

Table B
Previously-Identified Issues

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p><u>Indicator 3. Statewide or districtwide assessment.</u></p> <p>In the FFY 2005 Grant Award letter, RIDE was required to demonstrate, by July 1, 2006, that it is reporting publicly and to the Secretary on the participation of children with disabilities in alternate assessments, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16).</p> <p>The State was to either submit, by September 15, 2005, a written plan consistent with the requirements of 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16), detailing the steps and timelines for reporting publicly on the participation of children with disabilities in alternate assessments by July 1, 2006; or, by July 1, 2006, submit documentation that it has reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities in alternate assessments as required under 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16).</p>	<p>In a phone call to OSEP, the State provided a link to the Rhode Island Technical Assistance Project (RJITAP) website documenting that it is reporting publicly and to the Secretary on the participation of children with disabilities in alternate assessments as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16).</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in addressing this issue. Information on the website responded adequately to the requirements of the FFY 2005 Grant Award letter.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, demonstrating continuing compliance with this requirement.</p>
<p><u>Indicator 4. Suspension/Expulsion.</u></p> <p>OSEP's response to RIDE's FFY 2003 APR required Rhode Island to provide: (1) clarification of the basis on which it examined data of suspension/expulsion rates to determine significant discrepancies; (2) clarification of whether it determined if there are significant discrepancies; and (3) if it identified significant discrepancies, a description of its review of policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of individualized education programs (IEPs), use of behavioral interventions, and procedural safeguards to ensure they comply with Part B, including the results of the review by affected LEAs, if necessary, and any revisions required, as required under 34 CFR §300.146(b).</p>	<p>On January 30, 2006, RIDE submitted documentation clarifying what constitutes a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion. However, RIDE did not provide data regarding whether or not it determined if there are significant discrepancies and if so, provide a description of its review of policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure they comply with Part B, including the results of the review by affected LEAs, if necessary, and any revisions needed, as required under 34 CFR §300.146(b).</p>	<p>OSEP's analysis is found in Table A under indicator #4.</p>	<p>See Table A for Indicator #4.</p>

Issue	State Submission	OSEP Analysis	Required Action
<p><u>Indicator 15B – Monitoring in Non-Priority Areas.</u> OSEP's response to RIDE's FFY 2003 APR required the State to provide documentation to OSEP not later than May 6, 2006, demonstrating that all identified noncompliance in the Providence District has been corrected.</p>	<p>On January 30, 2006, RIDE submitted documentation indicating that it conducted monthly verification reviews in the Providence School District. To date, all bilingual evaluations have been completed within timelines and the Providence District is compliant with all previously identified areas of noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in addressing this issue. The information provided meets the requirements in OSEP's response to the FFY 2003 APR.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data for indicator 15 in the APR, due February 1, 2007, demonstrating continued compliance in this area.</p>
<p><u>Indicator 16 – Formal Written Complaints.</u> OSEP's October 31, 2005 response to RIDE's FFY 2003 Annual Performance Report (APR) required Rhode Island to submit a plan to OSEP, including strategies, proposed evidence of change, targets and timelines designed to ensure correction of the noncompliance identified with regard to formal written complaints as soon as possible and not more than one year after OSEP accepted the plan. No later than six months from the date of that letter, the State was required to submit a Progress Report, including data and analysis demonstrating progress toward compliance, and provide a report to OSEP, with data and analysis demonstrating compliance, as soon as possible, but not later than 30 days following the end of the one-year timeline.</p>	<p>On January 30, 2006, RIDE submitted documentation indicating a full review of its complaint management system and revisions to the system in 2005 to ensure correction of the noncompliance identified with regard to formal written complaints. The revisions included: (1) requiring that all complaints be signed by the complainant and time stamping all complaints to start the 60-day timeline; and (2) implementing a computerized tracking system for complaints and reporting only those special education complaints that meet the IDEA and State requirements. RIDE also reported data for July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005 indicating 100% compliance in meeting the 60-day timeline.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in addressing this issue. The information provided meets the requirements of OSEP's October 31, 2005 letter.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, demonstrating continued compliance with this requirement.</p>