64.90%	65.90%	66.90%	67.90%	79.64%
Data	59.38%	62.98%	62.38%	64.41%	84.97%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	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.

Progress on Indicators related to Secondary Transition continue to be shared and discussed with stakeholder groups such as the State Transition Council, the Regional Transition Centers, the Regional Transition Advisory Committees (largely LEA and adult service provider agencies), special education administrators and educators, RI Parent Information Network, parents and students.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,035
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	61
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	46
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	50

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1,035	1,192	84.97%	80.14%	86.83%	Met target	No Slippage

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. RIDE has recently completed extensive stakeholder engagement, drafted a new proposal to adopt a set of Readiness- Based Graduation Requirements in order to increase the number of students graduating from RI high schools ready for both college and career. The proposal centers on three key priorities including that: 1. We will prepare our graduates to create their own future; 2. We will increase engagement through real world relevant learning experiences; and 3. We will change how we support our children and families. This proposal passed in November, 2022 and will take effect for the Class of 2028.

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)

The target graduation rate for the 2020-2021 school year is 80.14%%. For FFY 2021, Rhode Island's graduation rate is 86.83% meeting the target and exceeding the target by 7 percentage points.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

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

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.

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

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.

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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

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.

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 Statistics's Common Core of Data.

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.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	27.11%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	19.70%	18.70%	17.70%	16.70%	15.70%
Data	7.33%	8.19%	6.48%	6.01%	4.53%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	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. Progress on Indicators related to Secondary Transition continue to be shared and discussed with stakeholder groups such as the State Transition Council, the Regional Transition Centers, the Regional Transition Advisory Committees (largely LEA and adult service provider agencies), special education administrators and educators, RI Parent Information Network, parents and students.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,035
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	61
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	46
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	50

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
50	1,192	4.53%	14.70%	4.19%	Met target	No Slippage

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)

The target dropout rate for the 2020-2021 school year is 14.7%. For FFY 2021, Rhode Island's dropout rate is 4.19% meeting the target and exceeding the target by 11percentage points.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	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.

In addition to the broad stakeholder input described in the Introduction section, RIDE staff participated in a six-session Family Peer Learning Group (PLG), entitled, Empowering Families to Understand the Role of Assessments in State Systemic Improvement Plans. This Family Peer Learning Group (PLG) was run by the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO). The state worked alongside RIPEN parents, SEA staff from other states, as well as parent networks from other states to create short videos and infographics to help increase the understanding and importance of assessment for all students. RIDE will continue to participate in follow up sessions.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	1,632	1,691	1,495
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	651	742	495
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	840	698	642
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	103	155	124

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	1,633	1,691	1,498
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	361	569	493
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1,118	851	637
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	102	155	124

*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 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,594	1,632	90.31%	100.00%	97.67%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,595	1,691	78.71%	100.00%	94.32%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,261	1,495	75.61%	100.00%	84.35%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,581	1,633	90.14%	100.00%	96.82%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,575	1,691	78.45%	100.00%	93.14%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,254	1,498	74.52%	100.00%	83.71%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 students with disabilities who have participated in the regular assessment with accommodations here <https://www3.ride.ri.gov/ADP>. To access this data, under subject choose RICAS (there are two options for math and ELA). Then choose the correct year. Finally, 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)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

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 = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level 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 regular 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 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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	12.00%	13.00%	14.00%	15.00%	16.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	12.00%	13.00%	14.00%	15.00%	16.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	11.00%	12.00%	13.00%	14.00%	15.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	31.00%	32.00%	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	14.00%	15.00%	16.00%	17.00%	18.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	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 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	1,491	1,440	1,137
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	39	24	36
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	24	7	62

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	1,479	1,420	1,130

b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	67	28	7
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	39	4	19

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	63	1,491	5.57%	12.00%	4.23%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	31	1,440	2.17%	12.00%	2.15%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	98	1,137	9.73%	11.00%	8.62%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The reason for slippage for Group A (grade 4) can be directly attributed to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Although students were back in school for the 2021-2022 school year, mask mandates as well as social distancing was still in effect through March of 2022. For students who took the grade 4 reading assessment this meant that their core reading instruction happened in a mix of online, masked, and socially distanced. Many classrooms saw a high teacher turnover or many teachers on leave causing students to have additional disruptions in their learning. Additionally, many districts adopted new reading curriculum in either the 2020-2021 or 2021-2022 school year.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The reason for slippage for Group C (High School) can be directly attributed to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Although students were back in school for the 2021-2022 school year, mask mandates as well as social distancing was still in effect through March of 2022. For students who took the High School reading assessment this meant that they transitioned into High School at the start of the pandemic and their core reading instruction happened in a mix of online, masked, and socially distanced.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	106	1,479	3.26%	31.00%	7.17%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	32	1,420	1.47%	14.00%	2.25%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	26	1,130	2.40%	7.00%	2.30%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 students with disabilities who have participated in the regular assessment with accommodations here <https://www3.ride.ri.gov/ADP>. To access this data, under subject choose RICAS (there are two options for math and ELA). Then choose the correct year. Finally, 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)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	18.75%	19.00%	19.25%	19.50%	19.75%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	20.25%	20.50%	20.75%	21.00%	21.25%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	28.95%	29.20%	29.45%	29.70%	29.95%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	35.45%	35.70%	35.95%	36.20%	36.45%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	11.90%	12.15%	12.40%	12.65%	12.90%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	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 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	103	155	124
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	16	37	29

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	102	155	124
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	31	22	28

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	16	103	18.52%	18.75%	15.53%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	37	155	20.00%	20.25%	23.87%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	29	124	28.69%	28.95%	23.39%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The slippage for Group A (Grade 4) can be directly attributed to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Although students were back in school for the 2021-2022 school year, mask mandates as well as social distancing were still in effect through March of 2022. For students who took the alternative assessment this was a difficult time as many families of students with fragile immune systems needed to exercise caution when sending students back to school causing disruptions in instruction. In addition, teacher and substitute shortage saw many classrooms with inconsistent instruction.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The slippage for Group C (High School) can be directly attributed to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Although students were back in school for the 2021-2022 school year, mask mandates as well as social distancing were still in effect through March of 2022. For students who took the alternative assessment this was a difficult time as many families of students with fragile immune systems needed to exercise caution when sending students back to school causing disruptions in instruction. In addition, teacher and substitute shortage saw many classrooms with inconsistent instruction.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	31	102	35.19%	35.45%	30.39%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	22	155	11.67%	11.90%	14.19%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	28	124	21.31%	21.75%	22.58%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The slippage for Group A (Grade 4) can be directly attributed to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Although students were back in school for the 2021-2022 school year, mask mandates as well as social distancing were still in effect through March of 2022. For students who took the alternative assessment this was a difficult time as many families of students with fragile immune systems needed to exercise caution when sending students back to school causing disruptions in instruction. In addition, teacher and substitute shortage saw many classrooms with inconsistent instruction.

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 students with disabilities who have participated in the regular assessment as well as students who participate in the Dynamic Learning Maps Assessment (Alternate Assessment). Those results can be found at <https://www3ride.ri.gov/ADP>. To access this data, under subject choose DLM (there are three options for math, ELA and Science). Then choose the correct year.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

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 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	48.95	48.70	48.45	48.20	47.95
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	38.00	38.75	38.50	38.25	38.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	83.30	83.05	82.80	82.55	82.30
Math	A <=	Grade 4	22.80	22.55	22.30	22.05	21.80
Math	B <=	Grade 8	17.40	17.15	16.90	16.65	16.40
Math	C <=	Grade HS	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 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	9,738	10,274	9,442
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,491	1,440	1,137
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,774	2,960	4,177
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	54	21	271
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	39	24	36
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	24	7	62

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 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	9,833	10,274	9,467
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,479	1,420	1,130
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2,841	2,112	2,265
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	128	21	130
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	67	28	7
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	39	4	19

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	4.23%	29.04%	29.82	48.95	24.82	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	2.15%	29.01%	26.62	38.00	26.86	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	8.62%	47.11%	38.53	83.30	38.49	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	7.17%	30.19%	17.57	22.80	23.03	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	2.25%	20.76%	14.58	17.40	18.51	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	2.30%	25.30%	23.97	33.20	23.00	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The reason for slippage for Group A (Grade 4) can be directly attributed to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Although students were back in school for the 2021-2022 school year, mask mandates as well as social distancing were still in effect through March of 2022. All students, those with IEP's and those without, saw a decline in scores however, the impact of online learning, high absenteeism, masks, social distancing as well as teacher turnover had a larger impact on students who require more consistency. In addition, many districts changed curriculum during the 2020-2021 or 2021-2022 school year.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

The reason for slippage for Group B (Grade 8) is somewhat of a mystery since data from indicator 3B and 3C had no slippage in this grade level. However, after analyzing the indicator data against the state assessment (RICAS) data, it is clear that students with IEPs in grade 8 stayed relatively steady in their proficiency percent, while students without IEPs made larger gains in this area. 30.3% of students who took the state assessment (RICAS) showed high growth indicating that the high growth category did not include many students with IEPs or the gap would have continued to close instead of widening.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	0.00%
Data	100.00%	0.00%		0.00%	

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	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.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.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0		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)

Rhode Island notes that, while no LEA policies, practices, or procedures were examined, the nature of Indicator 4 is that LEAs that do not suspend students do not meet cell size requirement, and LEAs that do not suspend students at a level meeting the n/cell size requirements are not suspending students in general, and therefore are unlikely if not incapable of having improper policies, practices, or procedures regarding their use of suspension as a disciplinary measure. Rhode Island wishes to note that 0 LEAs met the size requirements due to having few to no students suspended. A vast majority of LEAs had 0 students suspended greater than 10 days in the prior year. Rhode Island wishes to note that even if the requirement for review was shortened to a single year instead of consecutive years, no LEAs would have met n/cell size requirements for the last 5 years.

