




Connecticut State Department of Education
Division of Family and Student Support Services
Bureau of Special Education



Connecticut *Part B*



STATE *Performance* PLAN

December
2005



Revised
February
2012




Table of Contents

Overview of State Performance Plan Development

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Broad Input from Stakeholders | i |
| Public Dissemination | i-ii |
| Continuous Improvement Visit | ii-iv |

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

| | |
|---|-------|
| Indicator 1: Graduation | 1-6 |
| Indicator 2: Dropouts | 7-11 |
| Indicator 3: Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessments | 12-19 |
| Indicator 4A: Suspension and Expulsion | 20-26 |
| Indicator 4B: Suspension and Expulsion | 27-33 |
| Indicator 5: Removal from Regular Class | 34-41 |
| Indicator 6: Preschool Settings | 42-52 |
| Indicator 7: Preschool Social, Knowledge and Behavior Skills | 53-73 |
| Indicator 8: Parent Involvement | 74-80 |

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

| | |
|---|-------|
| Indicator 9: Districts with Disproportionate Representation in Special Education and Related Services | 81-88 |
| Indicator 10: Districts with Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories | 89-96 |

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B

| | |
|---|---------|
| Indicator 11: Evaluation Timeline | 97-102 |
| Indicator 12: IEPs Implemented at Age 3 | 103-106 |
| Indicator 13: IEP Goals and Transition Services | 107-114 |
| Indicator 14: Post-Graduation Data | 115-121 |
| Indicator 15: General Supervision | 122-131 |
| Indicator 16: Complaints | 132-135 |
| Indicator 17: Due Process Hearing Requests | 136-140 |
| Indicator 18: Resolution Session Agreements | 141-143 |
| Indicator 19: Mediation Agreements | 144-146 |
| Indicator 20: Timely and Accurate Reporting | 147-149 |

Table of Contents

Appendix

| | |
|------------------------------------|---------|
| CT Special Education Parent Survey | 150-153 |
| Parent Survey Sampling Plan | 154-158 |
| CT Special Education Exiter Survey | 159-162 |

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development

Updated February 2012

Broad Input from Stakeholders:

With the first submission of the State Performance Plan (SPP) in December 2005, the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) divided the 20 indicators into six categories for its SPP. In its updated revision of the SPP, the CSDE reorganized its workgroups to reflect ten groups. Each category was designated as a work group with at least one CSDE consultant facilitating each. The work groups are:

- General Supervision – Indicators 15
- Dispute Resolution – Indicators 16, 17, 18, 19
- Disproportionality and Evaluation Timelines – Indicators 9, 10, 11
- Data Reporting – Indicator 20
- Early Childhood – Indicators 6, 7, 12
- Parent Involvement – Indicator 8
- Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) – Indicator 5
- Academic Accomplishment – Indicator 3
- School Engagement and Completion – Indicators 1, 2, 4A, 4B
- Secondary Transition – Indicators 13, 14

Personnel from the CSDE continued to invite the members of the former Connecticut Continuous Improvement Planning Team (CIPT) via the stakeholder groups to participate in making recommendations for revisions to the SPP and analyzing data for reporting in the Annual Performance Report (APR). These stakeholder groups were culturally and geographically diverse and contained a wide range of expertise and views. Each work group also included an employee of the State Education Resource Center (SERC), our training and technical assistance center. Additionally, general education personnel from the CSDE who have expertise and perspective with a particular indicator were invited to join each work group. CSDE personnel then reviewed each work group composition to ensure that parents of students with disabilities, district representatives, other state agencies, higher education, State Advisory Council and Connecticut's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) were represented on the work groups. The consultant assigned as work group manager oversaw the annual work plan, progress toward completing activities and the evaluation of outcomes. Relevant stakeholders participated by reviewing previous action plans and making strategic recommendations for sustaining best practices, closing existing gaps, proposing targets and securing resources to ensure successful completion.

Public Dissemination

The updated SPP and APR will be posted in the Special Education section of the CSDE's Web site at <http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2626&q=322094> by May 2012. Written communication bringing attention to the revised SPP and APR will be provided to each local education agency (LEA) and to parent organizations including, but not limited to, the state's Parent Training and Information (PTI) Center, African and Caribbean American Parents of

Children with Disabilities (AFCAMP), ARC of Connecticut and Padres Abriendo Puertas (PAP), as well as institutions of higher education throughout the state that have educator preparation programs, the State Advisory Council (SAC), the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS), the Connecticut Birth to Three System, the Department of Children and Families (DCF), the Department of Developmental Services (formerly Department of Mental Retardation) and the Commission on Children.

The CSDE will report annually to the public on the performance of each local education agency located in the state on the targets in the SPP through the District Annual Performance Report, which will be posted on the CSDE's Web site in May 2012, and announced in the Bureau of Special Education's *Bureau Bulletin*. The updated SPP and subsequent APRs will be shared with the Connecticut State Board of Education.

OSEP Continuous Improvement Visit: Results Meeting

Background

The U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) conducted its Continuous Improvement Visit (CIV) with the CSDE in November 2011. A new component of the CIV is a results meeting in which OSEP personnel join with state personnel and stakeholders to discuss a state-selected topic and generate recommendations to enhance outcomes for students with disabilities.

Selection of Topic

To finalize the state-selected topic, the CSDE engaged a number of its stakeholders to ask which area(s) they would recommend the CSDE choose for the state-selected topic. The CSDE discussed this issue with its Focused Monitoring Steering Committee in May 2011 and with Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE) in June 2011. The CSDE also considered the 2010-11 priorities of the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC) as it considered a state-selected topic. Furthermore, the CSDE hosted two meetings for CSDE State Education Resource Center (SERC) staff in June 2011 to finalize the state-selected topic. Through this data-driven decision making process, the CSDE selected State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicator 1 – Graduation as its topic.

The CSDE recognized that this topic needed to be refined to a more focused discussion point. The CSDE, therefore, partnered with the Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC) in June-July 2011 in order to use NERRC's *Targeting Indicator Improvement* workshop to assist CSDE/SERC staff in refining the state-selected topic. Through this workshop, CSDE and SERC staff reviewed and analyzed graduation data under the new four-year cohort graduation rate to determine a focus for the state-selected topic. The workshop allowed participants to analyze the graduation rate of students with disabilities in Connecticut to uncover barriers that inhibit students' with disabilities graduation rate and formulate potential solutions to improve this graduation rate. At the end of this data-driven decision making process, the CSDE determined that it would focus the results meeting discussion on the graduation rate of students of color with disabilities. The CSDE's rationale for choosing this focus was based on current data that demonstrated black and Hispanic students are disproportionately under-represented in the

population of students with disabilities who are graduating from high school in 4 years with a standard high school diploma.

Results Meeting

After selecting and narrowing the topic for discussion at the results meeting, CSDE personnel worked collaboratively to identify stakeholders necessary to the conversation. Stakeholders at the November 9-10, 2011, results meeting included OSEP personnel; CSDE personnel who address graduation/drop out, secondary transition, career readiness and student support services; SERC personnel; representatives of other state agencies (i.e., the Department of Children and Families, the Department of Corrections, Court Support Services Division); members of the SPP Indicators 1, 2 stakeholder group; representatives from higher education; representatives from parent advocacy groups; members of the SAC; representatives from school districts; representatives from state commissions on race and ethnicity; and a student representative.

The two-day results meeting was structured after NERRC's *Targeting Indicator Improvement* workshop (with NERRC's permission). The results meeting was a separate meeting from the 2011 SPP Indicators 1, 2 stakeholder group meeting because this group was charged with looking at graduation data specific to students of color with disabilities in order to generate recommendations to improve the graduation rate of students of color with disabilities. Stakeholders worked through a two-day process that afforded the group an opportunity to review and make observations about the data; identify contributing factors as to why students of color with disabilities are disproportionately under-represented in the population of students with disabilities who are graduating from high school; identify barriers to improving the graduation rate of students of color with disabilities; identify statewide strengths that can be leveraged to improve the graduation rate; and through this process, generate a list of recommendations for consideration by the SPP Indicator 1, 2 stakeholder group and the CSDE as the CSDE prepared its 2012 Annual Performance Report (APR).

The following recommendations were generated by the Results Meeting stakeholders for consideration by the SPP Indicator 1, 2 stakeholder group and the CSDE:

1. Mandate more "time" at PPT meetings for meaningful discussions that develop student-centered and evidence based IEPs;
2. Require coursework in teacher preparation programs that moves from a content focus to a focus on attitudes and dispositions that impact prejudices;
3. Mandate culturally relevant pedagogy, practice and education to be embedded in all pre-service and post-service training linked to state funding (audience includes parents/families);
4. Provide significant financial and social rewards (along with decreased oversight by the state) for schools with students with disabilities who are performing at levels comparable to students in general education;

5. Build capacity of all education partners to engage in racial equity conversations that allow those partners to monitor and hold educators accountable for student outcomes;
6. Build a systemic process for assessing district needs and the effectiveness of current policies, procedures and practices to build capacity;
7. Legislate additional special education and “whole child” (e.g., social/emotional needs) pre-service training and ongoing post-service professional development through required yearly continued education credits (CEUs);
8. Redesign professional development to ensure that training matches the need of the individual teacher, school or district (i.e., data-based professional development);
9. Establish “common core standards” for teacher preparation programs; and
10. Set up an infrastructure of a two-way communication system to ensure the dissemination of best practices, services and programs.

