

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 55.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 73.46%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 73.89%. The State did not provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, valid and reliable data. The State provided the required information based on a new four-year graduation rate cohort method for calculating the data for this indicator. OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 27.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 26.54%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 26.11%. The State did not provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, valid and reliable data. The State provided the required information based on a new cohort method for calculating the data for this indicator. OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 66.67%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 63.89%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 65%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues							OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																									
<p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading/ English Language Arts</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>3</td><td>98.7%</td><td>97.4%</td><td>100%</td><td>98.6%</td><td>97.5%</td><td>100%</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>99.2%</td><td>97.7%</td><td>100%</td><td>99.1%</td><td>98.8%</td><td>100%</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>99.1%</td><td>98%</td><td>100%</td><td>98.9%</td><td>98.2%</td><td>100%</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>98.9%</td><td>97.2%</td><td>100%</td><td>99%</td><td>97.3%</td><td>100%</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>98.5%</td><td>97.3%</td><td>100%</td><td>98.3%</td><td>97.2%</td><td>100%</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>98.4%</td><td>96.9%</td><td>100%</td><td>98.1%</td><td>96.8%</td><td>100%</td></tr> <tr><td>HS</td><td>95.8%</td><td>96.2%</td><td>100%</td><td>95.5%</td><td>95.7%</td><td>100%</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 97.2% for Mathematics and 97.3% for Reading/English Language Arts.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets of 100%.</p>	Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target		Reading/ English Language Arts			Math			3	98.7%	97.4%	100%	98.6%	97.5%	100%	4	99.2%	97.7%	100%	99.1%	98.8%	100%	5	99.1%	98%	100%	98.9%	98.2%	100%	6	98.9%	97.2%	100%	99%	97.3%	100%	7	98.5%	97.3%	100%	98.3%	97.2%	100%	8	98.4%	96.9%	100%	98.1%	96.8%	100%	HS	95.8%	96.2%	100%	95.5%	95.7%	100%	
Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target																																																											
	Reading/ English Language Arts			Math																																																													
3	98.7%	97.4%	100%	98.6%	97.5%	100%																																																											
4	99.2%	97.7%	100%	99.1%	98.8%	100%																																																											
5	99.1%	98%	100%	98.9%	98.2%	100%																																																											
6	98.9%	97.2%	100%	99%	97.3%	100%																																																											
7	98.5%	97.3%	100%	98.3%	97.2%	100%																																																											
8	98.4%	96.9%	100%	98.1%	96.8%	100%																																																											
HS	95.8%	96.2%	100%	95.5%	95.7%	100%																																																											
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading/ English Language Arts</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>3</td><td>33%</td><td>34%</td><td>34%</td><td>30.5%</td><td>33.9%</td><td>31%</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>27.2%</td><td>34.1%</td><td>28%</td><td>26.3%</td><td>31.3%</td><td>27%</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>25.7%</td><td>29.4%</td><td>27%</td><td>24.3%</td><td>29.4%</td><td>25%</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>20.9%</td><td>26.1%</td><td>22%</td><td>17.4%</td><td>26.1%</td><td>18%</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>19.7%</td><td>22.4%</td><td>21%</td><td>14.9%</td><td>22.4%</td><td>16%</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>22.9%</td><td>21.2%</td><td>24%</td><td>15.8%</td><td>20%</td><td>17%</td></tr> <tr><td>HS (11)</td><td>23.6%</td><td>20.8%</td><td>23%</td><td>15.1%</td><td>12.1%</td><td>15%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target		Reading/ English Language Arts			Math			3	33%	34%	34%	30.5%	33.9%	31%	4	27.2%	34.1%	28%	26.3%	31.3%	27%	5	25.7%	29.4%	27%	24.3%	29.4%	25%	6	20.9%	26.1%	22%	17.4%	26.1%	18%	7	19.7%	22.4%	21%	14.9%	22.4%	16%	8	22.9%	21.2%	24%	15.8%	20%	17%	HS (11)	23.6%	20.8%	23%	15.1%	12.1%	15%	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the required data, analysis, and explanation of progress or slippage related to proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and the State's alternative assessment. The State was also required to submit documentation that it is reporting publicly and to the Secretary on the performance of children on alternate assessments. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
Grade	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target																																																											
	Reading/ English Language Arts			Math																																																													
3	33%	34%	34%	30.5%	33.9%	31%																																																											
4	27.2%	34.1%	28%	26.3%	31.3%	27%																																																											
5	25.7%	29.4%	27%	24.3%	29.4%	25%																																																											
6	20.9%	26.1%	22%	17.4%	26.1%	18%																																																											
7	19.7%	22.4%	21%	14.9%	22.4%	16%																																																											
8	22.9%	21.2%	24%	15.8%	20%	17%																																																											
HS (11)	23.6%	20.8%	23%	15.1%	12.1%	15%																																																											

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>These data represent progress in part and slippage in part from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met part of its FFY 2006 targets.</p>	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 14%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 12%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a description of the review, and if appropriate revision, of 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 compliance with the IDEA for: (1) the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2005 APR; and (2) the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>The State reported that the five LEAs identified in FFY 2005 with significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year submitted action plans for reducing the rate of suspension of children with disabilities; the action plan includes revisions in policies, procedures, and practices. It is unclear to OSEP, however, whether the action plans include a review of the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The State did not submit the required description of the review, and if appropriate revision, of policies, procedures, and practices for the three LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps								
		<p>2006 APR.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of 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 compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p>								
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>									
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 1317 1419 1513"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>63%</td> <td>62.8%</td> <td>68%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	63%	62.8%	68%	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 data that are consistent with the 618 data. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target							
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	63%	62.8%	68%							

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>placements, or homebound or hospital placements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</p>	<p>15%</p>	<p>18.1%</p>	<p>16%</p>																					