Rhode Island has been subject to multitudes of state legislation regarding suspension and expulsion of students, and as such has systemic reasons for having some of the lowest suspension rates in the country. Additionally, Rhode Island would like to note that only out of school suspension for greater than 10 days is considered for the purposes of Indicator 4, as expulsion is not allowed under Rhode Island law and as such ensures there will always be 0 expulsions of students.

Additionally, Rhode Island continues to monitor LEA practices, policies, and procedures related to suspension of students through monitoring, even when APR numbers do not dictate automatic review of said policies, practices, and procedures.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR the State included none of the State's LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP recognizes the State reported, "A vast majority of LEAs had 0 students suspended greater than 10 days in the prior year. Rhode Island wishes to note that even if the requirement for review was shortened to a single year instead of consecutive years, no LEAs would have met n/cell size requirements for the last 5 years. Rhode Island has been subject to multitudes of state legislation regarding suspension and expulsion of students, and as such has systemic reasons for having some of the lowest suspension rates in the country." OSEP reminds the State that if the examination for significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs is not occurring in any meaningful way at the LEA level, OSEP may determine that a State's chosen methodology is not reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs.

4A - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology.

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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%			

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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)

Rhode Island notes that, while no LEA policies, practices, or procedures were examined, the nature of Indicator 4 is that LEAs that do not suspend students do not meet cell size requirement, and LEAs that do not suspend students at a level meeting the n/cell size requirements are not suspending students in general, and therefore are unlikely if not incapable of having improper policies, practices, or procedures regarding their use of suspension as a disciplinary measure. Rhode Island wishes to note that 0 LEAs met the size requirements due to having few to no students suspended. A vast majority of LEAs had 0 students suspended greater than 10 days in the prior year. Rhode Island wishes to note that even if the requirement for review was shortened to a single year instead of consecutive years, no LEAs would have met n/cell size requirements for the last 5 years.

Rhode Island has been subject to multitudes of state legislation regarding suspension and expulsion of students, and as such has systemic reasons for having some of the lowest suspension rates in the country. Additionally, Rhode Island would like to note that only out of school suspension for greater than 10 days is considered for the purposes of Indicator 4, as expulsion is not allowed under Rhode Island law and as such ensures there will always be 0 expulsions of students.

Additionally, Rhode Island continues to monitor LEA practices, policies, and procedures related to suspension of students through monitoring, even when APR numbers do not dictate automatic review of said policies, practices, and procedures.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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.

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 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR the State included none of the State's LEAs in its analysis of rates of suspension and expulsion of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP recognizes the State reported, "Rhode Island wishes to note that 0 LEAs met the size requirements due to having few to no students suspended" and, "Rhode Island has been subject to multitudes of state legislation regarding suspension and expulsion of students, and as such has systemic reasons for having some of the lowest suspension rates in the country." OSEP reminds the State that if the examination for significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs is not occurring in any meaningful way at the LEA level, OSEP may determine that a State's chosen methodology is not reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs.

4B- Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must explain how its methodology is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies, by race and ethnicity, are occurring in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs, including how the State's LEAs are being examined for significant discrepancy under the State's chosen methodology.

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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2019	Target >=	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	76.50%
A	71.00%	Data	69.69%	70.11%	70.22%	71.03%	71.65%
B	2019	Target <=	13.00%	12.50%	12.00%	11.50%	11.00%
B	11.00%	Data	12.77%	12.72%	12.57%	11.44%	10.87%
C	2019	Target <=	5.00%	5.00%	4.00%	3.50%	3.50%
C	5.60%	Data	5.25%	4.86%	4.62%	5.66%	5.58%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	77.00%	77.50%	78.00%	78.50%	79.00%
Target B <=	10.50%	10.00%	9.50%	9.00%	8.50%
Target C <=	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 - 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.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	21,711
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	15,607
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,289
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	1,026
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	76
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	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 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	15,607	21,711	71.65%	77.00%	71.89%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,289	21,711	10.87%	10.50%	10.54%	Did not meet 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]	1,113	21,711	5.58%	3.00%	5.13%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

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 = [(# 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) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 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 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	Target >=	48.00%	49.00%	50.00%	50.50%	52.69%
A	Data	48.40%	49.02%	49.03%	54.60%	52.69%
B	Target <=	17.00%	16.00%	15.00%	12.00%	12.72%
B	Data	14.78%	13.73%	12.58%	10.81%	12.72%

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 broader stakeholder input, early childhood special education (ECSE) specific feedback 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 initially 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.

As part of RIDE's continuous effort, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged over this last year in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus. Planning for stakeholder feedback 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. Stakeholder feedback is an ongoing part of State ECSE Leadership Meetings. These meetings typically take place every other month, but at times monthly, providing an opportunity for district-level ECSE leaders to come together with state partners to hear about current state-level initiatives, build an understanding of the ECSE requirements and best practices, discuss and analyze data, set goals and identify/modify activities for improvements. RI-PreK Ed Coordinator Meetings provide another opportunity to hear from and collaborate with our general early childhood partners around state-level initiatives and requirements, challenges and successes, and activities for improvement. Additionally, RIDE continues to participate with the Early Intervention Interagency Coordination Council (ICC), the lead agency for the Early Intervention (EI) Program. The ICC 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. Finally, RIDE prioritizes partnerships with our parent center, the RI Parent Information Network (RIPIN), and Parents Leading for Educational Equity (PLEE), an organization founded and led by parents, with a mission 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.

While the previous year's stakeholder feedback sessions began with a discussion of the historical data, potential targets, and vehicles for evaluating progress, this year's discussion was able to include a review of the improvement strategies and an examination of progress. Discussions with the ICC typically have about 10 parents who are either currently involved in EI or those who have already transitioned to Special Education, as well as EI providers and other state and community partners. The conversations with PLEE/RIPIN also have about 10 parents with children actively or formerly receiving ECSE services. PLEE/RIPIN feedback focuses on parents of color in the state's four core cities (Providence, Pawtucket, Central Falls, and Woonsocket). PLEE provides support for families so everyone can participate. Such support included access to computers and the internet, providing English and Spanish materials before the session, and Spanish interpretation during the event. Stakeholders understand that the impacts of COVID relative to the ECSE indicators are long-term and that the state is still feeling the effects. The family feedback itself provided critical improvement strategies including 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. In an ongoing matter, RIDE follows up with each stakeholder group at least annually to look at the current data, report progress, and identify any necessary modifications 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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	52.69%	52.69%	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%
Target B <=	12.72%	12.72%	12.00%	11.50%	10.50%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

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

Prepopulated Data
Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/06/2022

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	733	976	426	2,135
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	323	530	242	1,095
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	100	99	51	250
b2. Number of children attending separate school	9	9	5	23
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1	1	0	2
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	3	2	10	15

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 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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	1,095	2,135	52.69%	52.69%	51.29%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	275	2,135	12.72%	12.72%	12.88%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
C. Home	15	2,135	0.53%	0.53%	0.70%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A aged 3 through 5, if applicable

Although Rhode Island (RI) witnessed a significant increase in percentage A and decreases in percentage B in the years prior to the pandemic, challenges brought on by the health emergency disrupted this progress. Until 2019, RIDE reported a steady annual increase in the percentage of young children attending and receiving the majority of their special education and related services in regular early childhood programs, with a substantial 5.6 increase in FFY 2019 to 54.6%. RI also celebrated a steady decrease in the percentage of young children attending separate special education classes, separate schools, and residential facilities, including a 1.8 decrease in FFY 2019 to 10.81%. Much of the improvement 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 and reduces the need for separate programming. 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, over the last two years, due to the pandemic, percentage A has seen a decrease of 3.31 to 51.29%, and percentage B, an increase of 2.07 to 12.88%. Additionally, although RI increased its child count by 51 children this year, we still served 215 fewer children than in FFY 2019. This continues to be a likely direct result of the pandemic with parental fear of in-person schooling and LEAs needing to rely 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 expects that the FFY 2022 data will show an increase in its child count as the pandemic challenges subside.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C aged 3 through 5, if applicable

RI reports a slight .17 uptick to .7% of children in 6C, children receiving services in their homes. This represents a total of 15 children across 8 LEAs, with one district serving 6 children in their home and the other 7 districts, only 1 or 2 each. The district that served the 6 children at home reported the location of special education services was at parental request due to health concerns and that most of the children are currently back in school. Although 6C is a new indicator, looking back, it is clear that this is an increase over previous years and likely another outcome of the pandemic. The increase in services in the home is thought to be due to parental fear of in-person schooling. RIDE continues to provide technical assistance to districts, providing guidance and support.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A1	2020	Target >=	80.13%	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%	70.00%
A1	70.00%	Data	80.13%	79.28%	71.08%	67.69%	70.01%

A2	2020	Target >=	48.66%	49.50%	50.00%	50.50%	45.30%
A2	45.30%	Data	48.66%	52.08%	48.41%	47.78%	45.32%
B1	2020	Target >=	68.17%	69.00%	69.50%	70.00%	67.40%
B1	67.40%	Data	68.17%	79.45%	72.53%	66.94%	67.42%
B2	2020	Target >=	38.50%	39.00%	39.50%	40.00%	28.90%
B2	28.90%	Data	38.50%	44.40%	38.13%	34.65%	28.88%
C1	2020	Target >=	86.04%	86.50%	87.00%	87.50%	69.10%
C1	69.10%	Data	86.04%	80.88%	74.71%	69.13%	69.14%
C2	2020	Target >=	55.35%	56.00%	56.50%	57.00%	51.00%
C2	51.00%	Data	55.35%	60.03%	59.60%	58.11%	50.98%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	70.00%	70.00%	70.50%	71.00%	71.50%
Target A2 >=	45.30%	45.30%	46.00%	46.50%	47.00%
Target B1 >=	67.40%	67.40%	67.50%	68.00%	68.50%
Target B2 >=	28.90%	28.90%	29.50%	30.00%	30.50%
Target C1 >=	69.10%	69.10%	69.50%	70.00%	70.50%
Target C2 >=	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 broader stakeholder input, early childhood special education (ECSE) specific feedback 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 initially 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.

