

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2022**

Rhode Island



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

**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 2021-2022 school year is 80.64%. For FFY 2022, Rhode Island's graduation rate is 86.44% meeting the target and exceeding the target by 6 percentage points.

Indicator 2: The target dropout rate for the 2021-2022 school year is 13.7%. For FFY 2022, Rhode Island's dropout rate is 7.93% meeting the target and exceeding the target by 6 percentage points.

Indicator 3: FFY 2022: 3a The target of 100% participation was not met for both ELA and Math however, there was no slippage and High School saw an increase from the previous year. 3b targets for proficiency for reading (grade level academic achievement standards) were not met for group A (Grade 4) and group B (Grade 8) however both groups saw improvement. Group C (HS) did meet their target making significant improvement over the previous year. Targets for proficiency for math (grade level academic achievement standards) were not met by any of the groups but all 3 groups saw improvement. 3c. Proficiency for children ELA (alternate academic achievement standards) target were not met for groups A (grade 4) and C (HS) and slippage occurred for grade 4 in ELA. Group B (Grade 8) met their target in ELA. Proficiency for Children

MATH (alternate academic achievement standards) targets were not met however group A (Grade 4) saw an increase from the previous year. Slippage occurred for groups B (grade 8) and C (HS) 3d. Gaps in proficiency rates ELA (grade level academic achievement standards) targets were met in all 3 groups. Gaps in proficiency rates Math (grade level academic standards) targets were not met. Slippage occurred in group A (grade 4) and Group B (grade 8).

Indicator 4: Rhode Island has revised its methodology at the suggestion of OSEP. There were 0 LEAs with a significant discrepancy in students with disabilities expelled/suspended out of school greater than 10 days (4a) or in students with disabilities expelled/suspended out of school greater than 10 days by race/ethnicity (4b). 6 LEAs met the state's new n size of 5 or more students with disabilities suspended more than 10 days out of school, none of which met the rate ratio threshold for significant discrepancy (4a). No LEAs met the n size of 5 students with disabilities suspended out of school 10 or more days when disaggregated by race (4b). Additionally, Rhode Island found no improper policies, practices, or procedures in its review of LEA level discipline protocols through various levels of monitoring outside the SPP/APR.

Indicator 5: 5a- the target of 77.50% was not met. RIDE was at 72.06% for this indicator. 5b- the target of 10.00% was not met. RIDE was very close with 10.05%. 5c- the target goal of 2.50% was not met. Currently RIDE is at 5.17%. RIDE will continue to monitor and support LEAs in reducing this percent.

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 three years, due to the pandemic, percentage A has seen a decrease and percentage B has seen an increase. In FFY22, percentage A remained stable, at just below the target. Percentage B experienced minor slippage, and remained a few percentage points off the target. Percentage C improved in FFY22, and the target was met.

Indicator 7: After meeting the target for all 6 parts of the indicator last year, Rhode Island only met the target for 3 this year, with the other 3 experiencing slippage. The timeline of indicator 7 is such that a large number of children with COS scores have spent a majority of their life living through COVID, and an increase in the number of students entering Pre-K with needs and a complexity of said needs has been witnessed increasing since 2020.

Indicator 8: The number of respondent parents who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement for FFY22 was 77%, well above the target set by the state. Additionally, the state also saw a modest increase in response rate among parents of students with IEPs.

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: One district was found to have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification in discrete disability categories. The required target of 0% was not met.

Indicator 11: Timely evaluations experienced a slippage in FFY22, with a 2% decrease from last year's 99.35% to 97.63%. One LEA accounted for the majority of the slippage in this indicator, and has seen a sharp increase in the TA and PD received from the state in an effort to improve compliance with evaluation timelines.

Indicator 12: Rhode Island had an increase of the percentage of students transitioning from Part C to Part B who did not have an IEP in place by their 3rd birthday. 29 of the 30 students identified came from one LEA, that has historically been the target of intensive TA on Indicator 12. This LEA, and all LEAs, continue to inform the state of the large impact of COVID and staffing shortages on their ability to meet compliance on this indicator.

Indicator 13: For FFY 2022 APR, Rhode Island has a 99.98% compliance rate, 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 2022 APR, RI improved in Measure A and B and no Measure reported slippage. 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 NTACT and the National Postschool Outcomes Center. Currently RI's survey response rate is higher than the most recent national median response rate.

Indicator 15: Rhode Island saw a return to pre-pandemic numbers for much of its dispute resolution system in FFY22, including a return to meeting its targets for both dispute resolution indicators.

Indicator 16: Rhode Island saw a return to pre-pandemic numbers for much of its dispute resolution system in FFY22, including a return to meeting its targets for both dispute resolution indicators.

Indicator 17: 55% of 8th grade students with disabilities with growth data on the 2022-23 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 the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

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 these primary operations: Performance and compliance monitoring through the LEA Consolidated Resource Plan Application, and a collaborative and cyclical system of IDEA monitoring which is called the School Support System (SSS).

Rhode Island's Collaborative and Cyclical 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 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 addresses 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, evidence-based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

The RI Department of Education, IDEA office 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. 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 (via the Consolidated Resource Plan) and ensuring the appropriate use of the funds including coordinated early intervening services.

There are strong partnerships with parent and advocacy organizations as well as 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 as well as provide organizational support and communication for: RI State Special

Education Advisory Committee (state advisory panel for Part B) and the 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 and as a result we have redesigned 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 IDC and DCASD which help RIDE support districts to address 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 technical assistance 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:

<https://ride.ri.gov/teachers-administrators/professional-learning>. 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, multilingual learner and special education

educators. RI continues to certify an adequate number of teachers of the visually impaired and has met all current personnel demands for the blind and low vision populations.

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 and scaffolding of the standards. Continued work with the National Center on Intensive Intervention (NCII) and NCSI

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:

<https://ride.ri.gov/teachers-administrators/educator-certification>.

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://ride.ri.gov/instruction-assessment/early-childhood-education/early-childhood-special-education/measuring-child-outcomes>

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/ParticipationinGeneralEarlyChildhoodProgram>

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

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

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

Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) also compiled and analyzed data for the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) utilizing the expertise of relevant 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 occurs no later than 120 days after the submission of the SPP/APR. 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 engagement 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 was reviewed with the stakeholders in early 2022 with continued community engagement to socialize the Blueprint into 2022 and onward.

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

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

Soliciting Public Input:

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

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

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 2021 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 2021 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 revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

Each year RIDE publicly reports per 34 CFR 300.602(b)(1)(i)(A). Per OSEP, this occurs 120 days after the submission of the SPP/APR. 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 slide deck 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>. Rhode Island's online learning management system includes project math courses across the Tiers

of MTSS <https://mtssri.org/course/index.php?categoryid=2>

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

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 ED*Facts* 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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.

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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	65.90%	66.90%	67.90%	79.64%	80.14%
Data	62.98%	62.38%	64.41%	84.97%	86.83%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	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 was 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 relevant 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 occurs no later than 120 days after the submission of the SPp/APR. 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 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 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,090
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	11
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	60
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	100

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1,090	1,261	86.83%	80.64%	86.44%	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)

Rhode Island continues to significantly exceed the Indicator 1 target with the new exiting-group calculation, and looks to continue improving graduation rates for students with disabilities.

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 ED*Facts* 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 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 section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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.

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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	18.70%	17.70%	16.70%	15.70%	14.70%
Data	8.19%	6.48%	6.01%	4.53%	4.19%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	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 was 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 relevant 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 occurs no later than 120 days after the submission of the SPp/APR. 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 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 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	1,090
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	11

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	60
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	100

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
100	1,261	4.19%	13.70%	7.93%	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)

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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	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 was 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 relevant 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 occurs no later than 120 days after the submission of the SPp/APR. 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 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	1,696	1,812	1,428
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	629	732	420
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	903	816	690
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	124	162	131

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	1,696	1,812	1,428
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	347	644	415
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	1,195	904	681
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	124	162	131

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) 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.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,656	1,696	97.67%	100.00%	97.64%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,710	1,812	94.32%	100.00%	94.37%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,241	1,428	84.35%	100.00%	86.90%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,666	1,696	96.82%	100.00%	98.23%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,710	1,812	93.14%	100.00%	94.37%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1,227	1,428	83.71%	100.00%	85.92%	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.