Next Steps

1. Mail summary information and recommendations from the CIV to stakeholders outlined in improvement activity 1.16.
2. Recruit members from the Results portion of the CIV to be included in the stakeholder group outlined in improvement activity 1.16.
3. Convene stakeholder group in winter/spring 2012 to review graduation and dropout data, recommendations from the CIV and develop an action plan.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

| |
|---|
| Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE |
|---|

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

| |
|---|
| Measurement: States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. |
|---|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In 2005-2006 and subsequent years, the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) implemented a statewide register/unregister process for use with the Public School Information System (PSIS). This process allows the CSDE to utilize a single mechanism for collecting all students' exit data for general and special education students. Use of a single process for all public school systems will provide for increased accuracy, consistency and timeliness for reports relating to graduation and dropout information.

Graduation with a regular high school diploma is defined as receipt of Connecticut's approved state issued diploma. Graduation with a General Educational Development (GED) or a Certificate of Completion does not constitute graduation with a regular high school diploma. A minimum of twenty credits is required for graduation with a regular high school diploma, including no fewer than four of which shall be in English, not fewer than three in mathematics, not fewer than three in social studies, including at least a one-half credit course on civics and American government, not fewer than two in science, not fewer than one in the arts or vocational education and not fewer than one in physical education. In 2001, Connecticut General Statutes were revised to require that by September 1, 2002, each district had to specify basic skill levels necessary for graduation for classes graduating 2006 and later, and the district had to specify a process for assessing competency. This process needed to include, but could not be limited to, assessment on the statewide Grade 10 Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT). Districts were also required to create a course of study for students unsuccessful in meeting these competency requirements so they could reach a satisfactory level of competency before graduation. The same rules are applicable for youth with IEPs.

The formula for calculating graduation rates is: the number of students with disabilities who graduate with a regular high school diploma in a given year divided by the sum of the number of students with disabilities who graduated with a regular high school diploma plus the number of students with disabilities reported as having dropped out of school in the previous four reporting

cycles ($\frac{A}{B + C_4}$). This formula is used to calculate Connecticut graduation rates for both special education students and all students (general education and special education totals combined). In 2010, this graduation formula is expected to change for all students and special education students as the CSDE starts reporting a “graduation in the standard number of years” rate.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The 2004-2005 school year graduation rate for students with disabilities was 67.7 percent.

$$[3,390 \text{ 2004-05 graduates} / (3,390 \text{ 2004-05 graduates} + 294 \text{ 2004-05 12}^{\text{th}} \text{ grade dropouts} + 384 \text{ 2003-04 11}^{\text{th}} \text{ grade dropouts} + 494 \text{ 2002-03 10}^{\text{th}} \text{ grade dropouts} + 444 \text{ 2001-02 9}^{\text{th}} \text{ grade dropouts})] \times 100 = 67.7\% \left(\frac{3390}{3390 + 294 + 384 + 494 + 444} \right) \times 100 = 67.7 .$$

The CSDE all-student graduation rate was 91.2 percent for the same period.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The CSDE has seen a four-year increase in the graduation rate for students with disabilities, which resulted in a reduction of more than 20 percentage points in the existing gap between students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers, using the same graduation formula for both groups. Data are collected from a statewide data source. Sampling is not used. Data are valid and reliable.

In the 2004-05 school year, the CSDE reported for the first time district graduation rate data for both children with disabilities and their nondisabled peers in the Special Education Strategic School Profiles. This process of utilizing exiting data as a rate figure rather than a count of exiters (since 1989, Special Education Strategic School Profiles have included a count of exiters) has increased the visibility of the data, as well as the importance lent to it by local educational agencies. An additional measure has been to include a breakout of the graduation data by race and ethnicity.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 68.0% |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 69.0% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 72.0% |

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2008 (using 2007-2008 data) | 72.0% |
| 2009 (using 2008-2009 data) | 75.0% |
| 2010* (using 2009-2010 data) | 85.0% |
| 2011* (using 2010-2011 data) | 85.0% |
| 2012* (using 2011-2012 data) | 85.0% |

*Due to the new measurement requirement to align with the ESEA graduation rate, the targets for this indicator were revised.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| 1.5 Meet with State Education Resource Center (SERC) staff to discuss statewide and district-specific activities and training to address graduation and dropout. | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate a portion of IDEA funds awarded to SERC to provide professional development. • CSDE personnel • SERC personnel • CSPD Council • Plan statewide summit to target districts with low rates of student graduation • CALI • SRBI • PBIS |
| 1.6 Use the resources and technical assistance of the National Dropout Prevention Center. | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Dropout Prevention Center |
| 1.7 Assign a consultant from the Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and | July 2006 through | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Connecticut Department of Children |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Adult Education for dropout prevention and graduation for students with disabilities. This person will work with the Department and other state agencies to strengthen and promote interagency collaboration.</p> | <p>2013</p> | <p>and Families personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connecticut Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services personnel • Connecticut Department of Justice, Court Support Services Division • 12 targeted LEAs |
| <p>1.8 Disseminate data to all school districts via District Annual Performance Reports and the Strategic School Profiles. Data are available on the CSDE Web site.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| <p>1.9 Continue training through the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative’s (CALI) module titled <i>Improving School Climate to Support Student Achievement</i> to facilitate the reduction of suspensions/expulsions that affect graduation and dropout rates. The Department offers basic and certification training through our CALI professional development offerings. Certification training gives participants license to conduct basic training in order to develop state capacity.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Accountability and Improvement personnel • SERC personnel |
| <p>1.10 Monitoring from the Bureau of Accountability and Improvement to require inclusion of strategies to decrease suspension rates in districts where discipline and behavior are significant concerns, contributing to graduation and dropout issues.</p> | <p>2007-08 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel from the Bureau of Accountability and Improvement • Personnel from the Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation |
| <p>1.11 Explore components of school engagement model to be included in request for proposal (RFP) to develop demonstration programs aimed at increasing graduation rate and decreasing suspension, expulsion and dropout rates.</p> | <p>2007-08 school year through 2012</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel and IDEA and other funding sources |
| <p>1.12 Department will establish an intra-agency and interagency taskforce to address graduation, dropout, suspension and expulsion of students with and without disabilities.</p> | <p>2008-09 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Other state agency personnel • Representatives from local educational agencies (LEAs) and other stakeholder groups • In-school suspension guidelines |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|---|--|
| <p>1.13 The CSDE has identified the Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education to assume primary responsibility for dropout prevention services. An interagency taskforce will work with the Bureau and include representation from special education. The taskforce will implement the following recommendations from the CSDE report to the State Board of Education titled <i>A Review of Programs for Reducing the Dropout and Suspension Rates of Those Children At Risk of Dropping Out or Being Suspended from School</i>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct in depth analysis of dropout and suspension data among Connecticut’s School children; 2. Identify individuals in the state with expertise in dropout prevention and reach out to national consultant; 3. Complete and analysis of local programs in Connecticut to identify exemplary models; and 4. Promote the use of Scientific Research-based Intervention (SRBI) to identify youth at risk of dropping out of school. | <p>2008-09 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Representatives from Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) • Representatives from other state agencies • Representatives from other stakeholder groups |
| <p>1.14 The Connecticut proposals for secondary school reform will impact the graduation requirements. In addition to the IEP, the “Student Success Plan,” which includes features of the IEP and advisor-advisee programs, will be implemented to ensure that students with disabilities have appropriate post-secondary outcomes.</p> | <p>2008-09 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Public Act 10-111 |
| <p>1.15 In collaboration with the Governor’s P-20 Council, conduct a Dropout Prevention Summit.</p> | <p>Fall 2009</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Representatives from Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) • Representatives from other state agencies • Representatives from other shareholder groups • Grant Funds from America’s Promise |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|-----------------------|--|
| | | Alliance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant funds from State Farm Insurance • Re-allocated funds within CSDE |
| <p>1.16 (New) As a result of the OSEP Continuous Improvement Visit (CIV) in November 2011, the CSDE will engage stakeholders to develop an action plan and establish priority activities addressing graduation and dropout rates for black and Hispanic students with disabilities.</p> | 2011-2012 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Representatives from Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) • Representatives from other state agencies • Representatives from other stakeholder groups • SERC |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: States must report using the dropout data used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

A required statewide register/unregister process associated with the State's existing Public School Information System (PSIS) database was be piloted in the 2005-06 school year and is mandatory for all districts in the 2006-07 school year. This new process will allow the Department to collect all students' exit data, for both general and special education students, through one mechanism. This new system is anticipated to allow for the tracking of student movement within the State and will greatly affect the consistency and accuracy of state graduation and dropout information.

The dropout rate calculation for students with disabilities is consistent with the formula used for all Connecticut students. The formula is calculated by dividing the number of students with disabilities, in Grades 9-12, who dropped out in a given reporting year, by the total number of active students with disabilities, Grades 9-12 in the previous reporting year. Specifically, students who drop out are defined as: (1) 16-and 17-year-old students who notify the school of their intention to withdraw, with parental permission; (2) 18-year-old students who notify the school of their intention to withdraw; (3) students who enroll in a GED program; and (4) students who withdraw from the school, without notifying the district, and for whom no transfer information or transcript is requested by another school.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

In the 2004-05 school year, the dropout rate for students with disabilities was 5.6 percent.

$$(1,284 \text{ 2004-05 dropouts} / 22,763 \text{ students with disabilities} \\ \text{in Grades 9-12 in 2004-05}) \times 100 = 5.6\%$$

The Department all-student dropout rate was 1.7 percent for the same period.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The Department has seen a six-year decline in the dropout rate for students with disabilities, significantly reducing the existing gap between students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers, using the same dropout formula for both groups. Data are collected from a statewide data source. Sampling is not used. Data are valid and reliable.