As part of RIDE's continuous effort, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged over this last year in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus. Planning for stakeholder feedback 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. Stakeholder feedback is an ongoing part of State ECSE Leadership Meetings. These meetings typically take place every other month, but at times monthly, providing an opportunity for district-level ECSE leaders to come together with state partners to hear about current state-level initiatives, build an understanding of the ECSE requirements and best practices, discuss and analyze data, set goals and identify/modify activities for improvements. RI-PreK Ed Coordinator Meetings provide another opportunity to hear from and collaborate with our general early childhood partners around state-level initiatives and requirements, challenges and successes, and activities for improvement. Additionally, RIDE continues to participate with the Early Intervention Interagency Coordination Council (ICC), the lead agency for the Early Intervention (EI) Program. The ICC 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. Finally, RIDE prioritizes partnerships with our parent center, the RI Parent Information Network (RIPIN), and Parents Leading for Educational Equity (PLEE), an organization founded and led by parents, with a mission 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.

While the previous year's stakeholder feedback sessions began with a discussion of the historical data, potential targets, and vehicles for evaluating progress, this year's discussion was able to include a review of the improvement strategies and an examination of progress. Discussions with the ICC typically have about 10 parents who are either currently involved in EI or those who have already transitioned to Special Education, as well as EI providers and other state and community partners. The conversations with PLEE/RIPIN also have about 10 parents with children actively or formerly receiving ECSE services. PLEE/RIPIN feedback focuses on parents of color in the state's four core cities (Providence, Pawtucket, Central Falls, and Woonsocket). PLEE provides support for families so everyone can participate. Such support included access to computers and the internet, providing English and Spanish materials before the session, and Spanish interpretation during the event. Stakeholders understand that the impacts of COVID relative to the ECSE indicators are long-term and that the state is still feeling the effects. The family feedback itself provided critical improvement strategies including 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. In an ongoing matter, RIDE follows up with each stakeholder group at least annually to look at the current data, report progress, and identify any necessary modifications to targets and/or improvement activities.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

996

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	6	0.60%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	228	22.89%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	290	29.12%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	280	28.11%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	192	19.28%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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>	570	804	70.01%	70.00%	70.90%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$</i>	472	996	45.32%	45.30%	47.39%	Met target	No Slippage

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	4	0.40%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	257	25.80%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	375	37.65%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	336	33.73%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	24	2.41%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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>	711	972	67.42%	67.40%	73.15%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$</i>	360	996	28.88%	28.90%	36.14%	Met target	No Slippage

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	8	0.80%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	214	21.49%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	232	23.29%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	320	32.13%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	222	22.29%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who	552	774	69.14%	69.10%	71.32%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
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>							
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>	542	996	50.98%	51.00%	54.42%	Met target	No Slippage

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>
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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

RI is pleased to report an increase of 75 children over FFY 2020. While RI is still 40 children shy of FFY 2019, the state is on a positive trajectory. Again, this reduction in students can be attributed to the new data system and challenges brought on by COVID. RIDE continues to work extensively with districts and specifically our largest LEA to assist in the entry of the COS data into the new system. Ultimately, RIDE believes that the data accuracy has been greatly increased with the new data collection system in place.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, 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 must consider race/ethnicity. 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 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.

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.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2006	26.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	45.00%	47.00%	50.00%	51.00%	50.25%
Data	61.81%	70.44%	32.09%	32.12%	41.81%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
4,803	6,334	41.81%	50.50%	75.83%	Met 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, regardless of the age or IEP status of their children. The same survey questions were asked to families of students receiving special education services and families of students receiving general education services. The same questions regarding special education were asked of all families regardless of child's age, and all questions are applicable to all IEP students,

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

23,949

Percentage of respondent parents

26.45%

Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	27.57%	26.45%

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 with 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.

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.

In order to meet the aforementioned federal reporting requirements, the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) administered a parent survey in Spring 2022 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 61 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 61 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. Response rates from parents of students with disabilities have more than doubled between spring 2018 (2,936 responses) and spring 2022 (6,334 responses); this year's numbers are down 4% from the 2021 response count of 6,599.

Each survey included instructions for completing the survey in English, Spanish, and Portuguese. The percentage of surveys completed in English was approximately 84%, the percentage of surveys completed in Spanish was approximately 16%, and the percentage completed in Portuguese was less than 1%.

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

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, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and "Two or more Races." The percentage of surveys returned by racial/ethnic breakdown are as follows:

American Indian or Alaska Native = 1%

Asian = 3%

Black or African American = 7%

Hispanic or Latino = 31%

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander = Less than 1%

Two or more races = 5%

White = 43%

No response or blank = 11%

Respondents indicated that for their own gender:

79% were female

15% were male

5% preferred not to say

2% did not answer this demographic question

Rhode Island's parent survey responses continue to remain representative of the population of students receiving services in the category of race/ethnicity. 6 of the 7 race categories were within 1.5% of their representation percentage among all students receiving special education services in the state, with the only category deviating by more was white respondents, being 43% of respondents but approximately 50% of all students receiving services. Due to the ability to not answer the race/ethnicity question, the other 6 categories were able to be properly represented with white still being underrepresented and the total still reaching 100%.

RI's representativeness of gender in the respondent group is poor. The population of students receiving services is approximately 60% male, whereas respondents were nearly 80% female. RI notes that the gender demographic question is limited to one response, and that should 2 parents choose to answer the survey only 1 of the parents' genders can be recorded, potentially skewing the results of the gender demographics recorded.

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

NO

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

Rhode Island continues to increase total parent engagement across the state, including greater survey response among parents. Racial and ethnic representativeness among respondents remains good. As noted, the gender gap in students versus respondents continues to be quite large. Strategies to improve representativeness include reviewing allowable responses for the gender category to ensure cases where multiple parents respond do not skew demographics (as only 1 response is allowed), as well as looking at additional demographic categories to determine if any are suitable for use in determining survey respondent representativeness for future survey response years.

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

Rhode Island compared the percentage representation of race/ethnicity categories among students receiving services to the race/ethnicity reported by those who responded to the survey. As noted above. 6 of the 7 categories fell within the 3% discrepancy, all 6 of which were even closer to representativeness falling within 1.5% discrepancy. The white category fell outside of this range, at an approximately 7% discrepancy.

The same metric was used for the gender category, where the percentages were well outside the 3% threshold used to determine representativeness.

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
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Please note that this year's numbers reflect a change in the questions that were asked of families. Previous calculations were based on parent responses to all survey items, while this year's calculations were based on the special education-specific questions.

The included questions are as follows:

How well do you feel your child's Individualized Education Program (IEP) has been implemented this year compared to past years?

I am considered an equal partner by my child's IEP Team in planning my child's program.

I feel that my child's school consistently makes attempts to engage with me in an effort to improve special education services for my child.

I am always provided with resources and information, including how to exercise special education dispute resolution options in my native language, in the case that I disagree with a decision of the IEP team.

My child's school responds in a timely manner when I request an IEP meeting.

Evaluations, progress reports and other information is provided in a manner that is understandable to me.

There is consistent communication between general education teachers and special education teachers relating to my child's IEP.

I receive an explanation of my procedural safeguards under IDEA and RI State Regulations when I request an evaluation, when there is a change of placement, or when I have requested them

8 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The 2021 survey responses, in a 508 compliant online version, are available at the following link on the RI Department of Education webpage: <https://www.ride.ri.gov/informationAccountability/RIEducationData/SurveyWorks.aspx>

To access the webpage, click the button that says "VIEW THE 2022 SURVEYWORKS RESULTS" in the middle of the page. To view the spring 2021 results that were required to be posted, a user can click on any of the aggregate groupings of respondents shown on the screen (State, District, school, school type, or "State Groupings") and then, when shown the results, change to the spring 2021 survey by navigating to the top right of the page and selecting "Spring 2021" from the dropdown menu that by default says Spring 2022.

Selecting the Spring 2021 survey in this manner will display the content that was initially included in the attachment from the FFY 2020 SPP/APR.