<https://ride.ri.gov/instruction-assessment/assessment/assessment-results>

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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	13.00%	14.00%	15.00%	16.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	13.00%	14.00%	15.00%	16.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	12.00%	13.00%	14.00%	15.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	32.00%	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	15.00%	16.00%	17.00%	18.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	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 was 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 relevant 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 occurs no later than 120 days after the submission of the SPp/APR. 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 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

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	1,532	1,548	1,110
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	44	33	53
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	32	36	83

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

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	1,542	1,548	1,096

b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	61	38	12
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	53	10	20

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	76	1,532	4.23%	13.00%	4.96%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	69	1,548	2.15%	13.00%	4.46%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	136	1,110	8.62%	12.00%	12.25%	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	114	1,542	7.17%	32.00%	7.39%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	48	1,548	2.25%	15.00%	3.10%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	32	1,096	2.30%	8.00%	2.92%	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, both with and without 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, click "Special Education" to view the performance of students with disabilities, and "Accommodations" to view the performance of students who took the test with 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 ED*Facts* 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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	19.00%	19.25%	19.50%	19.75%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	20.50%	20.75%	21.00%	21.25%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	29.20%	29.45%	29.70%	29.95%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	35.70%	35.95%	36.20%	36.45%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	12.15%	12.40%	12.65%	12.90%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	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 was 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 relevant 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 occurs no later than 120 days after the submission of the SPp/APR. 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 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

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	124	162	131
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	17	34	33

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

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	124	162	131
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	44	14	24

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	17	124	15.53%	19.00%	13.71%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	34	162	23.87%	20.50%	20.99%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	33	131	23.39%	29.20%	25.19%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

RIDE contributes the slippage for Group A (Grade 4) to the continued impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Although classrooms were back to pre-pandemic functions, the effects from the March 2020- March 2022 mask mandates, social distancing, and frequent absenteeism due to illness took a toll on all populations of students but especially students with significant learning needs. In addition, teacher and substitute shortages see many classrooms with inconsistent instruction. Students who take the alternate assessment require more consistent instruction thus, getting back to pre-pandemic status will take a longer time.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	44	124	30.39%	35.70%	35.48%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	14	162	14.19%	12.15%	8.64%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	24	131	22.58%	22.00%	18.32%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

RIDE contributes the slippage for Group B (Grade 8) to the continued impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Although classrooms were back to pre-pandemic functions, the effects from the March 2020- March 2022 mask mandates, social distancing, and frequent absenteeism due to illness took a toll on all populations of students but especially students with significant learning needs. In addition, teacher and substitute shortages see many classrooms with inconsistent instruction. Students who take the alternate assessment require more consistent instruction thus, getting back to pre-pandemic status will take a longer time. This population of students will regress in skills after missing just a week of consistent instruction, this group of grade 8 students missed a year and a half.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

RIDE contributes the slippage for Group C (HS) to be the continued impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Although classrooms were back to pre-pandemic functions, the effects from the March 2020 - March 2022 mask mandates, social distancing, and frequent absenteeism due to illness took a toll on all populations of students but especially students with significant learning needs. In addition, teacher and substitute shortages see many classrooms with inconsistent instruction. Students who take the alternate assessment require more consistent instruction this, getting back to pre-

pandemic status will take a longer time. This population of students will regress in skills after missing just a week of consistent instruction, this group of High School students missed a year and a half.

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 alternate assessment here <https://www3.ride.ri.gov/ADP>. Under subject choose DLM English Language Arts/Literacy or DLM Mathematics.

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 ED*Facts* 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 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 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 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 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	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	48.70	48.45	48.20	47.95
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	38.75	38.50	38.25	38.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	83.05	82.80	82.55	82.30
Math	A <=	Grade 4	22.55	22.30	22.05	21.80
Math	B <=	Grade 8	17.15	16.90	16.65	16.40
Math	C <=	Grade HS	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 was 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 relevant 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 occurs no later than 120 days after the submission of the SPP/APR. 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 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	9,727	9,956	9,384
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,532	1,548	1,110
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,161	3,150	4,257
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	77	57	350
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	44	33	53
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	32	36	83

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	9,844	10,070	9,430
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,542	1,548	1,096
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	3,319	2,284	2,230
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	227	30	155
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	61	38	12
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	53	10	20

(1)The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	4.96%	33.29%	24.82	48.70	28.33	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	4.46%	32.21%	26.86	38.75	27.75	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	12.25%	49.09%	38.49	83.05	36.84	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	7.39%	36.02%	23.03	22.55	28.63	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	3.10%	22.98%	18.51	17.15	19.88	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	2.92%	25.29%	23.00	32.95	22.37	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

RIDE contributes the slippage for Group A (Grade 4) to the continued effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. Although classrooms were back to pre-pandemic functions the effects from the March 2020 - March 2022 mask mandates, social distancing, and frequent absenteeism due to illness took a toll on the learning of all populations of students but especially students with learning disabilities. This population of students require more consistency and time to acquire and retain skills and also require more time to regain skills lost during the disrupted school years. In addition, many districts are still adapting to new curriculum that they adopted in the 2021-2022 school year.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

RIDE contributes the slippage for Group B (Grade 8) to the continued effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. Although classrooms were back to pre-pandemic functions the effects from the March 2020 - March 2022 mask mandates, social distancing, and frequent absenteeism due to illness took a toll on the learning of all populations of students but especially students with learning disabilities. This population of students require more consistency and time to acquire and retain skills and also require more time to regain skills lost during the disrupted school years. In addition, many districts are still adapting to new curriculum that they adopted in the 2021-2022 school year.

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 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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 rates of suspensions and expulsions for 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 section 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 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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
2022	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%		0.00%		

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	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 was 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 relevant 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 occurs no later than 120 days after the submission of the SPp/APR. 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 2022 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.

59

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	6		0.00%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

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

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

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Comparison of the risk of a district's students with IEPs to be suspended out of school for more than 10 days to the risk of the district's students without disabilities to be suspended out of school for more than 10 days to obtain a risk ratio. At the encouragement of USED/OSEP, Rhode Island has changed its Indicator 4 methodology to examine more LEAs and lower the threshold in order to capture potential issues with discipline and disciplinary policies, practices, and procedures. As of FFY2022, Rhode Island has lowered its minimum n size and has changed its risk ratio threshold.

Rhode Island previously used an n size of 10 or more students with disabilities suspended more than 10 days out of school cumulative as it's threshold to trigger use of risk ratio. As of FFY22, this n size has been reduced from 10 to 5 students. Rhode Island's previous risk ratio threshold to trigger automatic review of policies, practices, and procedures was 2.5 times the rate of students with disabilities to the rate of nondisabled children in the same LEA, and maintaining that ratio for 2 consecutive years. For this year, Rhode Island has reduced that requirement to 1 year, from the previous 2-year requirement. Rhode Island additionally wishes to note that every LEA has their risk ratio calculated regardless of meeting n size requirements, and will be notified of their status for Indicators 4A and 4B if they have a risk ratio over the 2.5 times threshold, even if excluded from Indicator 4 calculations due to low n size.

With the new thresholds, Rhode Island believes its system for monitoring this indicator is now in line with OSEP's guidance and is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies occur. Rhode Island also notes that expulsion is not allowed by law in the state, and as such there are 0 students expelled each year, which the state suspects lowers the incidence of students that are counted for this indicator. Rhode Island also wishes to note that 42 of its LEAs (64.6% of the 65 LEAs in the state) had 0 students with disabilities suspended for greater than 10 days out of school and/or expelled, and as such cannot have a significant discrepancy by default.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to a change in methodology, Rhode Island has reset the baseline for Indicator 4a to the FFY 2022 data of 0% of LEAs having a significant discrepancy in the suspensions and expulsions of students with IEPs, and having 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. Rhode Island notes that the baseline is now 0%, and as such will lead to a failure to meet target on Indicator 4a should even 1 LEA have a significant discrepancy in suspensions/expulsions of students with disabilities as the result of improper policies, practices, and/or procedures. Rhode Island wishes to continue holding itself to this high standard.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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 were identified for review of policies, practices, and procedures through data pertaining to indicator 4. However, disciplinary policies, practices, and procedures are regularly reviewed as part of Rhode Island's comprehensive monitoring system.

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

The State DID 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 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

As of FFY2022, Rhode Island has lowered its minimum n/cell size to 5, and has changed its risk ratio threshold to be 2.5 times in any given year, as opposed to the previous n/cell of 10 and risk ratio threshold of 2.5 for 2 consecutive years. Implementation of the new n/cell size and threshold should result in an increase of districts reviewed for significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension. This improves the states ability to identify and respond disparities within district discipline policy, procedures and practices. With the new thresholds, Rhode Island believes its system for monitoring this indicator is now in line with OSEP's guidance and is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies in out of school suspensions of greater than 10 days are occurring.

4A - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2022, and OSEP accepts that revision.

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State was required to 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. OSEP appreciates the State reported it consulted with stakeholders to determine if its methodology is reasonably designed. However, OSEP notes that the State's revised methodology included 9.2 percent of 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, "As expulsion is not allowed by state law, it does not factor into Rhode Island's methodology." Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State's revised methodology is reasonably designed to determine significant discrepancies in the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with disabilities.

The State reported, "As of FFY2022, Rhode Island has lowered its minimum n/cell size to 5..." however, OSEP notes the State did not provide a description of what its n and/or cell size represents. OSEP encourages the State to provide this information.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), 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 the rates of suspensions and expulsions for 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 section 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 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 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 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 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, 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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 QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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
2022	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%				

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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.