In the 2004-05 school year, the Department reported for the first time district dropout rate data for both students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers in the Special Education Strategic School Profiles. This process of illuminating exiting data as a rate figure rather than a count of exiters (since 1989 Special Education Strategic School Profiles have included a count of exiters) has increased the visibility of the data as well as the attention paid to it by local agencies. Additionally, a breakout of the dropout data by race and ethnicity was included.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 5.5% |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 5.3% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 5.0% |
| 2008 (using 2007-2008 data) | 5.0% |
| 2009 (using 2008-2009 data) | 4.0% |
| 2010* (using 2009-2010 data) | 15.4% |
| 2011* (using 2010-2011 data) | 15.4% |
| 2012* (using 2011-2012 data) | 15.0% |

***Due to the new measurement requirement to align with the ESEA graduation rate, the targets for this indicator were revised.**

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|---|---|
| <p>2.5 Meet with State Education Resource Center (SERC) staff to discuss statewide and district-specific activities and training to address graduation and dropout.</p> | <p>2005-06 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate a portion of IDEA funds awarded to SERC to provide professional development. • CSDE personnel • SERC personnel • CSPD Council • Plan statewide summit to target districts with low rates of student graduation • CALI • SRBI • PBIS |
| <p>2.6 Use the resources and technical assistance of the National Dropout Prevention Center.</p> | <p>2005-06 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Dropout Prevention Center |
| <p>2.7 Assign a consultant from the Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education for dropout prevention and graduation for students with disabilities. This person will work with the Department and other state agencies to strengthen and promote interagency collaboration.</p> | <p>July 2006 through Fall 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Connecticut Department of Children and Families personnel • Connecticut Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services personnel • Connecticut Department of Justice, Court Support Services Division • 12 targeted LEAs |
| <p>2.8 Disseminate data to all school districts via District Annual Performance Reports and the Strategic School Profiles. Data are available on the CSDE Web site.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| <p>2.9 Continue training through the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative’s (CALI) module titled <i>Improving School Climate to Support Student Achievement</i> to facilitate the reduction of suspensions/expulsions that affect graduation and dropout rates. The Department offers basic and certification training through our CALI professional development offerings. Certification training gives participants license to</p> | <p>2006-07 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Accountability and Improvement personnel • SERC personnel |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| conduct basic training in order to develop state capacity. | | |
| 2.10 Monitoring from the Bureau of Accountability and Improvement to require inclusion of strategies to decrease suspension rates in districts where discipline and behavior are significant concerns, contributing to graduation and dropout issues. | 2007-08 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel from the Bureau of Accountability and Improvement • Personnel from the Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation |
| 2.11 Explore components of school engagement model to be included in request for proposal (RFP) to develop demonstration programs aimed at increasing graduation rate and decreasing suspension, expulsion and dropout rates. | 2007-08 school year through 2012 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel and IDEA and other funding sources |
| 2.12 Department will establish an intra-agency and interagency taskforce to address graduation, dropout, suspension and expulsion of students with and without disabilities. | 2008-09 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Other state agency personnel • Representatives from local educational agencies (LEAs) and other stakeholder groups • In-school suspension guidelines |
| <p>2.13 The CSDE has identified the Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education to assume primary responsibility for dropout prevention services. An interagency taskforce will work with the Bureau and include representation from special education. The taskforce will implement the following recommendations from the CSDE report to the State Board of Education titled <i>A Review of Programs for Reducing the Dropout and Suspension Rates of Those Children At Risk of Dropping Out or Being Suspended from School</i>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct in depth analysis of dropout and suspension data among Connecticut’s School children; 2. Identify individuals in the state with expertise in dropout prevention and reach out to national consultant; 3. Complete and analysis of local | 2008-09 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Representatives from Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) • Representatives from other state agencies • Representatives from other stakeholder groups |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|---|---|
| <p>programs in Connecticut to identify exemplary models; and</p> <p>4. Promote the use of Scientific Research-based Intervention (SRBI) to identify youth at risk of dropping out of school.</p> | | |
| <p>2.14 The Connecticut proposals for secondary school reform will impact the graduation requirements. In addition to the IEP, the “Student Success Plan,” which includes features of the IEP and advisor-advisee programs, will be implemented to ensure that students with disabilities have appropriate post-secondary outcomes.</p> | <p>2008-09 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Public Act 10-111 |
| <p>2.15 In collaboration with the Governor’s P-20 Council, conduct a Dropout Prevention Summit.</p> | <p>Fall 2009</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Representatives from LEAs • Representatives from other state agencies • Representatives from other shareholder groups • Grant Funds from America’s Promise Alliance • Grant funds from State Farm Insurance • Re-allocated funds within Department |
| <p>2.16 (New) As a result of the OSEP Continuous Improvement Visit (CIV) in November 2011, the CSDE will engage stakeholders to develop an action plan and establish priority activities addressing graduation and dropout rates for black and Hispanic students with disabilities.</p> | <p>2011-2012 school year</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Representatives from Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) • Representatives from other state agencies • Representatives from other stakeholder groups • SERC |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

| |
|---|
| Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE |
|---|

Indicator 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.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

| |
|---------------------|
| Measurement: |
|---------------------|

| |
|--|
| <p>A. AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size)] times 100.</p> |
|--|

| |
|---|
| <p>B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.</p> |
|---|

| |
|---|
| <p>C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)].</p> |
|---|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Department is redesigning the state's alternate assessment to reflect grade-level content in language arts (reading) and math for implementation in March 2006. Out-of-level testing was eliminated effective spring 2004. This effected the 2003-04 school year administration of the Grade 10 Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) and the 2004-05 school year administrations of the Grades 4, 6, and 8 Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT). Departmental activities included application of the principles of universal design to the Generation 4 tests in development as well as access to the general curriculum (including access to standard assessments) in all initiatives and trainings. Extensive professional development was offered in the areas of Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) (37 trainings), access to the general curriculum and effective instruction (56 trainings). The Department designed additional trainings during the 2004-05 school year around state assessments and improving student performance and holistic scoring, in addition to the ongoing CMT and CAPT workshops. Since 2006, the Department requires CMT/CAPT Skills Checklist Training for special education teachers that will be administering the CMT or CAPT Skills Checklist. Training is also provided to educators on assessment accommodations for the CMT and CAPT. Training is also conducted to school

personnel on making adequate yearly progress (AYP) for students with disabilities. This training is focused on those schools that have not made AYP for students with disabilities.

The Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI) contains the Department's professional development which is aligned to state standards and assessments. This is a state priority as it is aligned with Connecticut accountability legislation. Schools and districts that have not made AYP have access to these offerings. It is also required that districts in year 3 of not making AYP develop a data team structure, which includes district, school, grade and content level teams, as their accountability mechanism. Beginning in 2007-08, the Department monitors the data team structures within these districts.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

In the school year 2004 – 05:

3A: In Connecticut, 39.4 percent of districts met the state's AYP objectives for special education students for the CMT (Grades 4, 6, and 8) and 45.0 percent of districts met the state's AYP objectives for special education students for the CAPT (Grade 10).

3B: Average Participation Rate for students with disabilities = 97.1 percent

3C: Average Proficiency for students with disabilities = 35.0 percent

Discussion of Baseline Data:

3A: Forty-one of 104 districts in Connecticut (with at least 40 students with disabilities), or 39.4 percent of districts met the state's AYP objectives for special education students for the CMT (Grades 4, 6, & 8). Sixty-three districts did not meet the state's AYP objectives for special education students for the CMT (Grades 4, 6, and 8).

Eighteen of 40 districts in Connecticut (with at least 40 students with disabilities), or 45.0 percent of districts met the state's AYP objectives for special education students for the CAPT (Grade 10). Twenty-two districts did not meet the state's AYP objectives for special education students for the CAPT (Grade 10).

3B: a. = 21,541 students with IEPs
 b. = 19,638 students took the standard math assessment
 b. = 19,654 students took the standard reading assessment
 c. = 0
 d. = 0
 e. = 1,291 students took the alternate assessment

Unaccounted for students = 612 in math and 596 in reading.

These students were absent or exempt due to English Language Learner (ELL) status.