8 - OSEP Response

The State did not analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias or identify steps taken to reduce any identified bias to promote response from parents of children receiving special education services in the State, as required by the Measurement Table.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 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 2022 SPP/APR, the State must analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and report on steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	1.67%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

2

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
2	0	63	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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 2 school districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation. While some districts did not meet the minimum cell size of 5 students of a particular race/ethnicity in special education, almost all districts met the n size for at least one race/ethnicity group in special education. Only 2 districts (all small charter schools of a limited grade range) were excluded from examining disproportionate representation in special education and related services. There were 65 total districts and 2 were excluded due to cell size size. (Step One)

Step Two: Determining if Disproportionate Representation is the Result of Inappropriate Identification The State reviewed the child find, evaluation (including re-evaluation), and eligibility policies, procedures, and practices of the 2 districts identified in step 1 of the FFY2021 data review as having disproportionate representation to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

Evidence was collected from multiple sources:

Review of required district submissions of a disproportionality root cause self-assessment and corresponding evidence documents in the June 2021 and 2022 Disproportionality Report of the Consolidated Resource Plans including updates to action plans and prevention and/or correction activities. CCEIS detailed plans and budget are collected and reviewed annually. Beginning in the 2020-21 school year, collection of district reporting on how CCEIS are implemented with fidelity was added to the Disproportionality Report of the Consolidated Resource Plans.

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 FFY2021

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 MLL 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. TA meetings with districts to prepare for and review this work and explore intervention and prevention practices within the district.

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. 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 additional review of previous action plans for addressing disproportionality and accompanying revisions of policies, procedures, and practices.

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 2 districts had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification. File reviews did not yield child specific findings of noncompliance.

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

Step Two: Determining if Disproportionate Representation is the Result of Inappropriate Identification: The State reviewed the child find, evaluation (including re-evaluation), and eligibility policies, procedures, and practices of the 2 districts identified in step 1 of the FFY2021 data review as having disproportionate representation to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

Evidence was collected from multiple sources:

Review of required district submissions of a disproportionality root cause self-assessment and corresponding evidence documents in the June 2021 and 2022 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 FFY2021

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 MLL 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. TA meetings with districts to prepare for and review this work and explore intervention and prevention practices within the district.

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. 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 additional review of previous action plans for addressing disproportionality and accompanying revisions of policies, procedures, and practices.

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 the2 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 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

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 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 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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	5.45%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

2

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
6	0	63	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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 6 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 2 districts (small charter schools of a limited grade range) were excluded from examining disproportionate representation in special education and related services. There were 65 total districts and 2 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 6 districts identified in step 1 of the FFY2021 data review as having disproportionate representation to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

Evidence was collected from multiple sources:

Review of required district submissions of a disproportionality root cause self-assessment and corresponding evidence documents in the June 2021 and 2022 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. CCEIS detailed plans and budget are collected and reviewed annually. Beginning in the 2020-21 school year, collection of district reporting on how CCEIS are implemented with fidelity was added to the Disproportionality Report of the Consolidated Resource Plans.

Review of complaints, mediations, and hearings during FFY2021

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 MLL 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. TA meetings with districts to prepare for and review this work and explore intervention and prevention practices within the district.

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. 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 additional review of previous action plans for addressing disproportionality and accompanying revisions of policies, procedures, and practices.

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 6 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 6 districts identified in step 1 of the FFY2021 data review as having disproportionate representation to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification.

Evidence was collected from multiple sources:

Review of required district submissions of a disproportionality root cause self-assessment and corresponding evidence documents in the June 2021 and 2022 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. CCEIS detailed plans and budget are collected and reviewed annually. Beginning in the 2020-21 school year, collection of district reporting on how CCEIS are implemented with fidelity was added to the Disproportionality Report of the Consolidated Resource Plans.

Review of complaints, mediations, and hearings during FFY2021

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 MLL 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. TA meetings with districts to prepare for and review this work and explore intervention and prevention practices within the district.

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. 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 additional review of previous action plans for addressing disproportionality and accompanying revisions of policies, procedures, and practices.

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 6 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 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.84%	99.21%	99.35%	99.05%	98.62%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
3,862	3,837	98.62%	100%	99.35%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

25

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.

25 students were not evaluated within the 60 day timeframe allowed. Among those students, the days beyond the timeline that it took to complete evaluations ranged from 2 days (a 62 day evaluation period) to 185 days (245 day evaluation period). However, the 185 day delay was a massive outlier, and the timeframe between the 24 other students ranged from 2 days beyond 60 to 68 days beyond 60, with a max delay only one-third the length of the singular outlier. Many of the delayed evaluations cited Covid-19 related reasons for the delay in completing the evaluations, with other non-Covid reasons including parentally-induced delays, the need for additional screenings (secondary screenings, etc.), and shortages/lack of personnel available to complete evaluations.

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 previous June 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. All students on the report 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 the report by recording the student appropriately on the Special Education Evaluation System, the student will continue to appear on the report.

The system also features quarterly reporting. The Special Education Evaluation system generates cumulative LEA Percentage Rate reports, a Randomly Selected Student Record report, and the Students Missing Data reports. The system automatically emails these reports to the appropriate personnel in each LEA. RIDE's Data Manager is automatically sent a summary of all of these reports for review. These automated features have improved efficiency and serve as a reminder for the LEA to review their data reporting and they are required to submit the appropriate documentation to RIDE. The requirements for each LEA are as follows:

- 1) Each LEA must submit a District Action Plan to RIDE. Each quarter the local education agency must review their District Action Plan. If the LEA is not at 100% compliance, they 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 LEA with their cumulative percentage rate of compliance at the close of each quarter. This report is automatically emailed to each LEA for review.
3. In turn, the LEA is required to submit a Quarterly Report to RIDE inclusive of their cumulative percentage rate at that point in time and status of their District Action Plan. If the LEA has met 100% compliance, no revisions are required to their District Action Plan for that quarter. The LEA 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 an LEA has not met 100% compliance, revisions to the District Action Plan are required. The LEA 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. The LEA is required to revise or add steps to their District Action plan each quarter to ensure they are focused on the present data in the system and have a plan toward the target of 100% compliance by the close of the year. This Quarterly Report is dated and submitted to RIDE by the Special Education Administrator from each LEA at the end of every quarter. The LEAs 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 RIDE.
4. The Special Education Evaluation System generates and emails to each LEA, a Student Record Verification report each quarter, which randomly selects students that were entered on the Special Education Evaluation System. The LEA is required to submit a Quarterly Student Record Verification Sheet on the selected students to RIDE, in order to verify the student information entered on the system. (Those LEAs 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 LEA to RIDE 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. In addition, during RIDE School Support System visits to LEAs, 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 LEAs each quarter the Report of Students Missing Data, as a reminder that there are students whose evaluations have not been completed or their data was not yet recorded in 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. LEAs 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. The data is reviewed by the RIDE on a quarterly basis, and reminders are sent to Special Education Administrators. Special Education Administrators have access to their LEA's time line information at all times via the eRIDE system. The eRIDE Special Education Evaluation System provides each LEA with an Indicator 11 report which displays their percentage rate of compliance up to the current date. This affords each LEA the ability to monitor their compliance rate without assistance or data requests at any time.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
10	10	0	0

FFY 2020 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. 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 the reports of each individual student and LEA 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.

All LEAs that do not reach 100% compliance in any quarterly report are required to submit verified correction of non-compliance as well as a signed copy of the quarterly report to the state's data manager during each subsequent quarterly report for the remainder of that reporting year as well as all 4 quarterly reporting periods of the subsequent school year. Each finding of non-compliance as of submission of this APR has been verified as corrected through this process of submission by LEAs.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

RI, by virtue of a statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) that collects information on every evaluation done within the state, and automatically generates compliance reports. Compliance reports on LEAs are automatically generated on indicators including indicator 11, using every evaluation added to the system and, as such, every evaluation in the state, ensuring automatic subsequent verification occurs on not only a sample of subsequent data, but all existing data that could be used. Reports also ensure that no evaluation goes unreported. This procedure of subsequently verifying correction was carried out for all LEAs reported as non-compliant in FFY 2020.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.50%	98.87%	98.40%	97.30%	93.16%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	781
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	114

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	638
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.	17
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	7
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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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.	638	643	93.16%	100%	99.22%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

5

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 5 students from 4 LEAs who did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their 3rd birthdays.

(1) child- Incorrectly identified as a late EI referral- 51-60 days

(1) child- Challenge with summer bday- 41-50 days

(1) child- Scheduling constraints- 31-40 days

(1) child- Coordinator on leave- 1-10 days

(1) child- Child's medical needs- 1-10 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.

Since FFY 2020, 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 few years to create and refine 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 the LEAs to input information directly. The Executive Office of Health & Human Services (EOHHS), the lead agency for Part C, shares LEA notification data with RIDE on a monthly basis. This allows RIDE to identify students found eligible for Part C less than 90 days before their birthday. The data can now be paired with RIDE data, and a unique student identifier (SASID) created. 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 birthday and increases the reliability of the data collected and reported. RIDE believes that our data accuracy has greatly increased with the new collection.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

RIDE is pleased to announce that this year, RI was able to reach an overall compliance of 99.22%. RI significantly reduced the number of LEAs out of compliance from 8 during FFY 2020 to 4 during FFY 2021. Additionally, RI drastically reduced the overall number of students not in service by their third birthday from 40 in FFY 2020 to 5 in FFY 2021. Although RI did not meet the targeted 100% compliance rate, we witnessed a significant increase of 6.06 pts and a return to pre-pandemic rates. As noted in last year's APR, the percentage of children with a timely transition was significantly impacted by the health emergency, and the total number of children who did not experience a timely transition almost doubled from 21 children reported in FFY 2019 to 40 in FFY 2020, resulting in 93.16% compliance. RIDE is pleased to be back on track this year with 99.22% compliance. As noted last year, 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 in FFY 2019 to 709 in FFY 2020. This was attributed to the systemic issues within Early Intervention (EI), along with the lack of parental interest in participating in EI during the pandemic. This year, although not yet returning to pre-pandemic levels, RIDE is pleased to announce an increase of 72 children to a total of 781 children served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination. RIDE expects a continued increase in the upcoming years as EI programs are now stabilizing and parents are returning to service.

Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Stakeholder Input:

In addition to the broader stakeholder input, early childhood special education (ECSE) specific feedback 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 initially 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. As part of RIDE's continuous effort, extending over the entire SPP period, a wide variety of ECSE stakeholders were engaged over this last year in sharing information, collaborating, and building consensus. Planning for stakeholder feedback 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. Stakeholder feedback is an ongoing part of State ECSE Leadership Meetings. These meetings typically take place every other month, but at times monthly, providing an opportunity for district-level ECSE leaders to come together with state partners to hear about current state-level initiatives, build an understanding of the ECSE requirements and best practices, discuss and analyze data, set goals and identify/modify activities for improvements. RI-PreK Ed Coordinator Meetings provide another opportunity to hear from and collaborate with our general early childhood partners around state-level initiatives and requirements, challenges and successes, and activities for improvement. Additionally, RIDE continues to participate with the Early Intervention Interagency Coordination Council (ICC), the lead agency for the Early Intervention (EI) Program. The ICC 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. Finally, RIDE prioritizes partnerships with our parent center, the RI Parent Information Network (RIPIN), and Parents Leading for Educational Equity (PLEE), an organization founded and led by parents, with a mission 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. While the previous year's stakeholder feedback sessions began with a discussion of the historical data, potential targets, and vehicles for evaluating progress, this year's discussion was able to include a review of the improvement strategies and an examination of progress. Discussions with the ICC typically have about 10 parents who are either currently involved in EI or those who have already transitioned to Special Education, as well as EI providers and other state and community partners. The conversations with PLEE/RIPIN also have about 10 parents with children actively or formerly receiving ECSE services. PLEE/RIPIN feedback focuses on parents of color in the state's four core cities (Providence, Pawtucket, Central Falls, and Woonsocket). PLEE provides support for families so everyone can participate. Such support included access to computers and the internet, providing English and Spanish materials before the session, and Spanish interpretation during the event. Stakeholders understand that the impacts of COVID relative to the ECSE indicators are long-term and that the state is still feeling the effects. The family feedback itself provided critical improvement strategies including increasing collaboration with IHE, expanding free high-quality PreK/childcare, providing transportation, increasing funding for RI-ECSE 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. In an ongoing matter, RIDE follows up with each stakeholder group at least annually to look at the current data, report progress, and identify any necessary modifications to targets and/or improvement activities.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
8	6	1	1

FFY 2020 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 eight (8) LEAs with noncompliance in FFY 2020 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 (FFY 2021) Consolidated Resource Plan (CRP) 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 2021 data, the state verified that six (6) of the eight (8) LEAs are now correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and have reached 100% compliance. Additionally, one (1) LEA has subsequently corrected, as evidenced in the data over the past 6 months. The last LEA currently reached 98.45% compliance, an increase over FFY 2020 findings. Although the one LEA continues to demonstrate non-compliance in the FFY 2021 data, it must be noted that they have improved compliance by 4.45 percentage points even though they are still encountering significant challenges due to the pandemic and understaffing. 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 and support 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, forty (40) children in the FFY 2020 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 2020 consolidated resource plan (CRP), 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 2020 FFY findings was corrected and that all 40 children, although late, had an IEP developed and implemented.

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The one (1) district identified above, which was out of compliance in FFY 2020 and is not yet in compliance, will participate in individualized and intensive technical assistance during the upcoming year. This TA will provide the necessary support to analyze barriers, including those caused by the pandemic and serious staffing concerns, and to identify essential 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 assist in creating the plan, ensure that it meets all requirements, and monitor the implementation throughout the year. The RI Department of Education will continue to conduct subsequent reviews to determine whether 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 2020 was corrected and that each child, although late, had an IEP developed and implemented.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2019	1	0	1

FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

This is the same district identified above, out of compliance in FFY 2019 & FFY 2020 and not yet correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and reaching 100% compliance. The LEA will be required to participate in ongoing individualized and intensive technical assistance during the upcoming year. This TA will provide the necessary support to analyze barriers, including those caused by the pandemic and serious staffing concerns, and to identify essential 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 assist in creating the plan, ensure that it meets all requirements, and monitor the implementation throughout the year. The RI Department of Education will continue to conduct subsequent reviews to determine whether 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 has been 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

Each of the seven (8) LEAs identified as out of compliance in the FFY 2020 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, 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 2021) 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 2021 data, six (6) of the eight (8) LEAs are now correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and have reached 100% compliance. Additionally, one (1) LEA has subsequently corrected, as evidenced in the data over the past 6 months. The last LEA currently reached 98.45% compliance, an increase in compliance over FFY 2020 findings.

Although the one LEA continues to demonstrate non-compliance in the FFY 2021 data, it must be noted that they continue to make improvements and have increased compliance by 4.45 percentage points even though they are still encountering challenges due to the pandemic and significant understaffing. RIDE has provided significant TA to this district to ensure that they can implement IEPs by each child's third birthday and will continue to monitor compliance moving forward.

RIDE used the data districts enter into the Initial Evaluation Collection which is then uploaded into the consolidated resource plan (CRP) to confirm that each individual case of noncompliance had been corrected. As reported, forty (40) children in FFY 2020 were found eligible for Part B but did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their 3rd birthday due to delay factors not allowed by OSEP. Through the data provided in the FFY 2020 consolidated resource plan (CRP), 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 2020 FFY findings was corrected and that all 40 children, although late, had an IEP developed and implemented. The one (1) district identified above, which was out of compliance in FFY FFY 2019 and 2020 and is not yet in compliance, will participate in individualized and intensive technical assistance during the upcoming year. This TA will provide the necessary support to analyze barriers, including those caused by the pandemic and serious staffing concerns, and to identify essential 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 assist in creating the plan, ensure that it meets all requirements, and monitor the implementation throughout the year. The RI Department of Education will continue to conduct subsequent reviews to determine whether 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 and 2020 was corrected and that each child, although late, had an IEP developed and implemented.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and FFY 2019 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.96%	99.90%	99.98%	99.98%	99.87%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
5,191	5,192	99.87%	100%	99.98%	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 NTACTION (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 information often focuses on Indicator 13 throughout the school year. The State Transition 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 are often discussing both the quality and compliance of IEPs at both the local and state level. 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 may help inform discussions related to improvement activities.

Stakeholders 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, this school year, stakeholders and LEA personnel continue to discuss OSEP's recent 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.

For FFY 2021 (2020-2021 SY), one initial records/findings in one school district was found to be non-compliant in one or more transition requirements as of June 30, 2022. This record has since been brought into compliance by the district as of February 2022. The individual records/findings was already corrected and verified as compliant by RIDE. The affected district submitted an updated and corrected, individualized, compliant IEP for the initially non-compliant student IEP. Based on subsequent collection and review of additional individual IEPs for 2020-2021 SY the 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 99.98% in FFY 2021. 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 2020

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	7	0	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

For FFY 2020 (2019-2020 SY), seven records/findings in five school districts were non-compliant in one or more transition requirements as of June 30, 2021. These records have been brought into compliance as of February 2022. These records were corrected and verified as compliant by RIDE. The five affected school districts submitted an updated and corrected, compliant IEP for the initially non-compliant IEP. It should be noted that several were clerical errors. Due to the state's collection and monitoring of 100% of IEPs, subsequent monitoring is automatically done on all non-compliant LEAs by

virtue of required data collections and auto-generated compliance reports. Based on these subsequent collections, reports, and reviews for 2021-2022 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 99.98% in FFY 2021.