59

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0		0%		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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

For B4b, Rhode Island uses the comparison of the risk of a district's students with IEPs to be suspended out of school for more than 10 days to the risk of the district's students without disabilities to be suspended out of school for more than 10 days to obtain a risk ratio. At the encouragement of USED/OSEP, Rhode Island has changed its Indicator 4 methodology to examine more LEAs and lower the threshold in order to capture potential issues with discipline and disciplinary policies, practices, and procedures. As of FFY2022, Rhode Island has lowered its minimum n size and has changed its risk ratio threshold.

Rhode Island previously used an n size of 10 or more students with disabilities suspended more than 10 days out of school cumulative as it's threshold to trigger use of risk ratio counting. As of FFY22, this n size has been reduced from 10 to 5 students. Rhode Island's previous risk ratio threshold to trigger automatic review of policies, practices, and procedures was 2.5 times the rate of students with disabilities to the rate of nondisabled children in the same LEA, and maintaining that ratio for 2 consecutive years. For this year, Rhode Island has reduced that requirement to 1 year from the previous 2-year requirement. Rhode Island additionally wishes to note that every LEA has their risk ratio calculated regardless of meeting n size requirements, and will be notified of their status in for Indicators 4A/B if they have a high risk ratio, even if excluded from Indicator 4 calculations due to low n size.

For Indicator 4b, each calculation occurs as in 4a, but by race/ethnicity. Rhode Island is aware that, with it's 4a minimum n size of 5 for all students with disabilities in a district, 6 LEAs met the minimum. When looking at race/ethnicity, no single group in any LEA met the n size requirement of 5. Rhode Island wishes to note that 42 of its LEAs (64.6% of the 65 LEAs in the state) had 0 students with disabilities suspended for greater than 10 days out of school and/or expelled, and as such cannot have a significant discrepancy by default.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Rhode Island has made changes to its system to capture more LEAs in its analysis of discipline. Rhode Island continues to have a very low rate of out of school suspensions, and has no expulsions as they are not permissible under state law.

Due to the change in the methodology used to calculate Indicator 4b, Rhode Island has reset the baseline year and percentage for this Indicator to be the FFY 2022 data. Rhode Island notes that this is the same baseline percentage (zero percent of LEAs) as previous.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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 were identified for review of policies, practices, and procedures through data pertaining to indicator 4. However, disciplinary policies, practices, and procedures are regularly reviewed as part of Rhode Island's comprehensive monitoring system.

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

The State DID 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 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

As of FFY2022, Rhode Island has lowered its minimum n/cell size to 5, and has changed its risk ratio threshold to be 2.5 times in any given year, as opposed to the previous n/cell of 10 and risk ratio threshold of 2.5 for 2 consecutive years. Implementation of the new n/cell size and threshold should result in an increase of districts reviewed for significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension. This improves the states ability to identify and respond disparities within district discipline policy, procedures and practices. With the new thresholds, Rhode Island believes its system for monitoring this indicator is now in line with OSEP's guidance and is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies in out of school suspensions of greater than 10 days are occurring.

4B - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported its definition of significant discrepancy and methodology for determining significant discrepancies as "At the encouragement of USEd, Rhode Island has changed its Indicator 4 methodology to examine more LEAs and lower the threshold in order to capture potential issues with discipline and disciplinary policies, practices, and procedures. As of FFY2022, Rhode Island has lowered its minimum n/cell size to 5, and has changed its risk ratio threshold to be 2.5 times in any given year, as opposed to the previous n/cell of 10 and risk ratio threshold of 2.5 for 2 consecutive years. With the new thresholds, Rhode Island believes its system for monitoring this indicator is now in line with OSEP's guidance and is reasonably designed to determine if significant discrepancies in out of school suspensions of greater than 10 days are occurring.". It is unclear whether the State's methodology considers significant discrepancy by race and ethnicity, as required by the Measurement Table. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

4B- Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

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

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED Facts 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2019	Target >=	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	76.50%	77.00%
A	71.00%	Data	70.11%	70.22%	71.03%	71.65%	71.89%
B	2019	Target <=	12.50%	12.00%	11.50%	11.00%	10.50%
B	11.00%	Data	12.72%	12.57%	11.44%	10.87%	10.54%
C	2019	Target <=	5.00%	4.00%	3.50%	3.50%	3.00%
C	5.60%	Data	4.86%	4.62%	5.66%	5.58%	5.13%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	77.50%	78.00%	78.50%	79.00%
Target B <=	10.00%	9.50%	9.00%	8.50%
Target C <=	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 was 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 relevant 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 occurs no later than 120 days after the submission of the SPp/APR. 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 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	22,209
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	16,004
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,231
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	1,054
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	80
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	14

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 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	16,004	22,209	71.89%	77.50%	72.06%	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	2,231	22,209	10.54%	10.00%	10.05%	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]	1,148	22,209	5.13%	2.50%	5.17%	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 ED Facts 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 (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	49.00%	50.00%	50.50%	52.69%	52.69%
A	Data	49.02%	49.03%	54.60%	52.69%	51.29%
B	Target <=	16.00%	15.00%	12.00%	12.72%	12.72%
B	Data	13.73%	12.58%	10.81%	12.72%	12.88%
C	Target <=				0.53%	0.53%
C	Data				0.53%	0.70%

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 was 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 relevant 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 occurs no later than 120 days after the submission of the SPp/APR. 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.

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

Inclusive Targets – 6C

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

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	879	1,130	432	2,441
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	400	584	253	1,237
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	148	167	34	349
b2. Number of children attending separate school	0	10	7	17
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	2	0	2
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	5	3	1	9

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 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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	1,237	2,441	51.29%	52.69%	50.68%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	368	2,441	12.88%	12.72%	15.08%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Home	9	2,441	0.70%	0.53%	0.37%	Met target	No Slippage

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

Rhode Island has identified 2 primary reasons for slippage in category 6B. Firstly, districts have seen an increase in the complexity of needs of students entering the educational system in Pre-K, and have determined that the level of intensive supports and services are only able to be met in separate classes. The other main reason is that many pre-school classrooms have students with IEPs placed with non-disabled peers, but in ratios that do not reach the threshold to be considered inclusive classrooms. Many of these classrooms are just below the 51% threshold that would make them inclusive classrooms.

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 3 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2020	Target >=	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%	70.00%	70.00%
A1	70.00%	Data	79.28%	71.08%	67.69%	70.01%	70.90%

A2	2020	Target >=	49.50%	50.00%	50.50%	45.30%	45.30%
A2	45.30%	Data	52.08%	48.41%	47.78%	45.32%	47.39%
B1	2020	Target >=	69.00%	69.50%	70.00%	67.40%	67.40%
B1	67.40%	Data	79.45%	72.53%	66.94%	67.42%	73.15%
B2	2020	Target >=	39.00%	39.50%	40.00%	28.90%	28.90%
B2	28.90%	Data	44.40%	38.13%	34.65%	28.88%	36.14%
C1	2020	Target >=	86.50%	87.00%	87.50%	69.10%	69.10%
C1	69.10%	Data	80.88%	74.71%	69.13%	69.14%	71.32%
C2	2020	Target >=	56.00%	56.50%	57.00%	51.00%	51.00%
C2	51.00%	Data	60.03%	59.60%	58.11%	50.98%	54.42%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	70.00%	70.50%	71.00%	71.50%
Target A2 >=	45.30%	46.00%	46.50%	47.00%
Target B1 >=	67.40%	67.50%	68.00%	68.50%
Target B2 >=	28.90%	29.50%	30.00%	30.50%
Target C1 >=	69.10%	69.50%	70.00%	70.50%
Target C2 >=	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 was 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 relevant 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 occurs no later than 120 days after the submission of the SPP/APR. 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 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

1,162

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	4	0.34%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	353	30.38%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	312	26.85%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	295	25.39%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	198	17.04%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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. Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	607	964	70.90%	70.00%	62.97%	Did not meet target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	493	1,162	47.39%	45.30%	42.43%	Did not meet target	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	2	0.17%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	354	30.46%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	428	36.83%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	342	29.43%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	36	3.10%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age	770	1,126	73.15%	67.40%	68.38%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
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:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$							
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:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	378	1,162	36.14%	28.90%	32.53%	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	1	0.09%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	310	26.68%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	244	21.00%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	377	32.44%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	230	19.79%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	621	932	71.32%	69.10%	66.63%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	607	1,162	54.42%	51.00%	52.24%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	Post-pandemic, many younger students, especially those in the pre-school age range, have experienced significant increases in their needs and the deficits they are entering school with. A particular area of struggle is social-emotional skills, which Indicator 7A assesses. Rhode Island expects continued variance with Indicator 7 until such time that COVID has no longer impacted early childhood development.
A2	Post-pandemic, many younger students, especially those in the pre-school age range, have experienced significant increases in their needs and the deficits they are entering school with. A particular area of struggle is social-emotional skills, which Indicator 7A assesses. Rhode Island expects continued variance with Indicator 7 until such time that COVID has no longer impacted early childhood development.
C1	Post-pandemic, many younger students, especially those in the pre-school age range, have experienced significant increases in their needs and the deficits they are entering school with. Behavioral issues have been among the heavily reported issues for students entering

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	school. Rhode Island expects continued variance with Indicator 7 until such time that COVID has no longer impacted early childhood development.