Math Participation: $(19,638 + 1291) / 21,541 \times 100 = 97.2\%$

Reading Participation: $(19,654 + 1291) / 21,541 \times 100 = 97.2\%$

3C: a. = 21,541 students with IEPs

- b. = 7,397 students took the standard math assessment
- b. = 6,159 students took the standard reading assessment
- c. = 0
- d. = 0
- e. = 659 students were proficient on the math alternate assessment
- e. = 861 students were proficient on the reading alternate assessment

Math Proficiency: $(7397 + 659) / 21,541 \times 100 = 37.4\%$
 Reading Proficiency: $(6159 + 861) / 21,541 \times 100 = 32.6\%$
 Average Proficiency for students with disabilities = 35.0%

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|--|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 3A: 35.0% | 3B: 95.0% | 3C: CMT reading = 68.0% CMT math = 74.0% CAPT reading = 72.0% CAPT math = 69.0% |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 3A: 37.5% | 3B: 96.0% | 3C: CMT reading = 68.0% CMT math = 74.0% CAPT reading = 72.0% CAPT math = 69.0% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 3A: 40.0% | 3B: 97.0% | 3C: CMT reading = 79.0% CMT math = 82.0% CAPT reading = 81.0% CAPT math = 80.0% |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 3A: 50.0% | 3B: 95.0% | 3C: CMT reading = 79.0% CMT math = 82.0% CAPT reading = 81.0% CAPT math = 80.0% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 3A: 60.0% | 3B: 95.0% | 3C: CMT reading = 79.0% CMT math = 82.0% CAPT reading = 81.0% CAPT math = 80.0% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 3A: 70.0% | 3B: 95.0% | 3C: CMT reading = 89.0% CMT math = 91.0% CAPT reading = 91.0% CAPT math = 90.0% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 3A: 70.0% | 3B: 95.0% | 3C: CMT reading = 89.0% CMT math = 91.0% CAPT reading = 91.0% CAPT math = 90.0% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 3A: 70.0% | 3B: 95.0% | 3C: CMT reading = 89.0% CMT math = 91.0% CAPT reading = 91.0% CAPT math = 90.0% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|---|---|
| <p>3.1 Provide Step by Step for Inclusive Schools © training to targeted districts and available statewide.</p> | <p>2005-06 school year</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SERC |
| <p>3.2 Coordinate Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) activities to support districts in academic achievement for all students. This coordination is to assist districts in understanding the uses of assessment data and its implication for instruction. This coordination will also address the purpose and relevance of assessments and their relationship to the curriculum and state standards.</p> | <p>July 2005 through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Special Education • Bureau of Accountability and Improvement |
| <p>3.3 Provide professional development activities statewide with a focus on special education, to better understand how to effectively instruct students with disabilities in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • co-teaching; • differentiated instruction; • educational benefit; • assistive technology; • standards based IEPs; and • bilingual education and ELL • Effective Teaching Strategies (CALI) <p>Trainings will include explicit relationships to students with disabilities, particularly those in more inclusive settings.</p> | <p>2010-11 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate a portion of IDEA and Title I funds to professional development providers. |
| <p>3.5 Provide targeted training to districts and schools that do not make adequate yearly progress or those that make Safe Harbor for the subgroup of students with disabilities to assist districts in targeting more students to make progress and to sustain progress made. This training will include school improvement planning, analyzing student CMT/CAPT data and its</p> | <p>2010-11 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training provided by the State Education Resource Center |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------------------|---|
| relationship with time with nondisabled peers, design standards-based instruction based on the student’s curricular areas of need, and assist districts with strategies to achieve AYP targets for this subgroup. | | |
| 3.6 Mandate Certified Rater Training for all special education teachers who administer the CMT/CAPT skills checklist. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Student Assessment |
| <p>3.7 (Revised) Offer training opportunities for use by targeted schools not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) for students with disabilities, especially for those students who are increasing their time in regular classrooms. Components of the training will include three redesigned CALI modules: School and Instructional Data Teams, and Using Differentiated Instruction to Implement the Common Core State Standards, and Getting Ready for the Next Generation of Assessments. Additionally components of co-teaching, Educational Benefit Review Process and excerpts from Step by Step[®].</p> <p>Offer Improving School Climate Basic and Certification training to help complete the connections between data analysis, school climate, assessment, differentiation of instruction to meet student academic and social-emotional needs.</p> | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Accountability and Improvement • Bureau of Teaching and Learning • Bureau of Student Assessment • Bureau of Special Education • SERC • RESCs |
| 3.8 Disseminate information and partner with Connecticut institutes of higher education to provide resources and essential components of CALI so that these concepts can be integrated into teacher preparation programs. Continue providing training for district Boards of Education to focus their efforts on the deliberative decision making process in light of student achievement and accountability around district improvement plans. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Accountability and Improvement • Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) |
| 3.9 Collaborate with transition initiatives to ensure that transition goals and objectives are in alignment with the revision of | 2006-07 school year through | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Stakeholder groups, including the Interagency Transition Task |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| curriculum frameworks and standards. | 2011 | Force |
| 3.10 Disseminate data to all school districts via District Annual Performance Reports and the Strategic School Profiles. Data are available on the Department website. | 2006-07 school year through 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 3.11 Evaluate prior training activities to determine future technical assistance to school districts not making adequate yearly progress. | 2006-07 school year through 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Accountability and Improvement • SERC • RESC • IHE |
| 3.12 The CSDE will continue to provide statewide training on SRBI. Further development of CSDE content experts who are trainers of SRBI will occur. The CSDE will use the document <i>Addressing the Needs of the Whole Child: A Connecticut Framework for Academic Achievement, Social, Emotional, Behavioral, Mental and Physical Health</i> to develop training for CSDE staff in order to assist in developing and implementing evidence-based interventions that address non-academic barriers to educational achievement. This document complements and expands upon the existing recommendations cited in <i>Using Scientific Research-Based Interventions: Improving Education for all Students, Connecticut’s Framework for RtI</i> . | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSDE personnel • Division of Family and Student Support Services • SERC/RESC Alliance |
| 3.13 Continue to implement legislation enacted in 2007 that focuses on school and district improvement relative to increased outcomes for all students. This law gives authority to the Department to conduct school and district assessments and monitor district improvement plans for those schools and districts that are in year 3 of not making adequate yearly progress under NCLB. | 2007-08 school year through 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Accountability and Improvement |
| 3.14 Provide assistance with the implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and crosswalk documents to assist with the transition between CCSS and CT Frameworks. This will include what changes are needed to | 2011-12 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Teaching and Learning • SERC/RESC Alliance |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|---|---|
| <p>certain grade level expectations and the intent of those changes for teaching and learning. Training to include how staff informs parents of the curriculum, how to access it, who the district contact is, and any other written material available to parents or the community regarding a district’s curriculum.</p> | | |
| <p>3.15 Provide training on assessment accommodations for the CMT/CAPT and the MAS to include alignment with students’ special education programs and instruction, to ensure that administration of these assessments is consistent with state testing procedures, and to identify and select appropriate accommodations and assessment.</p> | <p>2010-11 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Student Assessment • Bureau of Special Education |
| <p>3.16 Develop math and reading benchmark assessments that would be available in the fall, winter and spring of grades 3 through 8 for educators to use with students. The assessments cover, at minimum, the math grade level expectations (GLEs) and the reading sub-strands of the CMT. The Connecticut benchmark assessments are computer-based, using the Measurement Incorporated Secure Test. Volunteer districts provide feedback about the system with the anticipated statewide launch date of fall 2009.</p> | <p>2007-08 school year through 2010</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Teaching and Learning • Bureau of Student Assessment |
| <p>3.17 Revise Connecticut curriculum frameworks and standards to make them more user-friendly to teachers.</p> | <p>2007-08 school year through 2011</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| <p>3.18 Conduct targeted monitoring and support for districts not making progress in meeting its AYP targets for students with disabilities. This is to be done either through the Focused Monitoring System, SPP indicator 3, or through other components of the Bureau’s General Supervision System. Support will be identified through the monitoring of districts to outline their needs in address</p> | <p>2011-12 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Special Education |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|---|---|
| students with disabilities meeting proficiency on the CMT and CAPT. | | |
| 3.19 Develop training and materials for families to assist with understanding school or district improvement planning, understanding CMT/CAPT reports, the SRBI Framework, and IEP goals and objectives aligned with the general education curriculum. | 2009-10 school year, annually as needed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Personnel • Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

| |
|---|
| Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE |
|---|

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year) divided by the (# of districts in the state)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity) divided by the (# of districts in the state)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Department consultants from the Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation and the Bureau of Special Education met to review suspension and expulsion data. The areas of suspension and expulsion reviewed included: special education out-of-school suspensions, special education overall (in- and out-of-school) suspension rates, and a calculated difference score between the overall suspension rates of students with disabilities and that of their nondisabled peers. Districts were ranked on these three indicators. A cut score for data of concern was established. Finally, districts were identified as belonging to one of three groups: districts with data below the state average, districts with data between the state average and the established cut score, and districts with data above the established cut score for suspension and expulsion rates of concern. Districts with atypical suspension and expulsion data (two or more indicators with data above the state established cut score) were notified in early spring 2005 and required to review their data and explain the patterns in the data.

The 2004-05 analysis discussed here using the 2003-04 school year suspension and expulsion data represents the establishment of a baseline for future comparison. The Department has been working diligently to clarify and consolidate the collection of suspension and expulsion data.

During the 2004-05 school year the Department conducted a number of activities to address inappropriate use of suspension and expulsion. Technical assistance was provided to districts based upon the recommendation of the Continuous Improvement Partnership Team (CIPT).

During the 2003-04 school year, the Department published in the Special Education Strategic School Profiles suspension and expulsion information (2002-03 data) for each district. District counts and rates were illuminated for in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions and expulsion data for both general and special education students. Statewide data were included for comparison. This new public display of data drew attention to the disproportionate suspension of students with disabilities within a district as well as across districts.

In response to the FFY 2003 Annual Performance Report letter dated October 18, 2005, the Department will communicate with superintendents of LEAs about disproportionately suspending students with disabilities and for having a high rate of suspending students with disabilities. District personnel will be asked to review and revise policies, procedures and practices related to development of IEPs, use of behavioral interventions and procedural safeguards. District personnel will report to the Department on a review of policies, procedures and practices, and the development of a plan to reduce the rate of suspensions. Targeted assistance and training will then be provided by the Department. The Department will report on these interventions in the 2007 APR.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Sampling is not used. Data are valid and reliable.

4A. Thirty-six districts or 21.3 percent of the districts in Connecticut demonstrate a significant discrepancy for the suspension and expulsion of students with disabilities based on 2004-05 school year data.

