

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2008 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State indicated in its FFY 2008 APR that it revised its indicator and measurement language (consistent with the revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator, but did not submit a revised SPP or direct OSEP to a revised SPP that reflected those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 55.9%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 56.9%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculations and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p> <p>The State explained that FFY 2007 data are the most recent data the State has reported to the Department as part of its CSPR.</p>	<p>The State must provide a revised SPP that reflects the revisions to the indicator and measurement language with its FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State indicated in its FFY 2008 APR that it revised its indicator and measurement language (consistent with the revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator, but did not submit a revised SPP or direct OSEP to a revised SPP that reflected those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 25.4%. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 26.7%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.</p>	<p>The State must provide a revised SPP that reflects the revisions to the indicator and measurement language with its FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State reported the required dropout rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. This means the State submitted the most recent dropout data that the State reported to the Department as part of its CSPR. In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p> <p>The State explained that FFY 2007 data are the most recent data the State has reported to the Department as part of its CSPR.</p>	
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 78%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 67%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 67%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State indicated in its FFY 2008 APR that it revised its indicator and measurement language (consistent with the revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator, but did not submit a revised SPP or direct OSEP to a revised SPP that reflected those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 96.6% for reading and 96.7% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State’s reported FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State provided web links to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> <p>http://www.infoworks.ride.uri.edu/2009/default.asp and http://reporting.measuredprogress.org/NECAPpublicRI/</p>	<p>The State must provide a revised SPP that reflects the revisions to the indicator and measurement language with its FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p>	<p>The State indicated in its FFY 2008 APR that it revised its indicator and measurement language (consistent with the revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator, but did not</p>	<p>The State must provide a revised SPP that reflects the revisions to the indicator and measurement language with its FFY 2009</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
<p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>submit a revised SPP or direct OSEP to a revised SPP that reflected those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 367 1419 1097"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>37.9%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>37.7%</td> <td>37.4%</td> <td>33%</td> <td>33.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>28.8%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>33.5%</td> <td>26.7%</td> <td>29%</td> <td>32.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>26.2%</td> <td>29%</td> <td>24.4%</td> <td>27.1%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>28.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>25.4%</td> <td>24%</td> <td>29.5%</td> <td>18.7%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>20.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>27.9%</td> <td>23%</td> <td>31.5%</td> <td>16.4%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>15.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>18.8%</td> <td>26%</td> <td>18.4%</td> <td>15.9%</td> <td>19%</td> <td>15.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>15.7%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>20.1%</td> <td>3.6%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>5.9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State's reported FFY 2007 data. The State met part of its FFY 2008 targets.</p> <p>The State provided web links to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> <p>http://www.infoworks.ride.uri.edu/2009/default.asp and http://reporting.measuredprogress.org/NECAPpublicRI/</p>	Grade	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target		Reading			Math			3	37.9%	36%	37.7%	37.4%	33%	33.7%	4	28.8%	30%	33.5%	26.7%	29%	32.0%	5	26.2%	29%	24.4%	27.1%	27%	28.5%	6	25.4%	24%	29.5%	18.7%	20%	20.3%	7	27.9%	23%	31.5%	16.4%	18%	15.8%	8	18.8%	26%	18.4%	15.9%	19%	15.7%	HS	15.7%	25%	20.1%	3.6%	17%	5.9%	<p>APR.</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 2009 APR.</p>
Grade	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target																																																											
	Reading			Math																																																													
3	37.9%	36%	37.7%	37.4%	33%	33.7%																																																											
4	28.8%	30%	33.5%	26.7%	29%	32.0%																																																											
5	26.2%	29%	24.4%	27.1%	27%	28.5%																																																											
6	25.4%	24%	29.5%	18.7%	20%	20.3%																																																											
7	27.9%	23%	31.5%	16.4%	18%	15.8%																																																											
8	18.8%	26%	18.4%	15.9%	19%	15.7%																																																											
HS	15.7%	25%	20.1%	3.6%	17%	5.9%																																																											
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 4%. The State met its FFY</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>																																																															

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>2008 target of 6%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEA’s 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, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEA’s 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2005, 2006, and 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. [Compliance Indicator; New for</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>Indicator 4B is new for FFY 2009. Baseline data from 2008-2009, targets (0%), and improvement activities must be submitted with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>FFY 2009]</p> <p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State indicated in its FFY 2008 APR that it revised its indicator and measurement language (consistent with the revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator, but did not submit a revised SPP or direct OSEP to a revised SPP that reflected those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data under IDEA section 618 for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 532 1467 1039"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td>70.67</td> <td>70.58</td> <td>74</td> <td>-0.09%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td>14.71</td> <td>7.44</td> <td>12</td> <td>7.27%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td>4.94</td> <td>5.07</td> <td>4</td> <td>-0.13%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5B from the FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 target for 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2008 targets for 5A and 5B.</p>		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	70.67	70.58	74	-0.09%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	14.71	7.44	12	7.27%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.94	5.07	4	-0.13%	<p>The State must provide a revised SPP that reflects the revisions to the indicator and measurement language with its FFY 2009 APR.</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 2009 APR.</p>
	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	70.67	70.58	74	-0.09%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	14.71	7.44	12	7.27%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.94	5.07	4	-0.13%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>The instruction package for the FFY 2009 APR/SPP will provide guidance regarding the information that states must report for this indicator in their FFY 2009 APRs.</p>																				

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
<p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>														
<p>7. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2008 baseline data and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 662 1444 1286"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 662 919 781">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="919 662 1192 781"><u>Summary Statement 1</u>¹</th> <th data-bbox="1192 662 1444 781"><u>Summary Statement 2</u>²</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 781 919 967">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 781 1192 967">76</td> <td data-bbox="1192 781 1444 967">81</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 967 919 1182">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 967 1192 1182">68</td> <td data-bbox="1192 967 1444 1182">80</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1182 919 1286">Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors</td> <td data-bbox="919 1182 1192 1286">67</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1182 1444 1286">86</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	76	81	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	68	80	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors	67	86	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ¹	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²												
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	76	81												
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	68	80												
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors	67	86												

¹ 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 six years of age or exited the program.

