

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 data for this indicator are 57.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 58.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 58.9%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation 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).</p> <p>OSEP notes that the State’s discussion of progress and slippage appears to compare a 5-year cohort graduation rate to the target, rather than the 4-year cohort rate, which the State used to report its actual target data.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 21.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 22.8%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 24.7%.</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>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 the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 80.56%. The State’s FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 81%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 69%.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.4% for reading and 97.4% for math. The State’s FFY 2009 data were 97.9% for reading and 97.7% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 100%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																																															
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 412 1583 1094"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Grade</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td align="center" colspan="3"><u>Reading</u></td> <td align="center" colspan="3"><u>Math</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>36.3%</td> <td>34.89%</td> <td>38%</td> <td>31.1%</td> <td>34.14%</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>26.7%</td> <td>29.95%</td> <td>32%</td> <td>25.4%</td> <td>28.07%</td> <td>31%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>30.2%</td> <td>32.17%</td> <td>31%</td> <td>23.86%</td> <td>26.81%</td> <td>29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>26.6%</td> <td>28.44%</td> <td>26%</td> <td>21.25%</td> <td>25.15%</td> <td>22%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>31.1%</td> <td>23.44%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>18.45%</td> <td>17.16%</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>30.8%</td> <td>37.07%</td> <td>28%</td> <td>17.14%</td> <td>18.21%</td> <td>21%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HS</td> <td>31.6%</td> <td>36.54%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>5.42%</td> <td>9.18%</td> <td>7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets.</p> <p>OSEP notes that the State's discussion of progress and slippage appears to reference the FFY 2009 participation rates, rather than the FFY 2010 rates.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>		<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>			3	36.3%	34.89%	38%	31.1%	34.14%	35%	4	26.7%	29.95%	32%	25.4%	28.07%	31%	5	30.2%	32.17%	31%	23.86%	26.81%	29%	6	26.6%	28.44%	26%	21.25%	25.15%	22%	7	31.1%	23.44%	25%	18.45%	17.16%	20%	8	30.8%	37.07%	28%	17.14%	18.21%	21%	HS	31.6%	36.54%	27%	5.42%	9.18%	7%	<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 2011 APR.</p>
<u>Grade</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																																																											
	<u>Reading</u>			<u>Math</u>																																																													
3	36.3%	34.89%	38%	31.1%	34.14%	35%																																																											
4	26.7%	29.95%	32%	25.4%	28.07%	31%																																																											
5	30.2%	32.17%	31%	23.86%	26.81%	29%																																																											
6	26.6%	28.44%	26%	21.25%	25.15%	22%																																																											
7	31.1%	23.44%	25%	18.45%	17.16%	20%																																																											
8	30.8%	37.07%	28%	17.14%	18.21%	21%																																																											
HS	31.6%	36.54%	27%	5.42%	9.18%	7%																																																											
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of</p>	<p>The State revised the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>																																																															

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 2%. The State met its revised FFY 2010 target of 3%. The State revised its FFY 2010 target in its SPP, but did not include the revised target in the FFY 2010 APR.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that 48 of 53 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students with IEPs that are suspended greater than ten days.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 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:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 1.9%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State changed its calculation methodology for this indicator. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that one district was identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported that it reviewed the district’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 district identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State also reported that one district was identified as having 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.</p> <p>The State reported that 50 of 53 districts did not meet the State-established minimum</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to data in the FFY 2011 APR demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator. The State also reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was not corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, the district identified with noncompliance in FFY 2010, and</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>“n” size requirement of ten students with disabilities in a particular racial/ethnic category suspended greater than ten days.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected district to revise), pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), the district’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 for the district identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was not corrected.</p>	<p>the district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator]</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	
	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	73.06	71.39	80	-1.67%	
	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	12.77	13.24	10	-0.47%	
	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.18	5.1	3	-0.92%	
	These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet any of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.					
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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. [Results Indicator; New]</p>	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.					The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of</p>	The State's reported data for this indicator are:					OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.
	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>		
	Outcome A:	72	69	74		

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)				The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	63	74	65	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	67	74	69	
	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	68	59	69	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	53	61	54	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	72	69	73	
	These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.				

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 38%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 33%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 34.5%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 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 2010 reported data for this indicator are 1.89%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that ten districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that one district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that one of 53 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of ten students in a particular race/ethnicity.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 was not corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2011 APR, demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator. The State also reported that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator was not corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the district identified in FFY 2010, and the district identified in FFY 2009 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (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 Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 3.77%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 23 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that two districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that one of 53 districts did not meet the State-established minimum</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2011 APR, demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>“n” size requirement of 10 students of a particular race/ethnicity.</p> <p>The State reported that two of four findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that one finding was subsequently corrected by February 1, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>However, OSEP’s June 20, 2011 Response Table required the State to demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, that the State verified that each district with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The State did not report that it met this requirement. Therefore, the State has not demonstrated that it corrected the noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that the five findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State’s FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2010 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator. The State also reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator was not corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2010, and the districts identified in FFY 2009 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 in 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 requirement(s) (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 Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 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</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		those requirements in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.
<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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.23%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 88.16%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 28 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 96%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 97%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all six of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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 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</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98.21%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 27 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps										
<p>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>of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(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 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1268 1583 1471"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">33</td> <td align="center">28.6</td> <td align="center">34</td> <td align="center">-4.40%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	33	28.6	34	-4.40%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p> <p>The State reported that the response group was not representative of the population. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>								
A. % Enrolled in higher education	33	28.6	34	-4.40%								

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</p>	<p align="center">67</p>	<p align="center">52.8</p>	<p align="center">68</p>	<p align="center">-14.20%</p>	<p>must report whether its FFY 2011 data are from a group representative of the population, and if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.</p>
<p>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</p>	<p align="center">78</p>	<p align="center">62.4</p>	<p align="center">79</p>	<p align="center">-15.60%</p>		
<p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet any of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population. The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. In the FFY 2010 APR the State provided improvement activities to ensure that the data will be representative.</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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that it timely corrected 523 of 527 findings identified in FFY 2009 and one finding was subsequently corrected by February 1, 2012. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>					<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the remaining 3 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2010 APR were corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>§§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 and each LEA identified with noncompliance identified in FFY 2009: (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 96.96%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 53.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p> <p>The State was identified as being in need of assistance for two consecutive years based on the State's FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 APRs, was advised of available technical assistance, and was required to report, with the FFY 2010 APR, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State reported on the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance for this indicator and reported on the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data, demonstrating that it is in 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 hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 90%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to correct the 618 data reported on Table 7 and resubmit an electronic version to OSEP's data contractor by June 30, 2011, and notify the OSEP State Contact when the action had been completed. The State provided the required information on October 12, 2011.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data, demonstrating that it is in compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that all four resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2010. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities in any fiscal year in which fewer than ten resolution sessions were held.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 66.1%. These represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 69.8%. The State met its</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011</p>

Rhode Island Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	<p>FFY 2010 target of 62%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	APR.
<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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. The State's FFY 2009 data were 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving 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 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>