$(36/169 \times 100 = 21.3\%)$

4B. Baseline Data for FFY 2009 can be found in the Optional Template for Indicator 4B

Discussion of Baseline Data:

4A. In order to address Indicator 4A, the Department calculated the greater than 10-day suspension and expulsion rates for each district for special education. The Department set a cut score of greater than 2 percent and determined which districts had a greater than 10-day suspension rate for students with disabilities. **Connecticut does not use a minimum “n” size for this analysis, and no districts were excluded from the calculation.** Thirty-six districts or 21.3 percent of the districts in Connecticut reported a suspension and expulsion rate of students with disabilities greater than 2 percent based on 2004-05 school year data.

Due to the data collection practices within the Department associated with the collection of suspension and expulsion data, it is not anticipated that these data will be reported within federal timelines (November 1 – Table 5; February 1 APR/SPP) for the foreseeable future. Currently, it is Department policy to open the discipline data collection in mid-July and allow reporting through late October. This timeline allows the Department to conduct multiple validation checks and align the discipline file with the state’s Public School Information System (PSIS) and assessment data collection files. The Department will be meeting in spring 2007 to discuss how and when it will be possible to convert the discipline data collection to an online system linked directly to PSIS

and enable collection in a manner that facilitates timely reporting of suspension and expulsion data.

Due to our data collection timelines, the 2004-05 school year suspension and expulsion data will be used as a data point to select districts for focused monitoring for the 2006-07 school year. Four data probes will be used: unique out-of-school suspension and expulsion rates for general education students; unique out-of-school suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities; difference between unique out-of-school suspension and expulsion rates for general and special education students; and greater than 10-days out-of-school suspension and expulsion rate for students with disabilities.

4B. See Optional Template for Indicator 4B

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 4A: 30.0% | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 4A: 30.0% | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 4A: 25.0% | |
| 2008 (using 2007-2008 data) | 4A: 25.0% | |
| 2009 (using 2008-2009 data) | 4A: 20.0% | 4B: 0% |
| 2010 (using 2009-2010 data) | 4A: 20.0% | 4B: 0% |
| 2011 (using 2010-2011 data) | 4A: 15% | 4B: 0% |
| 2012 (using 2011-2012 data) | 4A: 10% | 4B: 0% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| <p>4.1 Provide professional development activities statewide on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Behavior Supports: A Systems Approach to Effective School-wide Management; and • Challenging Behaviors: A Series of Three Workshops | 2005-06 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statewide training provided by SERC |
| <p>4.2 Disseminate state color-coded maps representing suspension/expulsion rates for students with disabilities.</p> | 2005-06 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel to design and disseminate the maps • Department website |
| <p>4.3 Include in bureau information to school district personnel current research on alternatives to suspension and expulsion.</p> | September 2006 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel to review research and develop update to district personnel |
| <p>4.4 Use suspension and expulsion data as a data point to select districts for focused monitoring.</p> | 2005-06 and 2007-08 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel and focused monitoring procedures |
| <p>4.5 Conduct statewide summit on dropout prevention, graduation and alternatives to suspension; incorporate into three-day consortium.</p> | 2006-07 and 2007-08 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • Allocate a portion of IDEA funds awarded to SERC for summit activities |
| <p>4.6 (Revised) Meet with the SERC, Regional Education Resource Centers (RESC) and University of Connecticut (UConn) staff to discuss statewide and district-specific activities and training to address rates of suspension and expulsion.</p> | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate a portion of IDEA funds awarded to SERC to provide professional development activities • Department personnel • SRBI • PBIS • CALI • UConn • SERC personnel • RESCs |
| <p>4.7 Provide targeted training to individual districts on positive behavior intervention and supports (PBIS).</p> | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District and school-wide training provided by SERC |
| <p>4.8 Assign a consultant from the Bureau of Health/Nutrition, family Services and Adult Education for suspension and expulsion for students with disabilities. This person will work with the Department and other state agencies to strengthen and</p> | July 2005 through fall 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| promote interagency collaboration. | | |
| 4.9 Disseminate data to all school districts via District Annual Performance Reports and the Strategic School Profiles. Data are available on the Department Web site. | 2006-07 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • CEDaR |
| 4.10 Use the resources and technical assistance of The Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports |
| 4.11 Identify and disseminate information regarding model programs and best practices in the area of reducing suspension and expulsion. | April 2006 through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 4.12 Explore components of school engagement model to be included in request for proposal (RFP) to develop demonstration programs aimed at increasing graduation rate and decreasing suspension, expulsion and dropout rates. | 2007-08 school year through 2012 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel and IDEA and other funding sources |
| 4.13 Monitoring from the Bureau of Accountability and Improvement to require inclusion of strategies to decrease suspension rates in districts where discipline and behavior are significant concerns, contributing to graduation and dropout issues. | 2007-08 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel from the Bureau of Accountability and Improvement • Personnel from the Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation |
| <p>4.14 The Department has identified the Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education to assume primary responsibility for dropout prevention services. An interagency taskforce will work with the Bureau and include representation from special education. The taskforce will implement the following recommendations from the Department report to the State Board of Education titled A Review of Programs for Reducing the Dropout and Suspension Rates of Those Children At Risk of Dropping Out or Being Suspended from School:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct in depth analysis of dropout and suspension data among | 2008-09 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Representatives from LEAs • Representatives from other state agencies • Representatives from stakeholders groups |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Connecticut’s School children;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Identify individuals in the state with expertise in dropout prevention and reach out to national consultant; 3. Complete an analysis of local programs in Connecticut to identify exemplary models; and 4. Promote the use of Scientific Research-based Intervention (SRBI) to identify youth at risk of dropping out of school. | | |
| <p>4.15 Continue training through the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative’s (CALI) module entitled Improving School Climate to Support Student Achievement to facilitate the reduction of suspensions/expulsion that impact graduation and dropout rates. The Department offers basic and certification training through our Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI) professional development offerings. Certification training gives participants license to conduct basic training in order to develop state capacity.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Accountability and Improvement • SERC personnel |
| <p>4.16 The CSDE to release official guidance to districts regarding in-school and out-of-school suspensions as passed via state legislation to be effective July 1, 2010. The CSDE will provide regional training for all districts on implementation of in-school suspension guidelines.</p> | <p>2008-09 school year through 2011</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| <p>4.17 Department will establish an intra-agency and inter-agency taskforce to address graduation, dropout, suspension and expulsion of students with and without disabilities.</p> | <p>2008-09 school year through 2011</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Other state agency personnel • Representatives from Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and other stakeholder groups • In-school suspension guidelines |
| <p>4.18 Design and implementation of new Web-based Suspension and Expulsion Data Collection System (ED 166).</p> | <p>2009-2010</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| <p>4.19 Department personnel will provide integrated data systems training to LEA</p> | <p>2009-10 through 2011</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SEDAC |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------------------|---|
| data managers. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public School Information System (PSIS) • ED 166 |
| 4.20 Implementation of a new SPP Indicator 4 District Suspension/Expulsion Self-Assessment. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 4.21 Training for Cultural Responsive Education through the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative’s (CALI) module, which is designed to improve culturally responsive schools, teachers, classrooms and parent engagement to support student achievement and to facilitate the reduction of suspensions/expulsion. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSDE Personnel • Bureau of Accountability and Improvement • Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

| |
|---|
| Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE |
|---|

Indicator 4B: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

| |
|---------------------|
| Measurement: |
|---------------------|

| |
|---|
| Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of 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) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100. |
|---|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The CSDE analyzed district suspension and expulsion data submitted electronically through the ED166 Discipline data system. CSDE consultants from the Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation, Division of Family and Student Support Services and the Bureau of Special Education reviewed suspension and expulsion data and the process for addressing districts with a significant discrepancy. Starting in FFY 2010, significant discrepancy is defined as: Greater than 2% of students with disabilities in a district suspended or expelled out-of-school (OSS) for any serious offense for a cumulative total of greater than ten days in a school year by race.

Definition of Significant Discrepancy and Methodology

Starting in FFY 2010, the State's comparison methodology compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State. Recently the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) directed the CSDE to change our calculation for SPP Indicator 4B. In Connecticut, significant discrepancy for Indicator 4B is now defined as follows: Greater than 2% of students with disabilities in a district suspended or expelled out-of-school (OSS) for any serious offense for a cumulative total of greater than ten days in a school year by race.

We established a state ratio bar of 2% in order to compare suspension rates among districts. We then calculated a suspension rate for each race/ethnicity in each district for students with disabilities and compared those rates to the established state ratio bar of 2%. Any calculated rate by race/ethnicity greater than 2.0% qualified as a significant discrepancy.

Connecticut applied a minimum “n” size requirement in the calculation of significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension and expulsion for greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs:

- minimum of 5 students with disabilities in the district were suspended/expelled for > 10 days (Rule A)
- minimum of 10 students with disabilities in the district in each race category (Rule B)

Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (using 2008-2009 data):

4B. In the 2008-09 school year, zero districts in Connecticut had a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year and had policies, procedures or practices that contributed 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. Target met.

$0/170 \times 100 = 0.0\%$

Data are federally required Section 618 data. Data are not obtained from sampling. Data are valid and reliable as verified by the series of validation checks built into the collection system.

For this indicator, report baseline data for the year before the reporting year (FFY 2008 data).

| |
|----|
| 0% |
|----|

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The CSDE analyzed district suspension and expulsion data submitted electronically through the ED 166 Discipline data system. CSDE consultants from the Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation, the Bureau of Special Education, and the Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education met to review suspension and expulsion data and the process for addressing districts with a significant discrepancy. In this baseline year, four districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy (RRI >2.0) in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs by race or ethnicity.