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 (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://ride.ri.gov/instruction-assessment/early-childhood-education/early-childhood-special-education/measuring-child-outcomes>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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 3 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 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States 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 was 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 relevant 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 occurs no later than 120 days after the submission of the SPp/APR. 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	47.00%	50.00%	51.00%	50.25%	50.50%
Data	70.44%	32.09%	32.12%	41.81%	75.83%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
5,176	6,680	75.83%	50.75%	77.49%	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.

24,650

Percentage of respondent parents

27.10%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	26.45%	27.10%

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 various demographic categories and set a threshold of plus or minus 3% to determine representativeness, the same method as used in examining the responders of the Indicator 14 post-secondary outcomes survey.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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 grade level from Pre-Kindergarten to 12th grade from 62 school districts across the state of Rhode Island.

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 2023 (6,680 responses); this year's numbers are up 5% from the 2022 response count of 6,334.

Each survey included instructions for completing the survey in English, Spanish, and Portuguese. The percentage of surveys completed in English was approximately 80%, the percentage of surveys completed in Spanish was approximately 20%, and the percentage completed in Portuguese was less than 1%.

In addition to the general response group characteristics detailed above, survey data was disaggregated by the following variables that respondents identified on their surveys: student and parent race/ethnicity, and student 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 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 of students for whom parents responded are as follows:

American Indian or Alaska Native = 1%

Asian = 3%

Black or African American = 8%

Hispanic or Latino = 35%

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander = Less than 1%

Two or more races or ethnicities = 10%

White = 32%

No response or blank = 8%

Respondents indicated that for their child's gender:

37% are Female

56% are Male

Less than 1% selected "My child uses another word to describe their gender"

4% chose "I prefer not to answer this question" or did not provide a response

The percentage of surveys returned by racial/ethnic breakdown of parents whom responded are as follows:

American Indian or Alaska Native = 1%

Asian = 3%

Black or African American = 8%

Hispanic or Latino = 37%

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander = Less than 1%

Two or more races or ethnicities = 5%

White = 36%

No response or blank = 11%

Respondents indicated that for their own gender:

78% are Female

15% are Male

Less than 1% selected "I use another word to describe my gender"

7% chose "I prefer not to answer this question" or did not provide a response

As with the FFY21 survey, Rhode Island sees a representative race/ethnicity responder group for the parent engagement survey, that represents the population of students receiving special education services as well as the greater population of the statewide student body and state population, in both the students for whom parents responded group and the parent respondent group.

The gender category continues to be skewed heavily among the responding parent group, and skewed slightly among the group of students for whom parents responded. Rhode Island's population of students with IEPs is approximately 2:1 male to female (less than .5% of students use "Other" to describe their gender), but the parents responding to the survey are approximately 5:1 female to male, largely unrepresentative of the student population; for students for whom parents responded, the ratio was approximately 3:2 male to female, closer to the actual demographics of students with disabilities and also has a larger percentage of male students than female students, the opposite of parents response demographics, but the same as the student population.

The demographics of the children for whom parents are 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 has considered several strategies to increase the representativeness of gender in parent responders. Primarily among them, the current survey only captures the demographics of one respondent, and does not take into consideration the demographics of 2 parent households. Rhode Island is working with it's survey vendor to gauge viability of collecting the demographics of multiple parents per survey, when applicable. Additionally, Rhode Island has found that demographics of the students represented by the respondent parents are representative, or near representative, based on the same 2 categories and plus or minus 3% comparison.

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

Rhode Island continues to make it's parent engagement survey more accessible to all parents across the state. Strategies include increased messaging about the survey, making both online and paper copies available, and continuing to translate the survey into more languages each year.

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.

Rhode Island acknowledges that nonresponse bias is likely with only a quarter of parents of students with disabilities responding, and has taken steps to minimize this bias. Chiefly, the survey has continued to be made more accessible, including more translations every year, easier digital access, paper copies upon request, and increased notifications and communication around the purpose and benefits of the survey to parents, parent groups, and administrators across the state. Rhode Island notes that another potential area of nonresponse is among parents who find themselves dissatisfied with their LEA and/or SEA, and as such would not respond and potentially inflate the percentage of parents who have reported that their school facilitates parent engagement. Rhode Island seeks to eliminate this potential nonresponse bias by means of increasing survey response to leave fewer and fewer voices unheard. As of now there is no one group of parents of students that is proportionally underrepresented by demographic breakdown, and Rhode Island continues to examine other potential group differences that may be underrepresented or overrepresented among parent respondents to the survey.

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)

8 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

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 grade level from Pre-Kindergarten to 12th grade from 62 school districts across the state of Rhode Island.

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 2023 (6,680 responses); this year's numbers are up 5% from the 2022 response count of 6,334.

Each survey included instructions for completing the survey in English, Spanish, and Portuguese. The percentage of surveys completed in English was approximately 80%, the percentage of surveys completed in Spanish was approximately 20%, and the percentage completed in Portuguese was less than 1%.

In addition to the general response group characteristics detailed above, survey data was disaggregated by the following variables that respondents identified on their surveys: parent race/ethnicity 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 = 8%

Hispanic or Latino = 37%

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander = Less than 1%

Two or more races or ethnicities = 5%

White = 36%

No response or blank = 11%

Respondents indicated that for their own gender:

78% are Female

15% are Male

Less than 1% selected "I use another word to describe my gender"

7% chose "I prefer not to answer this question" or did not provide a response

As with the FFY21 survey, Rhode Island sees a representative race/ethnicity responder group for the parent engagement survey, that represents the

population of students receiving special education services as well as the greater population of the statewide student body and state population. However, the gender category continues to be skewed heavily among the responding parent group. Rhode Island's population of students with IEPs is approximately 2:1 male to female (less than .5% of students use "Other" to describe their gender), but the parents responding to the survey are approximately 5:1 female to male, largely unrepresentative of the student population.

Rhode Island has considered several strategies to increase the representativeness of gender in parent responders. Primarily among them, the current survey only captures the demographics of one respondent, and does not take into consideration the demographics of 2 parent households. Rhode Island is working with its survey vendor to gauge viability of collecting the demographics of multiple parents per survey, when applicable. Additionally, Rhode Island has found that demographics of the students represented by the respondent parents are representative, or near representative, based on the same 2 categories and plus or minus 3% comparison.

Rhode Island continues to make its parent engagement survey more accessible to all parents across the state. Strategies include increased messaging about the survey, making both online and paper copies available, and continuing to translate the survey into more languages each year.

8 - OSEP Response

In its description of its FFY 2022 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State. Specifically, the State reported, "survey data was disaggregated by the following variables that respondents identified on their surveys: parent race/ethnicity and parent/guardian gender." Additionally, the State reported, "Rhode Island has recognized that it sees a lack of response from fathers/male parents based on parents responder demographics, and seeks to increase the response rate for this group of parents." The State must include the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the children receiving special education services, as required by the Measurement Table.

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

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for 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. 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	1.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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 (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 FFY2022 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 2022 and 2023 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 FFY2022

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, MTSS coordinators and interventionist, 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 FFY2022 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 2022 and 2023 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 FFY2022

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, MTSS coordinators and interventionist, 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 section 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). 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
8	1	63	0.00%	0%	1.59%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

For the one district with over representation of Native American students with SLD, root cause analysis and review of policies, procedures, and practices show under representation in two other racial groups that make up 50% of the total enrollment contributes to over representation of the racial group in question in the category of SLD. Inconsistency of MTSS implementation in middle and high school contributed to disproportionality. In addition, document reviews yielded evidence of incorrect SLD criteria entered into the district's automated system for special education records and data. MTSS and SLD evaluation procedures and practices were contributing to inappropriate identification.

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

Disproportionate Representation is defined as a risk ratio of 2.5 or higher for three consecutive years with a minimum n size of 5 students (step one) plus evidence of policies, procedures, and/or practices which result in inappropriate identification (step two). Evidence was collected from multiple sources: record reviews, onsite visits, district submissions in the consolidated resource plan including the disproportionality report online, and records of complaints, mediations, and hearings.