	<p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>	<p>3.14%</p>	<p>4.85%</p>	<p>4.3%</p>																					
	<p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets.</p>																								
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings). [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																								
<p>7. Percent of preschool children 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. [Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 967 1419 1513"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 967 1062 1141">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1062 967 1178 1141">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1178 967 1297 1141">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1297 967 1419 1141">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1141 1062 1211">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1141 1178 1211">1%</td> <td data-bbox="1178 1141 1297 1211">3%</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1141 1419 1211">1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1211 1062 1346">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1211 1178 1346">4%</td> <td data-bbox="1178 1211 1297 1346">4%</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1211 1419 1346">1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1346 1062 1446">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1346 1178 1446">6%</td> <td data-bbox="1178 1346 1297 1446">9%</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1346 1419 1446">4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1446 1062 1513">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable</td> <td data-bbox="1062 1446 1178 1513">16%</td> <td data-bbox="1178 1446 1297 1513">14%</td> <td data-bbox="1297 1446 1419 1513">12%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1%	3%	1%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	4%	4%	1%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	6%	9%	4%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable	16%	14%	12%	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, information on the sampling methodology that describes how data were collected. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009; and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																						
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1%	3%	1%																						
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	4%	4%	1%																						
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	6%	9%	4%																						
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable	16%	14%	12%																						

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	to same-aged peers.				
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	72%	70%	81%	
<p>8. 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator.</p> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 26%. However, OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress because the State submitted FFY 2006 data as its baseline data.</p>				<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>State revised its target in the APR however, OSEP cannot accept the revised targets because the targets are not consistent with the indicator.</p> <p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data because the State used the wrong measurement for this indicator. The State identified 11 districts with significant disproportionality of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services, but only determined that the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification in three of those districts.</p> <p>Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p>				<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 a description of how it determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification in the four districts identified in FFY 2005. The State reported this information for the districts identified in FFY 2005. In addition, the State was required to include a description of what the percentages listed in the SPP targets represented. The State revised its targets to be "0% of districts with significant disproportionality due to inappropriate identification." OSEP cannot accept these revised targets. Indicator 9 is the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification; the Secretary has set the targets at 0%. The State's revised targets are not consistent with</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>Indicator 9.</p> <p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data because it: 1) used the wrong measurement for this indicator, i.e., it identified districts with significant disproportionality of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services instead of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification; and 2) failed to determine whether the disproportionate representation in all of the districts was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP cannot determine from the State's revised definition/calculation of disproportionality whether it has separate definitions/calculations for disproportionate representation (as required by this indicator) and significant disproportionality (as required by 34 CFR §300.646). See page 2 of APR. The State only appears to calculate the data for significant disproportionality.</p> <p>The State reported on page 3 of the APR that the four districts identified as significantly disproportionate last year continue to be identified as significantly disproportionate using the State's new calculation method. An additional seven districts were identified with significant disproportionality in FFY 2006 and the State is in the process of determining whether this was due to inappropriate identification. The State reported that it hopes to determine this by Spring 2008. The State reported that, upon a review of policies, practices and procedures, a review of</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>monitoring reports, complaints/hearings, and individual district probes, disproportionality identified in FFY 2005 for three of four districts was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>It is not clear whether the State is making an annual determination of disproportionate representation consistent with Indicator 9.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report in the APR on whether significant disproportionality based on race and ethnicity in special education is occurring in the State, the State's FFY 2006 APR identifies districts with significant disproportionality. The State reported that the three districts identified in FFY 2005 with significant disproportionality that was the result of inappropriate identification were required to "write a disproportionality action plan explaining the use of 15% of IDEA Part B funds for Early Intervening Services," but it is unclear to OSEP whether the State completed all the activities required by 34 CFR §300.646(b). The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that it is in compliance with all of the requirements of 34 CFR §300.646(b), including for those districts identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 with significant disproportionality based on race and ethnicity.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173, and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>having disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its target in the APR, however, OSEP cannot accept the revised target because the target is not consistent with the indicator.</p> <p>The State did not provide valid and reliable data because it used the wrong measurement for this indicator. The State identified 28 districts with significant disproportionality of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories, but only determined that the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification in five of those districts.