4B(a). LEAs with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates of Suspension and Expulsion:

| Year | Total Number of LEAs (that meet “n” size requirement) | Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies by Race or Ethnicity | Percent |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---------|
| FFY 2009 (using 2008-2009 data) | 170 | 4 | 2.35% |

4B(b). LEAs with Significant Discrepancy, by Race or Ethnicity, in Rates of Suspensions and Expulsions; and 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.

| Year | Total Number of LEAs (that meet “n” size requirement) | Number of LEAs that have Significant Discrepancies, by Race or Ethnicity, and 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. | Percent |
|---------------------------------|---|--|---------|
| FFY 2009 (using 2008-2009 data) | 170 | 0 | 0.00% |

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2009 using 2008-2009 data): *If any LEAs are identified with significant discrepancies:*

The CSDE contacted the four districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs by race or ethnicity. The CSDE conducted the review outlined in 34 C.F.R. Section 300.170(b) by requiring districts to provide additional data and information to the CSDE through a self-assessment. The completed self-assessment addressed the district’s policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. CSDE staff reviewed the self-assessments through a desk audit and clarified any self-assessment responses with individual districts.

Additionally, if appropriate, the CSDE required the district to revise its 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 that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA. Upon completion of the desk audit, the CSDE determined that each of the four districts had policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards that were in compliance with the regulatory requirements. The CSDE completed the review of the four identified districts and there were no districts that had significant discrepancies due to inappropriate policies, procedures or practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2009 (using 2008-2009 data) | 0% |
| 2010 (using 2009-2010 data) | 0% |
| 2011 (using 2010-2011 data) | 0% |
| 2012 (using 2011-2012 data) | 0% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|---------------------------------|--|
| <p>4.1 Provide professional development activities statewide on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Behavior Supports: A Systems Approach to Effective School-wide Management; and • Challenging Behaviors: A Series of Three Workshops | 2005-06 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statewide training provided by SERC |
| <p>4.2 Disseminate state color-coded maps representing suspension/expulsion rates for students with disabilities.</p> | 2005-06 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel to design and disseminate the maps • Department website |
| <p>4.3 Include in bureau information to school district personnel current research on alternatives to suspension and expulsion.</p> | September 2006 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel to review research and develop update to district personnel |
| <p>4.4 Use suspension and expulsion data as a data point to select districts for focused monitoring.</p> | 2005-06 and 2007-08 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel and focused monitoring procedures |
| <p>4.5 Conduct statewide summit on dropout prevention, graduation and alternatives to suspension; incorporate into three-day consortium.</p> | 2006-07 and 2007-08 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • Allocate a portion of IDEA funds awarded to SERC for summit activities |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|---|---|
| <p>4.6 (Revised) Meet with the SERC, Regional Education Resource Centers (RESC) and University of Connecticut (UConn) staff to discuss statewide and district-specific activities and training to address rates of suspension and expulsion.</p> | <p>2005-06 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate a portion of IDEA funds awarded to SERC to provide professional development activities • Department personnel • SRBI • PBIS • CALI • UConn • SERC personnel • RESCs |
| <p>4.7 Provide targeted training to individual districts on positive behavior intervention and supports (PBIS).</p> | <p>2005-06 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District and school-wide training provided by SERC |
| <p>4.8 Assign a consultant from the Bureau of Health/Nutrition, family Services and Adult Education for suspension and expulsion for students with disabilities. This person will work with the Department and other state agencies to strengthen and promote interagency collaboration.</p> | <p>July 2005 through fall 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| <p>4.9 Disseminate data to all school districts via District Annual Performance Reports and the Strategic School Profiles. Data are available on the Department Web site.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • CEDaR |
| <p>4.10 Use the resources and technical assistance of The Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports.</p> | <p>2005-06 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports |
| <p>4.11 Identify and disseminate information regarding model programs and best practices in the area of reducing suspension and expulsion.</p> | <p>April 2006 through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| <p>4.12 Explore components of school engagement model to be included in request for proposal (RFP) to develop demonstration programs aimed at increasing graduation rate and decreasing suspension, expulsion and dropout rates.</p> | <p>2007-08 school year through 2012</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel and IDEA and other funding sources |
| <p>4.13 Monitoring from the Bureau of Accountability and Improvement to require inclusion of strategies to decrease suspension rates in districts where discipline and behavior</p> | <p>2007-08 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel from the Bureau of Accountability and Improvement • Personnel from the Bureau of Data |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| are significant concerns, contributing to graduation and dropout issues. | | Collection, Research and Evaluation |
| <p>4.14 The Department has identified the Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education to assume primary responsibility for dropout prevention services. An interagency taskforce will work with the Bureau and include representation from special education. The taskforce will implement the following recommendations from the Department report to the State Board of Education titled A Review of Programs for Reducing the Dropout and Suspension Rates of Those Children At Risk of Dropping Out or Being Suspended from School:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct in depth analysis of dropout and suspension data among Connecticut’s School children; 2. Identify individuals in the state with expertise in dropout prevention and reach out to national consultant; 3. Complete an analysis of local programs in Connecticut to identify exemplary models; and 4. Promote the use of Scientific Research-based Intervention (SRBI) to identify youth at risk of dropping out of school. | 2008-09 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Representatives from LEAs • Representatives from other state agencies • Representatives from stakeholders groups |
| <p>4.15 Continue training through the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative’s (CALI) module entitled Improving School Climate to Support Student Achievement to facilitate the reduction of suspensions/expulsion that impact graduation and dropout rates. The Department offers basic and certification training through our Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI) professional development offerings. Certification training gives participants license to conduct basic training in order to develop state capacity.</p> | 2006-07 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Accountability and Improvement • SERC personnel |
| <p>4.16 The CSDE to release official guidance to districts regarding in-school and out-of-school suspensions as passed via state legislation to be</p> | 2008-09 school year through 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| effective July 1, 2010. The CSDE will provide regional training for all districts on implementation of in-school suspension guidelines. | | |
| 4.17 Department will establish an intra-agency and inter-agency taskforce to address graduation, dropout, suspension and expulsion of students with and without disabilities. | 2008-09 school year through 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Other state agency personnel • Representatives from Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and other stakeholder groups • In-school suspension guidelines |
| 4.18 Design and implementation of new Web-based Suspension and Expulsion Data Collection System (ED 166). | 2009-2010 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 4.19 Department personnel will provide integrated data systems training to LEA data managers. | 2009-10 through 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SEDAC • Public School Information System (PSIS) • ED 166 |
| 4.20 Implementation of a new SPP Indicator 4 District Suspension/Expulsion Self-Assessment. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 4.21 Training for Cultural Responsive Education through the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative’s (CALI) module, which is designed to improve culturally responsive schools, teachers, classrooms and parent engagement to support student achievement and to facilitate the reduction of suspensions/expulsion. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSDE Personnel • Bureau of Accountability and Improvement • Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In the 2004-05 school year, 169 school districts in Connecticut provided special education and related services to 65,050 children with disabilities ages 6 - 21. This represents 11.4 percent of the total school population of children ages 6-21. The overwhelming majority of children, 93.9 percent, are educated in public schools, in either the LEA in which they live or another LEA.

Given the very small and rural nature of many of Connecticut’s school districts, a Regional Educational Service Center (RESC) network, along with private special education schools, are available to the 169 public schools to provide services and educational programs to students. The Department of Corrections, the Department of Children and Families and the Connecticut Technical High School System each operate a public school district for students in their jurisdiction as defined by Connecticut state law. These students are not reported by any other school district identified in this report.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

For the school year 2004 – 05:

5A. The percentage of students with disabilities aged 6 - 21 removed from regular class less than 21 percent of the day was 60.7 percent $(39,480 / 65,052) \times 100 = 60.7\%$

5B. The percentage of students with disabilities aged 6 through 21 removed from regular class greater than 60 percent of the day was 10.3 percent $(6,687 / 65,052) \times 100 = 10.3\%$

5C. The percentage of students with disabilities aged 6 - 21 served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements was 6.1 percent $(3,999 / 65,052) \times 100 = 6.1\%$

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data indicate a continuous increase for Indicator 5A and a continuous decrease for Indicator 5B for the past three years. Indicator 5C has decreased from the 2002-03 school year. Due to data trends moving in the appropriate direction, many of the interventions previously used that have contributed to achieving these data outcomes will continue (see improvement activities section that follows).

Annually, LEAs in Connecticut report to the Department the number of hours that students receiving special education and related services spend in school in any given week, along with the number of nondisabled peer hours per week. Nondisabled peer hours are determined by counting the number of hours a student spends with his or her nondisabled peers, including both special education and non-special education hours. This information is recorded on the IEP and submitted on December 1 of the school year. The Department calculates what proportion of time each student spends with nondisabled peers per week by dividing the number of nondisabled peer hours by the total school hours and multiplying by 100. Using this calculation, every student with an IEP is assigned a code to represent one of the three federal categories for educational environment of children with disabilities: removed from the regular class less than 21 percent of the day; removed from the regular class at least 21 percent of the day but no more than 60 percent of the day; and removed from the regular class greater than 60 percent of the day. The Department collects this information for every student with an IEP or service plan in the state. For the purposes of Part B Section 618 data reporting, students served in public or private separate schools, residential placements or homebound or hospital placements are not included in the educational environments categories. These students are considered in Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) data monitoring and auditing activities that examine LEAs' time with nondisabled peer data.