Step One: Using the criteria established above, the State determined that 8 school districts were identified as meeting the data threshold for disproportionate representation. While some districts did not meet the minimum cell size of 5 students of a particular race/ethnicity in special education, most districts met the n size for at least one race/ethnicity group in special education. Only 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 8 districts identified in step 1 of the FFY2022 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 2022 and 2023 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 FFY2022

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 1 district was noncompliant with the eligibility and evaluation requirements for SLD. Accordingly, the State determined that 1 of the 8 districts had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification. File reviews did not yield child specific findings of noncompliance.

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

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

The State reviewed the child find, evaluation (including re-evaluation), and eligibility policies, procedures, and practices of the 8 districts identified in step 1 of the FFY2022 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 2022 and 2023 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 FFY2022

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 phone calls and 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 1 district was noncompliant with the eligibility and evaluation requirements for SLD. Accordingly, the State determined that 1 of the 8 districts had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification. File reviews did not yield child specific findings of noncompliance.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

In the State's FFY 2021 APR submission, the State reported data for this indicator was 100%. However the State reported one finding in the "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021" data table and reported on the verification of correction of FFY 2021 noncompliance. Additionally, OSEP notes that the State reported, "As a result of its extensive verification process, the State found that 1 district was noncompliant with the eligibility and evaluation requirements for SLD." Therefore, it is unclear if the State is reporting on the verification of correction for the one instance of noncompliance in FFY 2022 or the State identified additional findings in FFY 2021.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.21%	99.35%	99.05%	98.62%	99.35%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
4,086	3,989	99.35%	100%	97.63%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

One LEA accounts for 83 of the 97 noncompliant timelines for the FFY2022 indicator 11 calculation. This LEA is the largest in the state and has said that, with an ongoing shortage of staff and an increase in children being referred to Special Ed, they are unable to keep up with the demand. In particular, they have noted that the largest increase has come in the form of students ages 3-5 referred by child outreach, most of whom are entering school for the first time since the beginning of the COVID pandemic. As such, RIDE has considered the largest reason for slippage to be the increase in students being referred for special education services post-pandemic, and the strain this has put on LEAs, particularly those with staffing issues. Due to this, RIDE's first course of action in improving evaluation timeliness has been working with LEAs to address their staff shortages, and in planning for best practices to evaluate children in a timely manner when staffing is a concern.

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

97

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.

Of the 97 students who were evaluated over the 60 day timeline as provided by regulation, delays ranged from 1 day (61 days total from received consent to completed evaluation) to 108 days (168 days from received consent to completed evaluation).

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 2021

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	8	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

There is no remaining finding of noncompliance from FFY2021, and no non-corrected findings from any prior years or APR reporting periods. One finding was issued to each of the 8 LEAs who were non-compliant for timeliness of initial evaluations, stemming from a quarterly report of less than 100% during the year. All 8 findings that were corrected were corrected within the required timeline of 1 year. 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 QA 23-01.

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 previous June's 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 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

There is no remaining finding of noncompliance from FFY2021, and no non-correction of findings from any prior years or APR reporting periods. One finding was issued to each of the 8 LEAs who were non-compliant for timeliness of initial evaluations, stemming from a quarterly report of less than 100% during the year. All 8 findings that were corrected were corrected within the required timeline of 1 year. 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 QA 23-01.

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 previous June's 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.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

- 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.87%	98.40%	97.30%	93.16%	99.22%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	437
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	59

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	312
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.	9
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	27
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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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.	312	342	99.22%	100%	91.23%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

One LEA accounts for the entirety of Rhode Island's slippage for this indicator. Of the 30 children identified who were determined eligible but did not have an IEP implemented by their 3rd birthday, this LEA accounted for 29 of them. This LEA has been in longstanding non-compliance on indicator 12, dating back to FFY2019. The LEA reports that the reason for their noncompliance, and slippage in this indicator, is the result of COVID, contributing to both staffing shortages and an increase in the number of children referred and found eligible for special education services, two issues that they have said compound into a severe backlog of children to evaluate. Rhode Island has engaged in extensive efforts to assist this LEA with meeting the requirements of implementing IEPs by the third birthday for students referred from Part C to Part B and found eligible for Part B.

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

30

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.

29 of the 30 children with delays came from one district, which has been informing the state regularly that they are struggling with capacity issues and severe personnel shortages, especially in the realm of early childhood special education, but also across the entirety of the educational spectrum. Each of their 29 unexcused delays had personnel shortages as the primary reason for delay. Of the 30 children in the state identified as having a non-timely IEP, the timeline for IEP implementation ranged from 6 days to 60 days after their 3rd birthday.

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)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	1	0	1

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Both LEAs with noncompliance in FFY 2021 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 2022) 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 2022 data, the state verified that one of the two LEAs are now correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and have reached 100% compliance. The other LEA continues to struggle with non-

compliance on evaluation and IEP implementation timelines for students. 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. Additionally, the LEA has entered into a settlement agreement related to a court case stemming from said non-compliance, with extensive plans to rectify its longstanding noncompliance.

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. 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 FFY2021 findings was corrected and that each child, although late, has had an IEP developed and implemented.

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

One LEA continues to struggle with non-compliance on evaluation and IEP implementation timelines for students, and has been in noncompliance perpetually since FFY2019. 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. Additionally, the LEA has entered into a settlement agreement related to a court case stemming from said non-compliance, with extensive plans to rectify its longstanding noncompliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2020	1	0	1
FFY 2019	1	0	1

FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

One LEA continues to struggle with non-compliance on evaluation and IEP implementation timelines for students, and has been in noncompliance perpetually since FFY2019. 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. Additionally, the LEA has entered into a settlement agreement related to a court case stemming from said non-compliance, with extensive plans to rectify its longstanding noncompliance.

FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

One LEA continues to struggle with non-compliance on evaluation and IEP implementation timelines for students, and has been in noncompliance perpetually since FFY2019. 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. Additionally, the LEA has entered into a settlement agreement related to a court case stemming from said non-compliance, with extensive plans to rectify its longstanding noncompliance.

12 - Prior FFY 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Both LEAs with noncompliance in FFY 2021 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 2022) 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 2022 data, the state verified that one of the two LEAs are now correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124 (b) and have reached 100% compliance. The other LEA continues to struggle with non-compliance on evaluation and IEP implementation timelines for students. 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. Additionally, the LEA has entered into a settlement agreement related to a court case stemming from said non-compliance, with extensive plans to

rectify its longstanding noncompliance.

One LEA continues to struggle with non-compliance on evaluation and IEP implementation timelines for students, and has been in noncompliance perpetually since FFY2019. 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. Additionally, the LEA has entered into a settlement agreement related to a court case stemming from said non-compliance, with extensive plans to rectify its longstanding noncompliance.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.90%	99.98%	99.98%	99.87%	99.98%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
5,194	5,195	99.98%	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 2022 (2021-2022 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, 2023. This record has since been brought into compliance by the district as of February 2023. 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 2021-2022 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 2022. 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 2021

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

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

For FFY 2021 (2021-2022 SY), one record/finding in one school districts was non-compliant in one or more transition requirements as of June 30, 2022. This record have been brought into compliance as of February 2023. This record was corrected and verified as compliant by RIDE. The one affected

school districts submitted an updated and corrected, compliant IEP for the initially non-compliant IEP. 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 2022-2023 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 2022.

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

For FFY 2021 (2021-2022 SY), one record/finding in one school districts was non-compliant in one or more transition requirements as of June 30, 2022. This record has been brought into compliance as of February 2023. This record was corrected and verified as compliant by RIDE. The one affected school districts submitted an updated and corrected, compliant IEP for the initially non-compliant IEP. 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 2022-2023 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 2022.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 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.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

For FFY 2021 (2021-2022 SY), one record/finding in one school districts was non-compliant in one or more transition requirements as of June 30, 2022. This record has been brought into compliance as of February 2023. This record was corrected and verified as compliant by RIDE. The one affected school districts submitted an updated and corrected, compliant IEP for the initially non-compliant IEP. 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 2022-2023 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 2022

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 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).

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 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

Include the State’s 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	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2009	Target ≥	41.00%	42.00%	43.00%	33.00%	33.42%
A	33.00%	Data	29.03%	32.05%	32.97%	29.00%	25.98%
B	2018	Target ≥	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	65.38%	65.38%
B	65.38%	Data	69.43%	65.38%	48.32%	45.75%	46.50%
C	2009	Target ≥	86.00%	87.00%	88.00%	78.00%	78.60%
C	78.00%	Data	79.47%	77.19%	78.78%	76.63%	77.22%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	33.84%	34.25%	34.67%	35.08%
Target B ≥	65.88%	66.38%	66.68%	67.38%
Target C ≥	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 was 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 relevant 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 occurs no later than 120 days after the submission of the SPP/APR. 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 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 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,350
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	999
Response Rate	74.00%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	308
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	177
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)	52
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).	230

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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	308	999	25.98%	33.84%	30.83%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	485	999	46.50%	65.88%	48.55%	Did not meet target	No 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)	767	999	77.22%	79.20%	76.78%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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	2021	2022
Response Rate	69.90%	74.00%

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

Rhode Island 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.