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

For FFY 2020 (2019-2020 SY), seven records/findings were non-compliant in one or more transition requirements as of June 30, 2021. These individual records were brought into compliance as of February 2022. These individual records/findings were corrected and verified as compliant by RIDE. The affected districts submitted an updated and corrected, individualized, compliant IEP for the initially non-compliant IEP. It should be noted that several errors were clerical and not a specific transition requirement. Based on the state's subsequent collection, review and verification of all student's individual IEPs within these affected districts as verified through electronic maintenance reports, census and on-site follow-up review, the districts are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of 34 CFR 300.320 (b) and 300.321 (b), achieving 100% compliance. The districts continue to demonstrate both quality and compliance on individual student records.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

RI, by virtue of a statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) that collects information on every IEP, including the required information to determine Indicator 13 compliance. Compliance reports on LEAs are automatically generated on indicators including indicator 13, using every IEP added to the system and, as such, every IEP in the state, ensuring automatic subsequent verification occurs on not only a sample of subsequent data, but all existing data that could be used. This procedure of subsequently verifying correction was carried out for all LEAs reported as non-compliant in FFY 2020.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

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 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their 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. If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2009	Target ≥	40.00%	41.00%	42.00%	43.00%	33.00%
A	33.00%	Data	28.43%	29.03%	32.05%	32.97%	29.00%
B	2018	Target ≥	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	65.38%
B	65.38%	Data	70.01%	69.43%	65.38%	48.32%	45.75%
C	2009	Target ≥	85.00%	86.00%	87.00%	88.00%	78.00%
C	78.00%	Data	80.49%	79.47%	77.19%	78.78%	76.63%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	33.42%	33.84%	34.25%	34.67%	35.08%
Target B ≥	65.38%	65.88%	66.38%	66.68%	67.38%
Target C ≥	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.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,206
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	843
Response Rate	69.90%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	219
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	173
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)	55
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).	204

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	219	843	29.00%	33.42%	25.98%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	392	843	45.75%	65.38%	46.50%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	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)	651	843	76.63%	78.60%	77.22%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Based on the survey results, RI saw slippage in only one Measure (Higher Education) as compared to the previous year where all three Measures saw slippage. Covid 19 has caused unprecedented drops in college enrollment numbers across the country and RI is no exception. Community Colleges have withstood the worst of these changes. RI's Community College where many students begin their college path, has yet to recover to its pre-pandemic enrollment numbers and only recently beginning to rebuild its enrollment. Many colleges have seen an increase in online learning, however, many students with disabilities have not found this to be the most conducive to learning. Despite slippage In Measure A, RI remains above the most recent national average for Measure A.

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	2020	2021
Response Rate	71.68%	69.90%

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 continues to use the National Post School Outcomes (NPSO) Response Calculator to determine any group that may be underrepresented. Use of this calculator indicates that the 2020-2021 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 or overrepresented. 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. With no under-represented or over-represented groups, RI's plan to ensure continued demographic representativeness of survey respondents continues to be raising response rate in an attempt to reach 100% response rate, which would automatically ensure representative responses. Given the unique size of RI and a historical trend of greater than average response rate, RI believes that a 100% response rate is within reach. RI's survey response rate continues to be higher than the most recent national median response rate. It is also important to note that RI analyzes six categories to monitor representativeness with geographic location being the least impactful given the size of the state.

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, race/ethnicity, 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 continue to 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. 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.

As mentioned above, with the use of the NPSO Response Calculator, RI is able to analyze responses by disability category, gender, ELL status, minority, race/ethnicity, and, and dropout. The data does not identify a specific group that was underrepresented. RI's plan to ensure demographic representativeness of survey respondents continues to be raising response rate in an attempt to reach 100% response rate, which would automatically ensure representative responses. Given the unique size of RI and a historical trend of greater than average response rate, RI believes that a 100% response rate is within reach. RI's survey response rate continues to be higher than the most recent national median response rate. It is also important to note that RI analyzes six categories to monitor representativeness with geographic location being the least impactful given the size of the state.

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.

The data does not identify a specific group that was underrepresented or overrepresented using this 3% discrepancy threshold for the chosen categories of the NPSO Response Calculator.

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)

Improvement activities and initiatives continue to be 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 NTA-CT; 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.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	11
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3

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.

There was a significant focus of gaining internal and external stakeholder feedback for Indicator 15 during the FY 2021. RIDE presents the SPP/APR report to groups in draft form and using the longitudinal data and stakeholder input to develop targets (during the previous year). 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 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.

On January 19, 2023 the SE State Director of OSCAS presented targets and actual data 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 targets and data for Indicator 15 and provided suggestions and input. It was continues to be acknowledged by stakeholders 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 comments 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 previously 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."

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	42.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%	57.00%	57.25%
Data	53.85%	57.14%	54.55%	42.86%	63.64%

Targets

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

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
3	11	63.64%	57.50%	27.27%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The calculation for this Indicator is the "Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements." During FY 2021 there were eleven resolutions sessions that were held which resulted in three resolution session agreements. The FFY 2021 target was 57.5% and the FY 2021 actual data was 27.27% resulting in not meeting the target and having slippage from FY 2020 (63.64%). Justification for the slippage is that there was a decline in the number of resolution session agreements reached during the required 30-day resolution session timeline. Rhode Island carefully monitors due process complaint filings, the 30-day resolution session timelines, and the 45-day decision due dates from special education hearing officers to issue final decisions. During the FY 2021 Rhode Island saw an increase in the number of matters that were not resolved during the 30-day resolution timeframe as the resolution sessions expired and special education hearing officers were assigned. When contacting parties it was found that there were scheduling challenges during the 30-day timeframe which resulted in the automatic assignments of SE Hearing Officers. Rhode Island did see Settlement Agreements that were reached after the assignment of SE Hearing Officers.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of 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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	29
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	18

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 continues to include 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. 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 in 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 this FY.

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. This SEA pulls monthly reports showing call inquiries specifically related to SE Mediation filings.

An area of improvement connected to this Indicator and gained through stakeholder feedback continues to include on-going needed quarterly trainings 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. This contract does not promote mediation agreements rather, it pays special education mediators for additional time spend on the drafting and finalizing mediation agreements. This SEA is also considering a higher payment amount of special education mediations that include to use of translators due to mediations taking longer time.

In January, 2023, the Coordinator of the SPP/APR of OSCAS presented targets and data 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 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 baseline targets for this Indicator, RISEAC was invited to submit more formalize feedback in writing to an IDEA team member.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	79.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	89.00%	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	80.00%
Data	74.07%	85.00%	92.59%	70.59%	61.29%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
-----	------	------	------	------	------

Target >=	80.25%	80.50%	80.75%	81.00%	81.25%
--------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1	18	29	61.29%	80.25%	65.52%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Again, this Indicator does not reflect the large amount of SE Mediation filings rather, it requires the data submission of mediations held and mediation agreements. OSEP may want to have this Indicator include additional information re. SE Mediation. Rhode Island had 42 special education mediation filings. 11 special education mediations were either withdrawn or not held.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

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 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, 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 2021 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 2021 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 2022). 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 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023; for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

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 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023) 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)

NO

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)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<https://www.ride.ri.gov/informationaccountability/accountability/stateperformanceplan.aspx#41832102-theory-of-action-revisions>

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

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
696	1,414	33.14%	36.00%	49.22%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

RICAS math state assessment student growth percentile data from spring 2022, 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. 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 statewide that showed typical or high growth spring 2022 on math RICAS state assessment for the SiMR. Data were shared across RIDE offices and with technical assistance providers for input and feedback. In addition to examining statewide data, RIDE has the capacity to examine the data by district, groups of districts, and by race and disability category. Examining 2022 growth data for students who attended districts that participated in the project coaching revealed the following: while 49% of 8th graders with IEP statewide showed typical or high growth on math RICAS, 64% of 8th graders with IEPs in project districts showed typical or high growth. This approximates typical or high growth shown by 8th graders without IEPs statewide (65.9%). Looking back at 2019 growth data, we see that for 8th graders in project districts 23% showed high growth that year whereas 27% showed high growth in 2022. In 2019, 37% of 8th graders in project districts with IEPs showed low growth while in 2022, 36% percent showed low growth.

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 2021, winter 2022, and spring 2022. Data was reported for all participating sites, except for one urban school district and one suburban elementary school. Elementary school benchmark performance in Grades 3-5 demonstrated an upward trend, with a 7% increase from fall to winter and a 1% increase from winter to spring of students meeting Tier 1 benchmarks. The data showed a percentage decrease of 2% from fall to winter and winter to spring for students requiring Tier 2. Interestingly, the percentage showing a need for Tier 3 intensive intervention decreased by 4% from fall to winter but increased by 2% from winter to spring. 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 1% increase from winter to spring of students meeting benchmarks at Tier 1. Students requiring Tier 2 had a percentage decrease of 2% from fall to winter and a 1% decrease from winter to spring. For Tier 3, the percentage of students decreased by 3% 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, Acadience Math, and Monitoring Basic Skills Progress (MBSP).

Data-Based Individualization (DBI) Case Studies: Eight out of the 11 (73%) case study students made moderate and ambitious growth toward progress monitoring goals as of June 2022. In relation to the language used in the SiMR, moderate growth equates to typical growth while ambitious growth equates to high growth. The state is comparing to pre-pandemic because the COVID pandemic impacted so much intervention time. Our case study results are similar to pre-pandemic data.

RIDE is also watching the Average Growth Percentile (AGP) on RICAS Math. Math RICAS AGP for 8th graders with IEPs is 47.31 which is higher than grades 3-8 math RICAS IEP (44) and lower than grades 3-8 math RICAS AGP for students without IEPs (51). In addition, RIDE examines the percent of SWD showing typical or high growth by disability category and race/ethnicity to look for equity issues in improving student growth. 8th graders with disabilities show typical and high growth at differing rates by disability: LD 61%, ASD 67%, ED 53%, SPL 52%. 8th graders with disabilities show typical and high growth at differing rates by race/ethnicity: two or more races 67%, Black 51%, Hispanic 57%, White 65%. Some groups have numbers too small to be reported. Finally, RIDE also watches the percent proficient. Currently, 2.3% of 8th graders with IEPs met or exceeded expectations on the math RICAS administered in spring 2022.