Disaggregation of Indicators 5A, 5B and 5C by age, disability type and location of service may be useful for further development of interventions. Additionally, stakeholders suggest that accuracy of this data may be influencing the rate of improvement as state terms being translated to federal terms may influence the way in which subindicator data is reported. Also, previous data audits of Indicator 5A for students with an intellectual disability have suggested an error rate that needs improvement and may be effecting data accuracy of other disabilities' data for Indicators 5A and 5B.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|----------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 5A: 62.5% | 5B: 10.0% | 5C: 6.0% |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 5A: 65.0% | 5B: 9.0% | 5C: 5.8% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 5A: 67.5% | 5B: 8.0% | 5C: 5.6% |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 5A: 70.0% | 5B: 7.0% | 5C: 5.4% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 5A: 70.0% | 5B: 6.0% | 5C: 6.0% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 5A: 70.0% | 5B: 6.0% | 5C: 6.0% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 5A: 70.0% | 5B: 6.0% | 5C: 6.0% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 5A: 72.0% | 5B: 6.0% | 5C: 6.0% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|------------------|--|
| 5.1 Begin implementation of the newly developed CMT/CAPT Skills Checklist, which is aligned with the state grade-level Connecticut Curriculum Frameworks to be used for assessment and instructional planning. | Spring 2006 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two consultants from the Bureau of Research, Evaluation and Assessment to work on training and development of CMT/CAPT standard and checklist assessment |
| 5.2 Examine mentoring teacher qualifications and training, and availability for student teaching placements in LRE settings. | Spring 2006 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bureau of Special Education facilitator and Bureau of Research, Evaluation and Assessment data analyst available for discussions with appropriate stakeholders (higher education personnel and district personnel) |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|---------------------|--|
| 5.3 Examine data definitions used for reporting to determine how to best report data to accurately reflect state and district activities that address LRE indicators. | Spring 2006 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Special Education facilitator and Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation data analyst to examine data definitions and reporting practices |
| 5.4 Hold a forum with Superintendents, led by the Connecticut Commissioner of Education, to discuss student participation in home school and general education classes. | Spring 2006 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five consultants from the Bureau of Special Education (one assigned full time) to work on the LRE initiative |
| 5.5 Conduct statewide focused monitoring on LRE as a key performance indicator focusing on percentage of regular class placement; percentage of separate class placement; percentage of out of district placement; mean percentage of time with nondisabled peers (TWNDP) in-district (K-12); and mean percentage of TWNDP (PK) to ensure that LRE decisions are made on an individualized basis in accordance with applicable regulations. Review to include low performing districts chosen from four population groups. | 2005-06 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 consultants from the Department to conduct focused monitoring site visits on LRE, including focused monitoring coordinator; and five consultants from the Department (one assigned full time) to work on the LRE initiative |
| 5.6 Disseminate state color-coded map, by district, representing LRE data and goals of the <i>P.J. et al. v. State of Connecticut, Board of Education, et al. Settlement Agreement</i> | 2005-06 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel to design and disseminate the map • Department website • Map dissemination |
| 5.7 Support implementation of academy to train coaches to provide in-district support to teachers educating students with disabilities in the general education classroom. | 2005-06 and 2006-07 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate \$270,000 to an organization to conduct a Coaches Academy per year |
| 5.8 Support implementation of a statewide technical assistance team to respond to districts and parents in need of immediate technical assistance to assist in helping a specific student to remain/return appropriately in/to the student’s home school and/or general education classroom. | 2005-06 and 2006-07 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate \$200,000 to an organization to operate a technical assistance team to assist with student specific needs in home school and general education class placement |
| 5.9 Conduct parent support in LRE through training and material dissemination. | 2005-06 and 2006-07 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate \$20,000 of IDEA funds awarded to the Parent Training |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|---|--|
| | | and Information Center (PTI) – The Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) for parent training on LRE related activities |
| <p>5.10 Provide “Families as Partners” training to parents and districts participating in STARS and Coaches Academy.</p> | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide \$10,000 to joint university project through the University Center on Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD) to conduct training |
| <p>5.11 Meet three times a year with the Expert Advisory Panel (EAP) of the <i>P.J. et al. v. State of Connecticut, Board of Education, et al.</i> Settlement Agreement to advise the state in increasing home school and regular class placement and examining out-of-district placements for students with intellectual disabilities.</p> | 2005-06 school year through December 2007 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate \$85,000 for Expert Advisory Panel expenses per year |
| <p>5.12 Discussions with the Department of Children and Families (DCF) about placement boundaries and impact on out-of-state and out-of-district placements, and determine next steps.</p> | 2007-08 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel to meet with DCF staff |
| <p>5.13 Disseminate <i>P.J. et al. v. State of Connecticut, Board of Education, et al.</i> settlement agreement data to all school districts via individual district determination letters. Data are available on State Web site.</p> | 2005-06 school year through 2010 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| <p>5.14 Continue to conduct general supervision and monitoring of targeted districts in the area of LRE/ID (intellectual disabilities). This is to include requiring targeted districts to submit action plans and multiple data reports per year on LRE/ID.</p> | 2006-07 school year through 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five consultants from the Department (one assigned full time) to work on the LRE initiative |
| <p>5.15 Use nationally available resources and research to guide the development of implementation strategies, such as the work of the Consortium on Inclusive School Practices to examine state and local policies on inclusion.</p> | 2005-06 through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five consultants from the Department (one assigned full time) to work on the LRE initiative • SERC |
| <p>5.16 Provide training and technical assistance to all <i>P.J. et al. v. State of Connecticut, Board of Education, et al.</i> Settlement Agreement targeted districts</p> | 2005-06 school year through 2010 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate a portion of IDEA funds awarded to the State Education Resource Center (SERC) to provide district specific training |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| through the State Education Resource Center (SERC) in the areas of LRE/Inclusion. | | |
| 5.17 Use National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) and LRE Part B Community of Practice to assist in informing best practice in monitoring. | 2005-06 through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCSEAM • Regional Resource Centers (RRC) |
| 5.18 Offer an annual statewide inclusion conference. | 2005-06 school year through 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate a portion of IDEA funds awarded to the State Education Resource Center (SERC) to conduct the conference and support the celebration |
| 5.19 A Department committee will determine alternative methods of displaying data outside of the use of the District APR that serve to highlight district standing on state SPP targets. | 2006-07 school year through 2010 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 5.20 Provide resources and training to districts regarding transition services in college, university and community settings for at-risk and 18 - 21 year old students. Meet with State Education Resource Center (SERC) staff to discuss statewide and district-specific activities and training to address graduation and dropout. | 2006-07 school year through 2010 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • CSDE Transition and LRE Workgroups • National Organization on Disability – Start on Success Programs (SOS) • CSPD Council |
| 5.21 Investigate alternative strategies to separate programming for students with MD, ED, OHI, and autism to educate in-district and increase their time with nondisabled peers. Continue emphasis on PBIS training and technical assistance. | 2006-07 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department to review resources, visit programs, gather information to inform these issues • Allocate a portion funds awarded to the State Education Resource Center (SERC) |
| 5.22 Use LRE stakeholder group to provide in-depth examination of data to uncover underlying issues in order to generate activities that address specific issues affecting the data (specifically examine specific disability groups such as emotional disturbance and other health impaired, 18 to 21-year-olds placement; placement locations such as private separate and public separate). | 2006-07 through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Special Education facilitator and Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation data analyst |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|---|--|
| <p>5.23 Examine state agency placements, private placements and RESC options and current practices with each of these to illuminate future intervention strategies.</p> | <p>2006-07 through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Special Education facilitator and Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation data analyst |
| <p>5.24 Increase focus on professional development and monitoring to assist districts in supporting students to remain in district that are being considered or are at risk for out-of-district placement, as well as to transition students back into district.</p> | <p>2006-07 through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate a portion of IDEA funds awarded to the State Education Resource Center (SERC) to offer statewide professional development training on LRE/Inclusion |
| <p>5.25 Support training and information sharing sessions conducted by other public or private agencies on LRE for families and school/agency personnel.</p> | <p>2005-06 school year through 2011</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate up to \$200,000 per year from IDEA funds for supporting LRE activities or other public and private organizations with advisement from CSDE Parent Workgroup |
| <p>5.26 (Revised) Provide professional development activities statewide on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • co-teaching; • differentiated instruction and assessment; • administrator training; • curriculum topics; • learning strategies; • positive behavior supports; • Common Core Curriculum Standards; • Universal design for learning; • assistive technology; • paraprofessionals | <p>Spring 2007 through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate a portion of IDEA funds awarded to the State Education Resource Center (SERC) to offer statewide professional development training on LRE/Inclusion |
| <p>5.28 Continue to examine data on expansion of out-of-district placement and causal factors, and the quality of programming at separate and out-of-district placements to determine next steps. Explore additional statistical techniques to more accurately represent this data.</p> | <p>2007-08 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Special Education and Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation staff to collaborate to examine data and to review findings of private facilities/RESC monitoring |
| <p>5.29 Investigate reading and behavioral supports and methods of delivery that can be implemented at younger ages to reduce later out-of-district placements of students for reading difficulties and behavioral</p> | <p>2007-08 school year through 2011</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department to review resources, visit programs, gather information to inform these issues |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| concerns. | | |
| 5.30 Develop tools around appropriate LRE decision making and develop dissemination via Web-site redesign. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSDE personnel • SERC |
| 5.31 Develop and provide a series of trainings for districts regarding tools for providing age-appropriate transition assessment, and using the results to develop measurable Post-School Outcome Goal statements, functional performance statements, and annual IEP goals and objectives within the general curriculum framework that will reasonably enable students to meet their postsecondary goals (e.g., Transition Assessment & the IEP; Education Benefit – Making the IEP a Living Document). | 2010- 11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • Transition Task Force (TTF) |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

