

Connecticut Part B FFY 2009 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Rather than reporting the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the State utilized its IDEA section 618 data. The State provided a detailed progress report in its APR on the status of implementing a data collection system that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with 34 CFR §200.19.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 81%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 79.4%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 75% for this indicator.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> |
| <p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 4.1%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 3.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 4.0%.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: 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. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 34.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 12.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 60%.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement</p> |

Connecticut Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|---|---|
| <p>with IEPs. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.1% for reading and 98.5% for math on the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT). The State met its FFY 2009 targets of 95% on the CMT.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 91.1% for reading and 90.8% for math on the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT). These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 92.6% for reading and 92.8% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 targets of 95% on the CAPT.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> | <p>in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 47.8% for reading and 58.9% for math on the CMT. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 28.3% for reading and 40.3% for math on the CMT. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 targets of 79.0% for reading and 82.0% for math on the CMT.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 45.0% for reading and 37.6% for math on the CAPT. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 33.3% for reading and 28.9% for math on the CAPT. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 targets of 81.0% for reading and 80.0% for math on the CAPT.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| <p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: 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>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 14.71%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 18.24%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 20%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEAs’ policies, procedures, and practices relating</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p> |

Connecticut Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>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 based on FFY 2008 data. The State did not identify any noncompliance through this review.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 based on FFY 2007 data through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected.</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 provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that four districts were 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 also reported that no districts were 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 its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State’s methodology for identifying “significant discrepancy” and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</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</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1414 1593 1518"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | <u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u> | <u>Progress</u> | | | | | | <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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| | <u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u> | <u>Progress</u> | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Connecticut Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | | | | | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|---|
| <p>placements. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</p> | <p>69.9</p> | <p>70.4</p> | <p>70.0</p> | <p>0.50%</p> | |
| | <p>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</p> | <p>5.49</p> | <p>5.4</p> | <p>6.0</p> | <p>0.09%</p> | |
| | <p>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</p> | <p>7.0</p> | <p>7.2</p> | <p>6.0</p> | <p>-0.20%</p> | |
| <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> | <p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR.</p> | | | | | <p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| <p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State revised the targets for FFY 2010 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</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 2010</p> |

Connecticut Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|------|------|----|--|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|------|------|------|--|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|--|
| <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 315 1593 1328"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center">58.3</td> <td align="center">54.3</td> <td align="center">56</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center">61.7</td> <td align="center">63.8</td> <td align="center">59.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center">50.5</td> <td align="center">50.7</td> <td align="center">48.0</td> </tr> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2008 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td align="center">54.2</td> <td align="center">55.5</td> <td align="center">52.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td align="center">33.0</td> <td align="center">33.9</td> <td align="center">31.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td align="center">26.5</td> <td align="center">26.1</td> <td align="center">24.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.</p> | <u>Summary Statement 1</u> | <u>FFY 2008 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Target</u> | Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%) | 58.3 | 54.3 | 56 | Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%) | 61.7 | 63.8 | 59.0 | Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%) | 50.5 | 50.7 | 48.0 | <u>Summary Statement 2</u> | <u>FFY 2008 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Target</u> | Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%) | 54.2 | 55.5 | 52.0 | Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%) | 33.0 | 33.9 | 31.0 | Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%) | 26.5 | 26.1 | 24.0 | <p>APR, due February 1, 2012. The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR.</p> |
| <u>Summary Statement 1</u> | <u>FFY 2008 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Target</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%) | 58.3 | 54.3 | 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%) | 61.7 | 63.8 | 59.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%) | 50.5 | 50.7 | 48.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>Summary Statement 2</u> | <u>FFY 2008 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Data</u> | <u>FFY 2009 Target</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%) | 54.2 | 55.5 | 52.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%) | 33.0 | 33.9 | 31.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%) | 26.5 | 26.1 | 24.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Connecticut Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|--|---|
| <p>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>stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 88.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 87.5%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 88%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2009 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p> | <p>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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 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 its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 1.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 1.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that 35 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that three 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 reported that all six of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating compliance.</p> <p>Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009 (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 2010 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2009 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in</p> |

Connecticut Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>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 Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> |

Connecticut Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|--|--|
| <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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 97.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 70 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 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</p> |

Connecticut Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|--|---|
| | | timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. |
| <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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 99.9%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</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</p> | <p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 77.8%.</p> | <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State 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 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must</p> |

Connecticut Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|---|--|
| <p>of majority. [Compliance Indicator]</p> | | <p>report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported 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 2010 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</p> | <p>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 46.3% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 61.2% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 78.7% 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>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |

Connecticut Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|---|--|
| <p>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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98.93%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 98.84%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100% for this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that 649 of 656 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the seven remaining findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2011.</p> <p>The State reported that the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005, FFY 2006, and FFY 2007 is the same finding of noncompliance that was originally identified in FFY 2005. The State reported that this one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was not corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> | <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 that was not reported as corrected in the FFY 2009 APR was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 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>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA 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</p> |

Connecticut Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|--|---|
| | | <p>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 2010 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 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 10, 11, and 13 in the FFY 2010 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 97.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 90.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> |
| <p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 88.9%. These data are based</p> | <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to</p> |

Connecticut Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|---|--|
| <p>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>on eight due process hearings. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> | <p>ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, demonstrating that the State 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 79.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 69.4%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 67.6%.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> |
| <p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 66.7%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 73.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 71%.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 95.24%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 95%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p> |

Connecticut Part B FFY 2009 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 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> |