

Connecticut 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 79.4%. 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 was progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 72%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 3.7%. 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 5%.</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>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 this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 12.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 18.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 50%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), targets, and improvement</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 98.6% for reading and 99.1% for math on the CMT, and 92.6% for reading and 92.8% for math on the CAPT. 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 its FFY 2008 targets of 95% for reading and 95% for math for the CMT, but did not meet its FFY 2008 targets of 95% for reading and 95% for math for the CAPT.</p> <p>The State provided web links to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results: http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/cedar/index.htm www.ctreports.com</p>	<p>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>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 indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 28.3% for reading and 40.3% for math on the CMT and 33.3% for reading and 28.9% for math on the CAPT. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 targets of 79% for reading and 82% for math for the CMT and 81% for reading and 80% for math for the CAPT.</p> <p>The State provided web links to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results: http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/cedar/index.htm www.ctreports.com</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <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</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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 18.24%. 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 25%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs’ policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2007 data as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was not corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that it has verified that the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>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 and FFY 2006. By conducting this required review for FFY 2006, the State reported that it corrected the noncompliance with 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> <p>The State reported that it did not revise (and did not require the affected LEAs to revise), the LEAs' 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 2006.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEAs' 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 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in six LEAs in FFY 2007 (2007-2008) based on data for FFY 2005 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that in FFY 2009 it required one of the 31 LEAs identified with significant discrepancy based on FFY 2007 data to revise 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). The State reported that it will report on the correction of this noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>	<p>FFY 2009 based on FFY 2007 data is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s).</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</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>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>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; New for 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 revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities 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="583 716 1499 1182"> <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>70.2</td> <td>69.9</td> <td>70.0</td> <td>-0.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td>6.2</td> <td>5.49</td> <td>7.0</td> <td>0.71%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td>6.8</td> <td>7.0</td> <td>5.4</td> <td>-0.20%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The State's FFY 2008 data for this indicator are 71.4% for 5A. However, OSEP recalculated the data for 5A to be 69.9%. The State's FFY 2008 data for this indicator are 5.59% for 5B. However, OSEP recalculated the data for 5B to be 5.49%. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 7.0% for 5C. These data represent progress for 5B and slippage for 5C from the FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet any of its FFY 2008 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's data reported in this indicator for 5A and 5B are not the same as</p>		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	70.2	69.9	70.0	-0.30%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6.2	5.49	7.0	0.71%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	6.8	7.0	5.4	-0.20%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p> <p>Although OSEP accepted the State's explanation for the State's reported FFY 2008 data for this indicator, the State is required to receive technical assistance to ensure that the State correctly reports its data for this indicator 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	70.2	69.9	70.0	-0.30%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6.2	5.49	7.0	0.71%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	6.8	7.0	5.4	-0.20%																		

Connecticut Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps									
	the State's 618 data reported in Table 3. The State provided an explanation.										
<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>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</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>									
<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 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, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="583 915 1478 1300"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="583 915 953 1029">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="959 915 1226 1029"><u>Summary Statement 1</u>¹</th> <th data-bbox="1232 915 1478 1029"><u>Summary Statement 2</u>²</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="583 1034 953 1164">Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="959 1034 1226 1164">58.3</td> <td data-bbox="1232 1034 1478 1164">54.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="583 1169 953 1300">Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/</td> <td data-bbox="959 1169 1226 1300">61.7</td> <td data-bbox="1232 1169 1478 1300">33.0</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) (%)	58.3	54.2	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/	61.7	33.0	<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) (%)	58.3	54.2									
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/	61.7	33.0									

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.

Connecticut Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	communication) (%)			
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	50.5	26.5	
<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 87.5%. The State met its FFY 2008 target for this indicator.</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 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 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that four districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were 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 the definition of disproportionate representation.</p>			<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</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>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance 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 1.2%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 1.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 38 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</p>			<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing, in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>The State described how it made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (including both over and underrepresentation) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that both of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner, and that both of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 for this indicator were corrected.</p> <p>The State provided the definition of disproportionate representation.</p>	<p>identification, i.e., that the identified districts were not in compliance with all of the child find, evaluation and eligibility requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311.</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 special education and related services 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 Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>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</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 95.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 94 of its findings of noncompliance identified in 2009 based on data from FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that 88 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>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 initial evaluation requirements 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 on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, 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 §300.301(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</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance 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's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 99.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 99.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that both of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 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 2009 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 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 on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, 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>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<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>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 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>The State is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that all five of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner, and that the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 for this indicator was corrected.</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>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</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>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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>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 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 98.84%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 96.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 171 of 173 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that one of two remaining findings subsequently was corrected by February 1, 2010. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that two of three findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>The State reported that the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was not corrected. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported on the actions it has taken to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance, identified in FFY 2008, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e); and OSEP Memo 09-02.</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 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>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007, the remaining finding identified in FFY 2006, and the remaining finding identified in FFY</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>2005, that were not reported as corrected in the FFY 2008 APR were corrected.</p> <p>The State's failure to correct longstanding noncompliance raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the State's general supervision system. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2009 APR, that it has corrected this noncompliance.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 4A, 10, 11, and 12 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 revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 90.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2009 APR, demonstrating that the State 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</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on seven due process hearings. The State met its FFY 2008 target of</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>100%.</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's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 69.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 22.2%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 67.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 73.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 70.6%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 70%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 95.5%. The State met its FFY 2008 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).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>