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.

The respondents to the survey were representative of Rhode Island's 2021-22 exiter class in every examined category. Each of the 7 federally defined race/ethnicity categories ("RACE7") fell well below the 3% threshold established by the state, with each of the 7 categories being less than 1% different from the leaver group to the respondent group. Similar levels of representativeness were achieved across the other categories used in the NPSO calculator, including disability category, gender, ELL status, and students who exited via dropping out. In fact, no demographic category used to determine representativeness fell outside of a 2% difference.

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 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 2021-22 data is representative of the demographics of youth who 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.

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.

Rhode Island has examined the 26% of students who did not respond and compared them to the 74% who did, and found there were no groups who were more likely to not respond. Rhode Island expects that nonresponse bias remains minimal if at all present with a high response rate and few unanswered questions among those who do respond. Additionally, nonresponse bias on individual questions among respondents is likely low as a result of the survey procedure, wherein a former teacher/case manager/special education personnel that knows the student completes the survey with them over the phone, as opposed to a survey distributed directly to former students. Rhode Island also notes that individual question nonresponse bias among survey respondents would not impact the calculations of categories (measurements 14 "A", "B", and "C") as the categories are determined by affirmative answers to questions, and non-response to questions of engagement is used as a "No"/"Not Engaged" for that particular category/question set.

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.

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 NTACTION; 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

The State did not analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias, as required by the Measurement Table.

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	10
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	9

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 was 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 relevant 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 occurs no later than 120 days after the submission of the SPP/APR. 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 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 and the IDEA Data Center 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).

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.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	42.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	55.00%	56.00%	57.00%	57.25%	57.50%
Data	57.14%	54.55%	42.86%	63.64%	27.27%

Targets

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
9	10	27.27%	57.75%	90.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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 ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	49
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	40

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 was 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 relevant 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 occurs no later than 120 days after the submission of the SPp/APR. 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 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.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	79.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	80.00%	80.25%

Data	85.00%	92.59%	70.59%	61.29%	65.52%
------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	80.50%	80.75%	81.00%	81.25%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1	40	49	65.52%	80.50%	83.67%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Rhode Island has noted that after several years of dispute resolution numbers being skewed heavily as a result of COVID and COVID-related impacts, numbers in both total mediation requests, mediations held, and mediation agreements. FFY2022 numbers align closely with FFY2018 and FFY2019 numbers that were all or partly pre-COVID.

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) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

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

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, 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) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

Phase I: Analysis:

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

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

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

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

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

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, 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., February 1, 2023). 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 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 (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., 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 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) 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://ride.ri.gov/information-accountability/accountability/state-performance-plan>
Scroll down to the accordion at the bottom to see the SSIP theory of action that was revised in a prior submission.

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	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	41.00%	46.00%	51.00%	59.00%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
787	1,424	49.22%	41.00%	55.27%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

RICAS math state assessment student growth percentile data from spring 2023 and spring 2022 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 identifiers and data warehouse tools matching to IEP census and enrollment census to examine specific student groups. Statistical analysis from the Center on Assessment of Baseline referenced Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs) was examined by OSCAS and the Office of Instruction, Assessment, and Curriculum at RIDE. Data of 8th grade students with disabilities, all races, ethnicities, and disability categories, were reported as low (SGP 1-34), typical (SGP 35-69), and high growth (SGP 70-100) for all students with growth data. RIDE then examined the percent of 8th grade students with disabilities that showed typical or high growth in spring 2023 on math RICAS state assessment. Data were shared across RIDE offices, with technical assistance providers, and with RISEAC 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 2023 growth data for students who attended districts that participated in the project coaching revealed the following: while 55% of 8th graders with IEP statewide showed typical or high growth on math RICAS, 63% of 8th graders with IEPs in project districts showed typical or high growth. This approximates typical or high growth shown by 8th graders with or without IEPs statewide (64%). The percentage of 8th graders statewide that reached typical or high growth levels did not increase or improve the way the percentage of 8th graders with disabilities that reached typical or high growth levels did. Where n sizes are large enough, the 8th grade growth data for students with disabilities is also examined by race/ethnicity and by disability category.

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: For this reporting period, the additional data collected is for students with disabilities in grades 1-5 since current 5th graders will be part of the 8th grade SiMR population in FFY2025. Future reports will include screening/benchmarking data for students with disabilities in grades 6-8. Examining trends in screening data at elementary grades helps TA providers understand district needs. Using the screening data collection tool described in previous submissions, we calculated the percentage of students in each instructional tier and the percentage changes between fall 2022, winter 2023, and spring 2023. Data were reported for six participating elementary schools from urban, urban ring and suburban districts. The screening/benchmarking data were collected from grades 1-5 and disaggregated for all students and students with disabilities.

For Grade 1 students with disabilities, there were no changes between fall and winter, with 56% meeting Tier 1 benchmarks, 28% in need of Tier 2, and 16% in need of Tier 3. Percent of students meeting benchmark decreased by 1% in Tier 1, increased by 3% in Tier 2, and decreased by 2% in Tier 3. For Grade 2 students with disabilities, students meeting benchmark increased by 16 percentage points in Tier 1 from 24% to 40% for fall to winter, but there were no changes from winter to spring. There was a downward trend of students in need of Tier 2 with a decrease from 54% to 43% and then a decrease of 2%. Students in need of Tier 3 decreased by 5% from 22% to 17% from fall to winter and then increased by 2% from winter to spring. For Grade 3 students with disabilities meeting benchmarks, there was an increase from 38% to 47% from fall to winter and a 5% decrease from winter to spring in Tier 1. Students in need of Tier 2 decreased from 32% to 30% from fall to winter and increased by 3% from winter to spring. Students in need of Tier 3 had a decrease from 30% to 23% from fall to winter and an increase of 2% from winter to spring. For Grade 4 students with disabilities, there was an upward trend in performance for students meeting benchmark at Tier 1 from fall to winter, with an increase from 26% to 35% and then another 9% increase from winter to spring. There was a downward trend for students who needed Tier 2 or Tier 3 from fall to spring. For Tier 2, there was a decrease from 45% to 44% from fall to winter and a decrease to 37% from winter to spring. For Tier 3, there was a decrease from 29% to 21% in fall to winter and a decrease to 19% from winter to spring. For Grade 5 students with disabilities, percent meeting benchmark in Tier 1 increased from 7% to 37% for fall to winter and decreased by 2% from winter to spring. Students in need of Tier 2 decreases from 38% to 27% for fall to winter and increased to 31% by spring. Students in need of Tier 3 had a downward trend from fall to winter with a decrease from 55% to 36% and then a 2% decrease to 34% from winter to spring.

Overall, there were percentage increases in students meeting Tier 1 benchmarks, and percentage decreases in those needing Tiers 2 and 3 across all grades for students with disabilities from fall to winter. It will be helpful to examine the circumstances, strategies, and/or techniques that are encouraging these changes to inform how to maintain the growth across an academic year.

Interim, formative mathematics assessments in use by LEAs: STAR Math, AIMSweb 2.0, Acadience Math, MBSP, iReady.

Data-Based Individualization (DBI) Case Studies: 15 out of the 16 (94%) new case study students made moderate and ambitious growth toward progress monitoring goals as of June 2023. In relation to the language used in the SiMR, moderate growth equates to typical growth, while ambitious growth equates to high growth.

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://ride.ri.gov/information-accountability/accountability/state-performance-plan>

Scroll down to the accordion at the bottom to see the SSIP evaluation plan that was revised in a prior submission.

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:

The SDI/DBI Workgroup provides stakeholder input and feedback on Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) in mathematics for the state to develop the DBI/SDI framework for accessible evidence-based math instruction. This workgroup comprises special education teachers and leaders, and general

education math instructors, such as instructional coaches and curriculum leads. Their meetings began in the spring of 2023 with a review of the federal definition of SDI and resources from the PROGRESS Center to identify common pitfalls and questions of SDI. They prioritized topic areas for the proposed SDI guidelines, such as how to document SDI and the characteristics of SDI in real time. The workgroup is now drafting a document with definitions, outlining the legal requirements, and sharing best practices of SDI. The guidelines include student examples to help address misconceptions of SDI and how to document within a student's IEP.

The virtual, statewide targeted Communities of Practice are tailored to schools' training plans and participants' roles, including 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 five-part virtual Community of Practice (CoP) series for the 22-23 school year was structured to help educators and district leaders identify and share best practices for implementing evidence-based intensive interventions in mathematics. The primary topics of the CoP were evidence-based practices: essential components of math instruction, instructional self-assessment, and fidelity of implementation, using data to support the data-based individualization (DBI) framework in a math intervention, and intensive intervention implementation. The CoP meetings were held once a month with accompanying office hours for additional assistance.