</p> <p>Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a description of how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. The State reported this information for the districts identified in FFY 2005. In addition, the State was required to include a description of what the percentages listed in the SPP targets represented. The State revised its targets to be “0% of districts with significant disproportionality due to inappropriate identification.” OSEP cannot accept these revised targets. Indicator 10 is the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification; the Secretary has set the targets at 0%. The State’s revised targets are not consistent with the indicator.</p> <p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data because it: 1) used the wrong measurement for this indicator, i.e., it identified districts with significant disproportionality of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories instead of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification; and 2) failed to</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>determine whether the disproportionate representation in all of the districts was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>OSEP cannot determine from the State's revised definition/calculation of disproportionality whether it has separate definitions/calculations for disproportionate representation (as required by this indicator) and significant disproportionality (as required by 34 CFR §300.646). See page 6 of APR. The State only appears to calculate the data for significant disproportionality.</p> <p>The State reported on page 7 of the APR that the five districts identified as significantly disproportionate last year continue to be identified as significantly disproportionate using the State's new calculation method. An additional 23 districts were identified with significant disproportionality in FFY 2006 and the State is in the process of determining whether this was due to inappropriate identification. The State reported that it hopes to determine this by Spring 2008. The State reported that, upon a review of policies, practices and procedures, a review of monitoring reports, complaints/hearings, and individual district probes, for all five of the districts identified in FFY 2005 disproportionality was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>It is not clear whether the State is making an annual determination of disproportionate representation consistent with Indicator 10.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report on whether significant disproportionality based on race and ethnicity in specific disability</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>categories is occurring in the State, the current report identifies districts with significant disproportionality. The State reported that the five districts identified in FFY 2005 with significant disproportionality that was the result of inappropriate identification were required to “write a disproportionality action plan explaining the use of 15% of IDEA Part B funds for Early Intervening Services.” However, it is unclear to OSEP whether the State completed all the activities required by 34 CFR §300.646(b).</p> <p>As such, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that it is in compliance with all of the requirements of 34 CFR §300.646(b), including for those districts identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 with significant disproportionality based on race and ethnicity.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173, and that the LEAs identified in the FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline).</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities and timelines for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State did not report FFY 2006 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data and a description of what the percentages listed in the SPP targets</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Compliance Indicator]		<p>represent. The State did not provide the required information.</p> <p>The State has not provided this data, although required, for two years. Under 34 §76.720(c)(2), failure to submit reports constitutes a failure to comply substantially with a requirement of law applicable to the Part B program. In the FFY 2006 APR, the State reported that the implementation of the new data collection system for this indicator was delayed a year but that the system is currently up and running for the 2007-2008 school year. The State reported that baseline data will be available at the end of the 2007-2008 school year. The State must submit the missing data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1).</p>
<p>12. 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 77%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 55%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the required data applying the proper measurement. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that prior noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 22.86%.</p> <p>These data are not valid or reliable because, in the collection of these data, RIDE discovered that some LEAs were not recording the data required or were not recording the data correctly. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.</p> <p>This is the first year the State has submitted data for this indicator, therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data and a description of what the percentages listed in the targets represent. The State did not provide the required information and must include it in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data and the State must provide the required data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both,</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 71.88%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the definition of postsecondary school and what constitutes full-time enrollment as required by</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>		<p>the instructions for this indicator. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that seven of seven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a description of how districts are selected for monitoring. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that it had corrected or taken appropriate enforcement action regarding the findings of noncompliance from FFY 2004 that were reported in the FFY 2005 APR as not timely corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the requirements of 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, and 17, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 96.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, an overview of the issue or description of the system or process for this indicator. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		demonstration that it is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, an overview of the issue or description of the system or process for this indicator. The State provided the required information. OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported no data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a description of what the percentages listed in the SPP targets represent. The State did not provide the required information and must include it in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009. The State did not submit data for this indicator but reported that a new data system is being developed to gather valid and reliable data. The State must provide the required data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 80%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 79%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 58%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, an overview of the issue or description of the system or process for this indicator. The State provided the required information. OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		improve performance.
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its APR and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 91%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 80.7%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008 data for Indicator 20 as a percentage. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State is in compliance with the requirements regarding timely and accurate data in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>