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)

NO

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)

NO

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

- Cross-Office Collaboration within the RIDE Math Team
- Collaboration with the Office of District and School improvement (OSDI) to share resources and efforts within districts with particular attention to districts receiving support from OSDI and also from the SSIP Math Project.
- Members of Office of Student, Community, and Academic Support (OSCAS) represent all federal programs including IDEA and regularly collaborate with the Office of Instruction, Assessment & Curriculum along with the Office of College and Career Readiness. Two areas of continued collaboration are the ReThink Intervention grant work aligned to MTSS and Curriculum Frameworks initiatives. We will continue those endeavors along with participating on a math team representing the three offices.

The SSIP Math Project provides training and resources on evidence-based math instruction and DBI through an online learning management system, BRIDGE-RI (<https://mtssri.org/>). 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. Currently there are three self-paced BRIDGE-RI Mathematics Courses: Core Instruction in the Mathematics Classroom (Part I): Foundations, Supporting All Learners in Math: Universal Design, Differentiation, and Scaffolding, and Supporting Language Development in Mathematics. The fourth self-paced mathematics course, Core Instruction in the Mathematics Classroom (Part II): Advanced - Facilitating Deep

Mathematical Understanding will launch in the next quarter. Two self-paced BRIDGE-RI Tier 3 Courses were developed in collaboration with WestBay: Tier 3 Overview and Tier 3 Systems. The SSIP Math Project supported the creation of family and community engagement resources and highlighted math specific examples of the DBI process.

We continued with the District Model for two districts, Johnston and North Providence. 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. The District Model allowed our coaches to support the districts with their infrastructure in order to scale and sustain their capacity for K-8 students, especially students with disabilities.

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 Math Project works collaboratively with stakeholders within RIDE, special education directors, teachers, and the BRIDGE-RI team. The Math Project has always approached the achievement of the SiMR through a systems framework to support across all levels of the systems, the SEA, districts, schools, and parents. RIDE to schools to parents. Building capacity throughout a district through coaching and professional development (PD) leads to greater sustained efforts and supports sustainability and scale-up. Within each district, a group of stakeholders that included administrators, mathematics coaches and coordinators, special education leads, MTSS or RTI leads, and/or curriculum or instructional leads were selected to provide feedback regarding the professional learning and coaching and the current structure they are provided in to further support scaling and sustainability. The purpose was to create a system, driven by high expectations and standards, PD, and coaching that lead to the achievement of the SiMR by increasing the capacity to support K-8th students with disabilities. This systemic approach has supported scaling to additional school sites and sustaining practices to meet the needs of all students, but especially students with disabilities.

BRIDGE-RI provides PD online which allows educators to complete when it is convenient. It also allows user to go back into the modules, thus providing "just in time" support. Approximately 270 educators have completed at least one BRIDGE-RI math course. When asked, "To what extent did the content in this course advance your understanding of this subject," 51% of participants selected "Quite a lot," whereas 43% chose "Somewhat." It appears that the BRIDGE-RI math courses are achieving the short-term outcome of increasing educator knowledge of DBI for math. When asked, "How much of what you learned will you apply to your practice," 42% of participants stated they learned several new things and will be applying at least one of pieces of information learned from the course immediately, whereas 50% stated they learned some new things and hope to implement at least one of pieces of information learned from the course in the future. The results show that the BRIDGE-RI math courses are demonstrating continued progress toward the intermediate outcome for increasing educators' application of skills related to evidence-based math instruction at varying levels of intensity.

In the District 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 engaged in virtual training/coaching around Peer Assisted Learning Strategies and Data-based decision-making and received follow-up during the winter and spring of 2022. These training modules along with the educational personnel team structure of the District Model aligned with the short-term outcome of increasing educator knowledge of collaboration and teaming practices to ensure access to core-math instruction as well as to individualization based on data-use.

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.

A Specially Designed Instruction and Data-Based Individualization (SDI/DBI) workgroup and virtual Communities of Practice (CoP) will begin following the submission of this report. The description and data outcomes will be shared in next year's report.

In partnership with Special Education Directors, RI Parent Information Network (RIPIN), and BRIDGE-RI, the SDI/DBI workgroup will identify trends and areas of improvement related to specially designed math instruction (SDI), define SDI in mathematics, and develop a framework in Rhode Island for accessible evidence-based math instruction. The virtual, statewide targeted Communities of Practice will be tailored to schools' training plans and participants' roles, include activities to enhance knowledge in accessible evidence-based math instruction, SDI, and components of DBI, to provide schools with the resources they need to effectively implement and take action. The workgroup and communities of practice aim to achieve the short-term outcomes of increasing educator knowledge of evidence-based math instruction at varying levels of intensity from Tier 1 to DBI to SDI and increasing educator knowledge of collaboration and teaming practices to ensure access to core-math instruction as well as to individualization based on data-use. They also aim to achieve the intermediate outcome of increasing educator application of skills related to evidence-based math instruction.

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

Using the networks of our partners, the Math Project will recruit ten to twelve educators, leaders, higher education faculty, advocates, and parents to join the SDI/DBI workgroup. The workgroup will convene to review various documents, provide feedback to drive implementation and user guide document(s), and will establish consensus on implementation methods and user guide document(s) prior to sharing with the field. We are anticipating the implementation of the products created by the workgroup will be used in the field by RIDE and districts/LEAs to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Starting with our sixteen existing school partnerships, the Math Project will annually administer a comprehensive needs assessment to determine what level of support each school needs and for what they are ready. Based on the level of readiness, we will recruit up to four schools with similar math professional learning goals to join a quarterly targeted content-specific CoP. These schools will engage in asynchronous learning through the coursework and then join facilitated sessions to discuss implementation of the professional learning. Facilitated sessions will include opportunities for educators to share problems of practice and action plan around potential solutions, as well as engage with colleagues across the state that might not have intensive coaching support at their school but have taken at least one of our existing courses. We are anticipating attaining completed needs assessment as well as training feedback for the asynchronous and facilitated learning sessions.

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:

- DBI process (includes evidence-based intensification strategies, including fluency practice)
- 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

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 will help school sites 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 during the first iteration of the Math Project were from 28 participating schools (20 elementary, 8 middle) through site cohorts and/or district models. Across sites, there were a total of 3,940 students enrolled. The DBI case study process has been conducted with 53 students since the project’s inception in 2016. 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 participated in the RI Math Project, focusing on different aspects of implementation (e.g., learning and implementing evidence-based practices in mathematics, DBI in mathematics). Since the contract for the previous SSIP implementation ended in June 2022, all three cohorts focused on scaling and sustaining implementation. Each site had 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 aligned 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 were implemented by the school teams with coaching support from the project.

The Math Project team continued 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 made progress toward the previous short-term outcomes related to increasing their knowledge of core mathematics instruction and data-driven processes. In addition, Math Project staff provided 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: 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 engaged in virtual training/coaching around Peer Assisted Learning Strategies and Data-based decision-making and received follow-up during the winter and spring of 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 addressed the previous 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.

Book Study - The Math Project continued to offer a virtual book study, as it had in the past reporting period. This approach aligned with the Math Project’s previous theory of action and long-term outcomes; it provided 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 2022, focusing on the text, Antiracism and Universal Design for Learning: Building Expressways to Success by Andraesha Fitzgerald. During this reporting period, there were 23 participants from 9 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.

In early spring 2022, RIDE issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to identify a vendor to support implementation and evaluation of the SSIP, based on the current theory of action and logic model. The Math Project at AIR was awarded as the vendor. The logic model includes activities of providing training and resources on evidence-based math instruction and DBI through the online learning management system, BRIDGE-RI. This model also specifies virtual and in-person coaching of teams on DBI and SDI and utilizing the Book Study. Under this new phase of implementation, the Math Project will recruit more districts through virtual communities of practices, thus impacting more students.

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

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. 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. The rating scale for the pulse check is from 1 – 6, with 1 representing "strongly disagree" and 6 representing "strongly agree." For this report, we present weighted average responses for various survey items. Fifty-eight participants completed the survey items aligned with the EOY pulse check. Of these, five took survey for the first time, and 53 were returning participants who completed the pulse check at least one other time during the project. This report highlights comparative data of recurring participants from the baseline data in 2018 to the most recent data in 2022.

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. 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), the ratings were increased across all items (100%). The item with the highest difference in ratings related to the customization and individualization of interventions to maximize the likelihood of a student's success (2018 = 1.9, new = 3.92). These increased ratings suggest that recurring participants have ensured processes are in place to document and monitor student-level mathematics interventions. The increased ratings also demonstrate progress toward the long-term outcome of improved fidelity of school-level implementation of DBI in mathematics.

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 but one of the seven items related to participants' ratings of their knowledge of intensive intervention, there were increases in ratings for recurring participants when comparing 2018 with 2022. The decrease rating for the prompt, "There is a difference between progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data," suggests that educators continue to have difficulties distinguishing between the types of data used within the DBI process to support intensive intervention implementation. The item with the largest difference between means was the prompt, "I have appropriate knowledge about developing intensive math intervention plans for students" (2018 = 3.5; 2022 = 4.07). This finding suggests that educators' knowledge for this topic grew significantly during their participation with the Math Project.

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. Recurring participants increased their ratings across all seven items (100%) from 2018 to 2022, suggesting educators are applying their gained knowledge into their student plans. The item with the largest difference between means was the prompt, "Schedules are flexible enough to allow time for intensive math intervention outside of core instruction" (2018 = 1.7; 2022 = 3.76). This finding suggests educators and administrators have improved their efforts in ensuring designated time for intensive intervention for students.