The Rhode Island Tiered Intervention in Math Education (RI TIME) project provides evidence-based math instruction and DBI training and resources through an online learning management system, BRIDGE-RI (<https://mtssri.org/>). The BRIDGE-RI Courses offer learning opportunities designed to foster active learner engagement, promote the implementation of newly learned skills, provide learner choice, and build the 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 five self-paced BRIDGE-RI Mathematics Courses: Core Instruction in the Mathematics Classroom (Part I): Foundations and (Part II): Advanced - Facilitating Deep Mathematical Understanding, Supporting All Learners in Math: Universal Design, Differentiation, and Scaffolding, Supporting Language Development in Mathematics, and Using Number Talks to Support Students in Mathematics. Four self-paced BRIDGE-RI Tier 3 Courses were developed in collaboration with WestBay: Tier 3 Overview, Tier 3 Systems Teaming for Intensive Intervention, Tier 3 Data Progress Monitoring and Data-Based Individualization, and Tier 3 Practices - Validated Intervention and the Map. The SSIP Math Project supported the creation of family and community engagement resources and highlighted math-specific examples of the DBI process.

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 SDI/DBI Workgroup and the virtual communities of practice aim to achieve the short-term outcomes of increasing educator knowledge of evidence-based math instruction at varying levels within MTSS and in meeting individual student needs through SDI, as well as increasing educator knowledge of collaboration and teaming practices to ensure access to core-math instruction and to individualization based on data-use. In drafting the SDI guidelines, the workgroup focused on addressing misconceptions of SDI to ensure RI educators have better knowledge and understanding of SDI. The workgroup also wanted to include student examples in the manual to help special and general educators understand how to plan and implement SDI, which will aid in educators' knowledge of collaboration and teaming practices. Through the virtual CoP series, educators acquired knowledge of the essential components of math instruction, instructional self-assessment, and fidelity of implementation. One of the sessions focused on the taxonomy of intervention intensity, which informed educators about the varying levels of intensity of math instruction. The SDI/DBI workgroup and virtual CoPs also aim to achieve the intermediate outcome of increasing educator application of skills related to evidence-based math instruction. The SDI manual created by the workgroup will help educators apply their knowledge of SDI into their math instruction. One of the sessions of the virtual CoP series included a refresher on using the DBI framework in a math intervention. Educators then conducted a sample case study where they integrated the five steps of the DBI framework and applied these skills by conducting case studies with their students who receive intervention.

BRIDGE-RI provides PD online, which allows educators to complete it when it is convenient and to go back into the modules, thus providing "just in time" support. During this reporting period, 91 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," 43% of participants selected "Quite a lot," whereas 52% chose "Somewhat." It appears that the BRIDGE-RI math courses are achieving the short-term outcome of increasing educator knowledge of evidence-based math instruction at varying levels of intensity from Tier 1 to DBI. When asked, "How much of what you learned will you apply to your practice," 36% of participants stated they learned several new things and will be applying at least one of the pieces of information learned from the course immediately, whereas 54% 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 educator application of skills related to evidence-based math instruction.

The RI TIME project works collaboratively with stakeholders within RIDE, special education directors, teachers, and the BRIDGE-RI team. The RI TIME 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. Building capacity throughout a school or district through coaching and professional development (PD) leads to greater continued efforts and supports sustainability and scale-up. RIDE Staff from the Office for Student Community and Academic Supports provide regular updates on an intervention tracker as well as summaries and question/answer sessions at Statewide Math Team meetings. The math team includes staff from the Office of Instruction, Assessment, Curriculum as well as the Office of College and Career Readiness plus the Division Chief and a Deputy Commissioner and helps ensure RIDE cross office communication. Work across math initiatives is better aligned through these efforts, and alignment promotes sustainability and scale up. An upcoming math summit will train large numbers of school principals and special educators on various math initiatives including the work of the SSIP. Additional alignment to the Statewide MTSS Team at RIDE, which released a District MTSS Practice Profile, will further sustainability and scale up efforts. The RI Special Education Advisory engages in periodic updates on SSIP progress with opportunities for input at those sessions. Within each school or 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 received to further support scaling and sustainability. The purpose was to create a system driven by high expectations and standards, PD, and coaching that led to the achievement of the SiMR by increasing the capacity to support K-8 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.

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

NO

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

The RI TIME project anticipates finalizing the SDI guidelines that will be used in the field by RIDE and districts/LEAs. The SDI guidelines will be presented in a kickoff meeting with our school partnerships during the 2024-25 academic year. We will then begin using the guidelines in our coaching and professional development opportunities. As educators learn more about SDI, we will collect data on the short-term outcome of increasing educator knowledge of meeting students' needs through SDI. We will continue to collect data on educator's increased knowledge of evidence-based math instruction at varying levels of intensity of instruction from Tier 1 to DBI. The next virtual Communities of Practice series will be focused on data and will feature topics such as the Math Basic Skills Program (MBSP), graphing progress monitoring, and goal setting, academic goal setting, and data-based decision-making. Each school or district is expected to have a designated leader who meets with the data team on a bi-weekly basis to discuss their progress to date and review action plans. We will collect data from schools' MTSS team meetings as evidence towards the short-term outcome of increasing educator knowledge of collaboration and teaming practices to ensure access to core-math instruction and to individualization based on data use. The workgroup and communities of practice will continue to achieve the intermediate outcome of increasing educator application of skills related to evidence-based math instruction. The next set of BRIDGE-RI courses will feature the following topics: early numeracy, number talks, planning, delivery, and intensifying instruction, and an introduction to SDI to accompany the SDI guidelines. These courses will demonstrate continued progress toward the intermediate outcome for increasing educator application of skills related to evidence-based math instruction.

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

The following RI 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 help them to determine the level of intensity. For example, the Strategic Math Series from the University of Kansas and the Bridges Math Intervention from the Math Learning Center are intervention platforms comprising EBPs that are based on IES recommendations, as mentioned above.

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

The RI TIME project offers coaching and professional development to support math EBP implementation for 13 participating sites across seven school districts. Each participating site focuses on different aspects of implementation (e.g., learning and implementing EBPs in math, DBI in math) through direct coaching, a community of practice (CoP), or consultation. Through direct coaching, each site works with a coach to create and implement an action plan prioritizing goals for the academic year related to not only increasing knowledge and implementation of RI Core-aligned EBPs in mathematics across the tiers but also the structural changes (i.e., teaming processes) required to achieve results. Below are some examples of how direct coaching changes district procedures and practices as well as teacher/provider practices to impact the SiMR.

- For one district, a coach met with general and special education leadership to help them better understand the need to provide a math intervention and validated progress monitoring tool to not only MTSS students at Tier 2 and Tier 3 but also students with disabilities. This led the district to purchase a Tier 3 standardized platform that could be intensified and individualized for students with disabilities.
- One school was trained on the DBI process using its district Tier 2 intervention (that has research base aligned to the original IES Math RTI practice guide). The staff explored their Progress Monitoring Monitoring tool, AIMSweb Plus, to consider how students were being progress monitored, how it relates to their students' IEP goals and how to connect the pieces. This team was brought back together in Spring 2023 to review progress around implementation and there was less accountability and implementation than intended. A plan was defined in Spring 2023 with the school principal and math coach to better support systems-level implementation. The leadership team reviewed the math screening data to identify the areas of need and the grade level with the highest need. Together, the coach and the leadership team used the data-based decision-making process to determine the next steps for the 23-24 school year, which included defining an intervention block, identifying a class-wide intervention PALS to support the core instruction problem, and offering additional opportunities to support implementation.

Overall, a RI TIME coach trains a school team on a particular aspect of math EBP implementation. As the school or district team begins implementing these concepts, they may learn that their instruction is not explicit, systematic, or effective enough to support all students, including students with disabilities. Thus, they work with the coach to identify tools, resources, or interventions to utilize to change district/school procedures and practices or teacher procedures and practices.

As previously mentioned, the virtual statewide targeted Communities of Practice are tailored to schools' training plans and participants' roles, including 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. An assignment during the CoP was to select a student at risk or with math difficulty to participate in a student-level DBI case study. The student-level DBI case study is as an opportunity for educators to integrate CoP components throughout the month, thus changing teacher practices. The CoP conducted 16 case studies where 15 students achieved ambitious or moderate growth, thus improving student outcomes on interventions.

The RI TIME project offers a virtual book study, as used by the RI Math project in previous reporting periods. This approach provides a mechanism for school districts to build their internal capacity, take ownership of professional learning activities, and work toward sustaining practices across time. The book study approach has been favorably received by participants. During this reporting period, the book study occurred between February and June

2023, focusing on the text, *Antiracism and Universal Design for Learning: Building Expressways to Success* by Andratesha Fritzgerald. During this reporting period, there were 15 participants from 14 sites, including classroom teachers (both general and special education), math interventionists/coaches, and school administrators. This iteration of the Book Study includes an accompanying podcast, "Math Chat Podcast," led by two coaches from the previous RI Math Project to help educators better understand the text.