² Summary Statement 2: The percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	to meet their needs (%)			
<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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 33%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 28%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 31.37%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2008 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>			<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</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>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 8%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p> <p>The State provided the definition of disproportionate representation.</p> <p>The State reported that none of the four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner, but that all were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2010.</p> <p>However, the State reported that it did not make child-specific findings of noncompliance in FFY 2007 and thus, could not verify that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). Despite the fact that the State did not make child-specific findings of noncompliance, the State reported that part of its verification of correction process included reviewing student files. The State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The State reported that the four outstanding findings of noncompliance</p>			<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>Given the requirements of this indicator, it is not sufficient to solely identify systemic noncompliance. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on all findings of noncompliance, including child-specific findings of noncompliance, identified in FFY 2009.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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>identified in FFY 2006 were corrected.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 6%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 10%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State provided the definition of disproportionate representation.</p> <p>The State reported that three of five findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that two findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2010.</p> <p>However, the State reported that it did not make child-specific findings of noncompliance in FFY 2007 and thus, could not verify that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 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. Despite the fact that the State did not make child-specific findings of noncompliance, the State reported that part of its verification of correction process included reviewing student files. The State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The State reported that the five outstanding findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected.</p>	<p>Given the requirements of this indicator, it is not sufficient to solely identify systemic noncompliance. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on all findings of noncompliance, including child-specific findings of noncompliance, identified in FFY 2009.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2008 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (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 district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17,</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>
<p>11. 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State indicated in its FFY 2008 APR that it revised its indicator and measurement language (consistent with the revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator, but did not submit a revised SPP or direct OSEP to a revised SPP that reflected those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 85%. However, OSEP recalculated the State's data based on the information provided in the revised APR regarding the 406 allowable exceptions listed in Table 11.2. OSEP determined that only 266 of the 406 children listed with allowable exceptions could be properly excluded from (a) and (b) pursuant to 34 CFR §300.301(d) and the Part B measurement table. The children with acceptable exceptions are the 90 children whose parents did not return phone calls, the 173 children whose parents requested a delay, and the three children who moved or withdrew from the school. Therefore, the State's recalculated data for this indicator are 67.86%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State's FFY 2007 data were not valid and reliable. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 18 of 36 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining 18 findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2010.</p>	<p>Some of the State's allowable exceptions to the 60-day timeline are not consistent with 34 CFR §300.301(d). Because the State has adopted the IDEA timeline for initial evaluations, the State must, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR, ensure that all children who are not included in the measurement for (a) meet the allowable exceptions in 34 CFR §300.301(d).</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirement in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of FFY 2008 noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (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 completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State indicated in its FFY 2008 APR that it revised its indicator and measurement language (consistent with the revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator, but did not submit a revised SPP or direct OSEP to a revised SPP that reflected those revisions.</p> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 87%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State's FFY 2007 data were not valid and reliable. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2007, the State did not provide information on correction of any findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator.</p>	<p>The State must provide a revised SPP that reflects the revisions to the indicator and measurement language with its FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR,</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator : (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (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 developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>The State must also report, in the FFY 2009 APR, on why it did not make findings based on the FFY 2007 data that the State reported under this indicator, given that the FFY 2007 data reflected noncompliance.</p>
<p>13. 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</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that 28 of 28 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner. However, the State did not report, as required by OSEP Memo 09-02, that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b); and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must provide a revised baseline using data from 2009–2010. Targets must remain 100%.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that the remaining 28 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2007 were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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 was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.</p>	<p>noncompliance, the State must report in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.320(b) (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 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data, targets or improvement activities for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report a new baseline, targets and, as needed, improvement activities.</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 92%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 93%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 216 of 234 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the 18 findings of uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that the seven findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected.</p> <p>The State did not report, as required by OSEP Memo 09-02, that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the remaining 18 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR were corrected.</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 2009 APR demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2008 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>Although the State did not report for this indicator that it verified correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 consistent with the OSEP 09-02 memo, OSEP accepted the data for this indicator this year because this indicator measures timely correction of noncompliance and the OSEP 09-02 memo was issued after the beginning of the FFY 2008 correction period.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (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</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>In responding to Indicators 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described 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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State indicated in its FFY 2008 APR that it revised its indicator language (consistent with the revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator, but did not submit a revised SPP or direct OSEP to a revised SPP that reflected those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 62%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must provide a revised SPP that reflects the revisions to the indicator language with its FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited</p>	<p>The State indicated in its FFY 2008 APR that it revised its indicator language (consistent with the revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator, but did not submit a revised SPP or direct OSEP to a revised SPP that reflected those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on nine due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2008 target of</p>	<p>The State must provide a revised SPP that reflects the revisions to the indicator language with its FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
hearing, within the required timelines. [Compliance Indicator]	100%.	§300.515.
18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 41%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 39.13%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 45%.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.
19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2008 reported data are 80%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 84%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.
20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. [Compliance Indicator]	The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 96.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 81.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.