Data-Driven Instruction Survey: The Data-Driven Instruction survey was an internally developed resource to assess educator beliefs about using data to inform instruction. It includes 12 items related to data efficacy and data-use. Responses to the Data-Driven Instruction survey and attributes related to those skills included a set of items on which respondents rated their agreement on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). This survey was also administered to educators across the SSIP sites for the past 5 years. We can report the comparative data from the baseline in 2017 to the survey administration during the 2021-22 school year. There were rating increases across all survey items (100%) from teachers' confidence in their ability to interpret student data to using assessment data/results to measure the effectiveness of their math instruction. This finding suggests that educators have improved their capacity to use data to inform their instructional decisions, determine causes of students' math performance, and set targets and goals for students.

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.

All cohorts made progress toward the previous 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 for this reporting period were Acadience Math, AIMSweb, and Monitoring Basic Skills Progress (MBSP). 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 Acadience Math typically is administer twice per month. Of the 11 case study students, five made ambitious growth, meaning they achieved more than a year's worth of growth in a year to close gaps. Two students who made ambitious growth exited intervention. Three students made moderate growth and four students made minimal growth. Educators applied their learned skills of implementing EBPs in mathematics, resulting in 73% of case study students demonstrating ambitious or moderate growth. During the first 6-year iteration of the Math Project, we conducted fifty-three student-level DBI case studies. Of the 53, forty-three students (81%) made moderate to ambitious 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 steps are occurring under the new vendor contract with RIDE that began in October 2022.

We are continuing with the same EBPs but providing more clarification around how to align these practices within SDI. TA will be provided on these EBPs through four primary professional learning activities: statewide professional learning, targeted professional learning content-specific Communities of Practice, targeted coaching, and leadership Communities of Practices. The anticipated outcomes to be attained are the short-term outcomes of increasing educator knowledge of evidence-based math instruction at varying levels of intensity of instruction from Tier 1 to DBI to SDI and increasing educator knowledge of collaboration and teaming practices to ensure access to core-math instruction as well as to individualization based on data-use.

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

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

Changes were made and submitted in last year's report (FFY 2020) and thus will be carried forward and implemented in schools and districts beginning in the 2022-2023 SY and beyond. We will begin working with more middle schools and will receive more feedback if additional coaching and training are needed. At this point, all stakeholders are satisfied with the work being provided. It is also apparent from this submission that the SSIP implementation has led to positive student outcomes.

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.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.

The SSIP Math Project conducts additional stakeholder groups, workgroups, and survey opportunities to engage a variety of stakeholders in the work. Specific details are outlined in the following sections.

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

To gather robust details on how the Math Project has supported LEA capacity, a series of interviews were conducted with LEA personnel to gather more detailed information on how their internal capacity has shifted. The 13 LEA personnel interviewed were from all three cohorts, both school sites and district models. The interview included a couple of questions asking about specific training or implementation activities that were most impactful on the schools' successes as well as the most helpful technique for schools during their participation with the Math Project. Most LEA personnel expressed that the on-site coaching & modeling, intervention trainings, and assistance with creating systems related to data were the most helpful for themselves and their educators. In response to their feedback, the Math Project will continue to offer targeted coaching activities that focus not only on building educator competency related to the delivery of accessible, evidence-based math instruction through DBI but also on building the systems-related elements needed to support implementation.

In addition, stakeholder improvement efforts included:

- Sharing resources with Office of District and School Improvement and Office of Assessment, Instruction, and Curriculum, CEEDAR State Leadership Team, Cross-office Math Team at RIDE, the Academic Strategies team at RIDE, Office for Student, Community and Academic Supports Team which represents all federal programs.

- RI Special Ed Advisory Council - regular input, updates, and recruitment to the new Math project advisory

During the Parents and Family Support Survey and Interviews administered during FFY 2020, parents/caregivers and family members shared that they utilize websites such as Google and YouTube for mathematical concept tutorials to improve their mathematical understanding. Yet parents/caregivers and families expressed that they continued to seek out additional resources for support, particularly strategies informing parents/caregivers on how the "new math" works. As a result of this feedback about parents/caregivers utilizing YouTube for math tutorials, the Math Project developed a vetted playlist of YouTube videos for parents/caregivers and families to help them better understand mathematical concepts and methods. Since not all YouTube

tutorials are of high quality, the Math Project staff selected or developed videos that align with Common Core mathematical standards and evidence-based practices. We have ongoing evaluation of this playlist to ensure it meets the needs expressed by parents/caregivers and families and make adjustments accordingly. In response to the feedback about parents/caregivers wanting additional resources on “new math”, the Math Project team developed a suite of parent and family infographics on math homework. These resources, available in both English and Spanish, are designed to provide guidance to parents/caregivers and families on supporting their student's math learning at home. The series provides explanations of research-based math strategies in easy-to-understand language and offers multiple suggestions for fun activities families can do at home to support those strategies. The project plans to conduct future surveys to understand their use of the new resources and additional needs.

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

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Based on feedback from LEA and school personnel, parents & families, etc., educators, schools and districts need more support and guidance around specially designed instruction (SDI). As a result of this feedback, the second iteration of the Math Project is establishing a work group and creating additional self-paced learning courses through BRIDGE-RI that will address these specific concerns raised by the stakeholders. In addition, RIDE and BRIDGE-RI have reached out to the Progress Center for additional TA and RIDE and LEA staff are participating in the special education guidance PLG organized by the Progress Center. In OSCAS communications to districts, Progress Center materials such as IEP tip sheets are shared.

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.

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

The current contract that funds the Math Project and will implement the current SiMR, TOA, and evaluation plan began October 2022.

Timeline of Activities:

- Determine Professional Learning needs for potential schools based on a comprehensive needs assessment to onboard schools for targeted coaching and “offboard” to leadership CoPs. [Oct 2022 – Feb 2023]
- Facilitate the Workgroup to develop the framework for SDI and DBI in math in Rhode Island. [first meeting to be held at the end of Jan 2023]
 - o Develop BRIDGE-RI Moodle courses around SDI in mathematics based on the framework and guidance from the Workgroup.
 - o Develop math instruction professional learning guides.
- Establish Leadership Communities of Practice (CoP) to support sustainability of current adopters as leaders across the state (up to 10 schools). [To begin in Jan-Feb 2023]
- Develop a series for targeted coaching on SDI and DBI. [To begin in Jan 2023]
 - o Pilot the coaching series with 6 existing schools.
- Facilitate the self-paced Podcast and Book study of the text, Antiracism and Universal Design for Learning: Building Expressways to Success by Andraesha Fitzgerald with educators and leaders. [Spring 2023]
- Facilitate another Book Study to begin in Fall 2023; book to be determined. [Fall 2023]

Anticipated Data Collection & Measures and Expected Outcomes

- Needs assessment – increased education knowledge of evidence-based math instruction at varying levels of intensity from Tier 1 to DBI to SDI (short-term)
- BRIDGE-RI Moodle courses & training implementation and evaluation data – increased educator knowledge of collaboration and teaming practices to ensure access to core-math instruction as well as to individualization based on data-use (short-term)
- Math Beliefs Survey - Increased educator, family, and stakeholder beliefs of mathematics (short-term)
- EOY Pulse Check - Increased educator application of skills related to evidence-based math instruction (intermediate)
- Observational tool data - Increased educator application of skills related to evidence-based math instruction (intermediate)
- Stakeholder engagement survey - Improved stakeholder engagement to support improved math outcomes for students with IEPs (long-term)
- Progress Monitoring, Universal Screening, and State Assessment growth data - Improved formative and summative assessment outcomes in math for students with IEPs (long-term)

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

The number of initiatives that schools and districts are engaging in (High-Quality Curriculum Materials, Right to Read, etc.) is limiting educators' time and capacity to meaningfully engage in our work post-pandemic. As a result, we have shifted our coaching model to four primary activities (mentioned above) and is based on schools' and districts' readiness.

As reflected at the national level, there is a teacher and substitute shortage in the state, making it a challenge for schools to have coverage for educators during PD training and/or coaching. Due to the shortage, the Math Project is offering more asynchronous training opportunities via BRIDGE-RI modules.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

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

Title:

Senior Administrator, Quality Assurance Services

Email:

susan.wood@ride.ri.gov

Phone:

401-222-8992

Submitted on:

04/27/23 12:29:48 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination¹

Percentage (%)	Determination
80.83%	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	24	16	66.67%
Compliance	20	19	95.00%

2023 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	91%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	85%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	19%	0
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	95%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	30%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	91%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	91%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	84%	1
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	31%	0
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	92%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	14%	0
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	90%	1

¹ For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2023: Part B."

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	4	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	86	2

*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, "the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential."

2023 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator ²	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	99.35%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	99.22%	NO	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	99.98%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	95.24%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			1
Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	Yes, 2 to 4 years		

² The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

Data Rubric

FFY 2021 APR³

	Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data	
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1
	Subtotal	21
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2021 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
	Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

³ In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

		618 Data ⁴		
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 4/6/22	1	0	1	2
Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22	1	0	1	2
			Subtotal	19
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	23.52

⁴ In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	23.52
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	49.52
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator*) =	0.9524
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	95.24

***Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2023 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all EDFacts files or the entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	1 st Wednesday in April
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Exiting	C009	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	Wednesday in the 3 rd week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date)
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	1 st Wednesday in November
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	1 st Wednesday in May

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to EDFacts aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>