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

Due to the late start date of the new vendor contract, the RI TIME project revamped its program during the fall of 2022 and started providing services under the revised TOA to participating sites at the beginning of the 2023 calendar year. Much of the data collected during this reporting period was baseline data for school that are new to the work, demonstrating the starting point of educators' implementation and practice. We anticipate collecting growth data and assessment of practice change in the subsequent reporting periods.

The RI TIME project has a Technical Assistance (TA) Tracker that houses information about each TA activity conducted by project members, including direct coaching, virtual CoP meetings, and professional learning opportunities. The Tracker form features an Additional Note section where project members share comments or updates about educators' implementation and practice changes. Below are a few comments from the TA tracker.

- "After one email exchange and one virtual session, it is clear that there is a lot of room for improvement and growth to build DBI/SDI knowledge and implementation."
- "It is clear [this educator] will be a champion DBI implementor. Possibly, partner with them for future conferences, PD, and/or on-site coaching. Student trendlines are exemplary (i.e., high attendance, clean, individualized, above average)."

During one of the virtual CoP meetings, pulse check data were collected to examine the degree to which participants implement various topics, such as math instructional strategies from BRIDGE-RI, the taxonomy of intervention intensity, and the five steps of DBI. Based on the participants' self-rating, at least 50% are "very comfortable" or "mostly comfortable" in implementing math instructional practices from BRIDGE-RI modules, the five steps of DBI, and SDI; 33% rated "very comfortable" or "mostly comfortable" for implementing the taxonomy of intervention intensity, while 100% of participants rated themselves "very comfortable" or "mostly comfortable" for implementing decision-making using progress monitoring data. It should be noted that some of the CoP participants have worked with the previous iteration of the RI Math project, so their higher level of comfort could be related to prior knowledge and experience.

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.

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

We are continuing with the same EBPs but providing more clarification on how to align these practices within SDI once the SDI guidelines are launched. Completing the SDI guidelines has surfaced challenges (e.g., misunderstanding of who provides SDI, effectively planning and measuring SDI) that has led to a delay in completing the guidelines for the 2023-2024 school year. The discussions during the SDI work sessions have also identified additional TA that will be needed as part of the rollout. RI TIME will continue to provide TA on these EBPs through the project's three primary professional learning activities: statewide professional learning through BRIDGE-RI and book studies, targeted professional learning content-specific Communities of Practice, and direct coaching. 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, SDI, and increasing educator knowledge of collaboration and teaming practices to ensure access to core-math instruction and 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.

Some of the evaluation data shared above is baseline data since this was the first full year of the implementation of the new iteration of the RI SSIP, demonstrating the need to continue implementing the SSIP without modification to see if there is any growth or progress over time across various data sets. Progress on the SiMR would suggest the current SSIP approach is successful.

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 was 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 relevant 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 occurs no later than 120 days after the submission of the SPP/APR. 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.

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

Throughout the development of the SDI guidelines, the SDI/DBI workgroup provided feedback to ensure that it was tailored for the Rhode Island context. During virtual sessions, the workgroup reviewed various documents related to SDI and provided feedback on using those documents to drive the RI SDI documents. They then reviewed the created guidelines documentation and established consensus on these documents before sharing them in the field. The workgroup participated in brainstorming sessions of potential resources to create to support SDI implementation and potential challenges or questions they foresee surfacing as SDI messaging is shared.

In the TA Tracker, there is a section where the RI TIME project member describes any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities. These notes help the RI TIME team improve the coaching, communities of practice, and professional learning opportunities services they provide.

The RI TIME 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 RI TIME staff selected or developed videos that align with Common Core mathematical standards and evidence-based practices. We have an ongoing evaluation of this playlist to ensure it meets the needs expressed by parents/caregivers and families and adjust accordingly. In response to conversations with RIPIN and RIDE, the RI TIME staff created subsections for each grade level with infographics, resources, and YouTube videos that align with major focus areas being taught in classrooms. The vetted playlist of YouTube videos is featured in the Parent and Family Support section on the project's website. The section includes resources of ideas families and parents can use to make math learning a part of their daily lives. <https://sites.google.com/view/rimathproject/parent-and-family-support>

In response to feedback on how parents and families can connect with their child's learning at school, the RI TIME team uploaded guides that help parents understand student assessment, how to build successful communication with teachers, and MTSS and Screening for families.

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

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

During the SDI Workgroup sessions, some members raised concerns about meeting the legal requirements of SDI and alignment of the SDI guidelines with RIDE's approval. The RI TIME staff explained that the workgroup, in partnership with RI TIME project staff, has been charged by RIDE to provide stakeholder input and feedback on SDI to help create the framework for the state to use. Project staff helped the workgroup understand that the purpose of the SDI guidelines is to provide guidance on supporting students in real time and not solely on the legal requirements of SDI implementation.

During the virtual CoP meetings, participants expressed feeling unsupported by their district administration to foster collaboration and build the capacity of general education teachers. The RI TIME staff member offered suggestions on how to address these concerns by identifying a math interventionist lead that can foster collaboration and to coordinate quarterly leadership updates between general education teachers and special education administrators.

Both the SDI workgroup and CoP participants expressed concerns about misconceptions of SDI in the field. During internal meetings, RI TIME staff brainstormed potential guidance documents and resources to tailor to misconceptions of SDI in the Rhode Island context. RIDE agreed to a slower timeline for the development and roll-out of the guidelines in order to promote deep stakeholder engagement in buy-in. RIDE and the RI TIME staff subsequently looked for and utilized collaboration opportunities with other math training events from for coherent and consistent messages to special educators.

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.

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. [Aug 2023 - June 2024]
- Launch the SDI Manual by the end of the 2023 -24 school year and host a kickoff meeting at the beginning of the 2024-2025 academic year.
- o Develop BRIDGE-RI Moodle courses around SDI in mathematics based on the framework and guidelines from the Workgroup.
- o Develop math instruction professional learning guides.

- Continue Leadership Communities of Practice (CoP) to support the sustainability of current adopters as leaders across the state. [Aug - Dec 2024]
- Develop a series for targeted coaching on SDI and DBI.
- o Pilot the coaching series with 6 existing schools.
- Continue to facilitate the self-paced Podcast and Book study of the text, Antiracism and Universal Design for Learning: Building Expressways to Success by Andratesha Fitzgerald with educators and leaders. [Fall 2023]
- Co-planning of the RI math conference to encourage greater application and knowledge building of math EBPs [Spring 2024]
- Facilitate another Book Study using the conference keynote's text, The Math Pact: Achieving Instructional Coherence Within and Across Grades by Karen Karp, Barbara Dougherty, and Sarah Bush. Participants will choose The Math Pact that aligns with their grade level. [Spring 2024]

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

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 and training implementation and evaluation data – increased educator knowledge of collaboration and teaming practices to ensure access to core-math instruction and to individualization based on data-use (short-term)
- Parent and Family Survey questions featured in Indicator 8 Survey - Increased parent or family awareness of evidence-based math instruction across the tiers of MTSS (short-term)
- Math Beliefs Survey - Increased parent/family and stakeholder beliefs of mathematics (short-term)
- EOY Pulse Check and Case Study data - 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 fidelity of school-level implementation of MTSS and SDI, including screening and progress monitoring across a growing number of LEAs (long-term)

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

Throughout the state, local districts have differing opinions or interpretations of SDI and its implementation within an MTSS framework. It is challenging to come to an agreement and to factor a lot of perspectives into a consensus with buy-in. The RI TIME team is addressing this barrier through meetings with the state's IDEA team, local SDI workgroup, and specific TA at targeted sites.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

The RI TIME project usually recruits schools based on their readiness levels. The state education agency has an interest in learning more about schools with an Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) category or subgroup and wants to prioritize these kinds of schools. A school with a student subgroup identified for ATSI means the subgroup would be identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement if it were its own school. The RI TIME project staff will use internal meetings to determine which schools to prioritize and recruit.

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:

04/25/24 8:33:25 AM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results			
Compliance			

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

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

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments		
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress		

(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 2024: Part B."

Exiting Data Elements

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

**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.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (2)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (3)	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.			
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.			
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.			
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation			
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday			
Indicator 13: Secondary transition			
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data			
Timely State Complaint Decisions			
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions			
Longstanding Noncompliance			
Specific Conditions			
Uncorrected identified noncompliance			

(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/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(3) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Data Rubric

FFY 2022 APR (1)

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	0	0
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

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	20
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 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) =	25

(1) 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 (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	0	1	2
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	0	1	2

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	19
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	23.52

(2) 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	25
B. 618 Grand Total	23.52
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	48.52
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) (3) =	0.9332
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	93.32

(3) 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 2024 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	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	5/3/2023

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 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

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