Percent = # of preschool children with IEPs who received special education services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total # of preschool children with IEPs times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

There are 159 school districts in Connecticut that provide special education and related services to eligible 3-, 4- and 5-year-old children with disabilities. Since the initial submission of the SPP in December 2005, Connecticut served the following numbers of children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP:

| School Year | Number of 3-, 4-, and 5-year-olds |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| 2004-05 | 7,978 |
| 2005-06 | 7,881 |
| 2006-07 | 6,833* |

* CT changed from a Dec. 1 to an Oct. 1 child count collection date

In Connecticut, kindergarten is provided to all children who turn age 5 on or before January 1st of a school year while preschool education for all children 3 and 4 years old is not a component of compulsory public elementary school education. Besides the availability of private community-based early childhood programs for the preschool-age population, the state has two publicly funded early childhood programs: a federally funded program, Head Start which also receives state funds, and a state funded early childhood program called School Readiness. Each of the two publicly funded programs has their own specific eligibility criteria. A number of children with disabilities who meet the eligibility requirements of either Head Start or School Readiness have access to and are included in these two publicly funded programs either as a part of or in addition to the special education and related services children received through an IEP. Children with disabilities also have

access to and participate in private community-based early childhood programs which may or may not be a component of a child's IEP.

All school districts provide special education and related services to eligible 3-, 4- and 5-year-old children with disabilities and use a variety of service delivery options including an integrated program service model (e.g., 'reverse mainstream program') and itinerant services which may be provided at a community-based early childhood program and/or at a public school facility. Some school districts provide a preschool program specifically designed for typically developing 3- and 4-year-old children and use that particular program setting to provide services to preschool-age children with an IEP.

The state is working toward the goal of ultimately having preschool universally available for all children 3 and 4 years old in the next 10 years. There is a Governor's Early Childhood Cabinet. Personnel from the State Department of Education are members of the Governor's Early Childhood Cabinet and members of related work groups established by the Cabinet. The Governor's Early Childhood Cabinet and the related work groups are building an inter-agency statewide collaborative network that will design and build an infrastructure for access to universal preschool for all children in the state.

State Data Collection System:

On an annual basis, the Department collects data from all school districts on the educational environments of 3-, 4- and 5-year-old children with disabilities receiving special education and related services. Data are provided to the Department through an electronic data submission. This data collection falls under the Section 618 data collection requirements in the IDEA. The data are collected annually in accordance with the established timelines for federal reporting. Data are not obtained from sampling.

Assurance of Data Accuracy

The Department has unique student identification numbers for students ages 3 through 21. Each school district has a mechanism to annually input required data on an individual student basis. Data is submitted electronically from each school district to the state's data system. The data submitted to the Department are verified by the Superintendent of Schools as accurate. In addition, the Department data system has data verifications and checks that are a part of the data system to ensure the accuracy and validity of the data that are submitted by each school district.

Another activity to ensure the accuracy and validity of the data is the annual and on-going training and technical assistance provided to all school districts by the Department. Specific training and technical assistance is provided to the data managers in each school district to ensure their understandings of the data required and ultimately ensure accuracy in the information provided to the state. Upon collection of the data at the state level, Department personnel follow-up with individual school districts when unusual or outlier data have been provided to the state. Targeted technical assistance and guidance are available by the Department to assist school districts in their data reporting.

Implementation of a New Statewide Data Collection System 2006-07

A new state data system was implemented in the 2006-07 school year. The state's data system is known as SEDAC, the Special Education Data Application and Collection. The new data system was launched in 2006-07. Analysis of special education data for this indicator demonstrated a need for improved (1) understanding at the district level of new data elements and definitions; (2) data entry and accuracy at the district level and (3) ability to provide the needed comprehensive, individualized and targeted training and technical assistance to school districts. The data system's data verifications and checks assisted the Department in identifying needed improvements in the operation of the data system and the training needs of school districts.

LRE Data Collection 2004-05

The data collected on the IDEA 619 educational environments in 2004 included eight categories, two of which were optional reporting categories. The eight educational environment categories were those identified and defined by the U.S. Department of Education. The Department's data collection and analysis for 2004 reflected all eight federally identified and defined educational environment categories for children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP and included: early childhood setting; early childhood special education setting; part-time early childhood and part-time early childhood special education setting; separate school; residential facility; home; reverse mainstream setting, and itinerant services. The Department used the federal data definitions for each of the eight educational environments for data collection and analysis. Department training, technical assistance and data verification activities for these eight environment categories reflected strict adherence to the federal definition for each educational setting. The Department collected this data statewide on educational environments for each individual 3-, 4- and 5-year-old child with an IEP. This information was used to submit the federally required 618 data to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs for 2004-05 and for reporting in the SPP submitted December 2005.

LRE Data Collection 2005-06

In 2005, the Department began revising its data collection to reflect the new educational environment categories approved by the U.S. Department's Office of Management and Budget (OMB). For 2005, the Department began implementation of the new federal educational environment categories using the new federal definitions to collect data from each school district. This information would ultimately be used to report on the educational environments of children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP. The new educational environments include: early childhood program, separate class (e.g., early childhood special education), separate school, residential facility, home and service provider location. In 2005, the Department created a crosswalk between the old and new categories to assist in the collection and analysis of data.

For one of the new reporting categories, the "early childhood program" environment, those children will be identified as: (a) spending 80 -100 percent of the time in regular education; (b) 40-79 percent of the time in regular education; or (c) 0-39 percent of the time in regular education. Statewide training and technical assistance was available in 2005-06 to ensure

that special education personnel, including district data managers, were introduced to and understood the changes in the data collection to assist ensuring accuracy in data reporting. Related state forms, state data bases and other infrastructure elements were adjusted accordingly.

LRE Data Collection 2006-07

Beginning in the 2006-07 school year and annually thereafter, the state will collect and analyze information based upon new federal categories and the federal definitions on the educational environments of children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP. The new educational environments include: early childhood program, separate class (e.g., early childhood special education), separate school, residential facility, home and service provider location.

The new statewide data system, SEDAC, will be used to collect information from each school district in the state on each 3-, 4-, and 5-year-old child with an IEP. While the data collection in 2005-06 was crosswalked between the old and new educational environment categories, this is no longer required. The crosswalk was helpful in transitioning data managers to the new educational environment categories, but is not longer necessary in the second year of collection. General training and technical assistance was provided statewide to assist school districts in their understanding of the new system as well as the new data elements implemented and required for reporting in SEDAC.

LRE Data Reported 2004-05

Data collected by the Department from all school districts in the 2004-05 school year indicate that 61.0 percent of children 3, 4 and 5 years old with an IEP are receiving their special education and related services with typically developing peers in either an early childhood setting, a reverse mainstream setting or by receiving itinerant services (see italicized chart below).

| Early Childhood Environments | 2004-05 |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|
| <i>Early Childhood Setting</i> | 22.1 |
| <i>Reverse Mainstream Setting</i> | 21.7 |
| <i>Itinerant Services</i> | 17.2 |
| Part-Time EC/Part-Time ECSE | 18.8 |
| Home | 0.1 |
| Early Childhood Special Education | 19.3 |
| Residential Facility | 0.0 |
| Separate School | 0.7 |

A total of 1,767 children or 22.1 percent of children 3, 4 and 5 years old with an IEP received services in an early childhood setting. A total of 1,247 children 5 years of age (40.2 percent)

received their services in a regular education kindergarten while the preschool population was served in a variety of early childhood settings that included private community-based programs, publicly funded preschool programs or preschool programs offered by the public schools. Specifically 8.1 percent of 3-year-olds and 12.6 percent of 4-year-olds were served in these three types of setting that offered time with typically developing peers.

A total of 21.7 percent or 1730 children ages 3 through 5 were served in a reverse mainstream setting. A reverse mainstream setting was utilized primarily for the preschool age population with 34.9 percent of 3-year-olds and 30.0 percent of 4-year-olds respectively served in a reverse mainstream setting while only 5.3 percent or 163, 5 year old children received their special educated services in a reverse mainstream setting. In Connecticut, itinerant services were utilized for the preschool population with 27.9 percent of 3 year old children and 24.2 percent of 4 year old children receiving itinerant services. Only 3.6 percent of 5year old population of kindergarten-aged children received itinerant services.

Regular education kindergarten appeared to be the least LRE for 5 year old children while the utilization of reverse mainstream settings and the delivery of itinerant services appeared to be the LRE for 3 and 4 year old children. More restrictive settings such as residential facilities, separate schools and home are rarely used in the state to deliver special education and related services to the eligible population of young children with an IEP.

LRE Data Reported 2005-06

The data obtained through a data crosswalk using the old and new data elements in the 2005-06 school year, indicate that 70.0 percent (n = 5520) of all children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP spend 80-100 percent of their time in a regular early childhood program. In drilling down into the data by age, of those children spending 80-100 percent of time in a regular early childhood environment, the data indicate that 60.9 percent of 3-year-olds, 69.3 percent of 4-year-olds and 76.7 percent of 5-year-olds spend 80-100 percent of their time in an early childhood environment, including kindergarten. The percentages of children spending 80-100 percent of their time with typically developing peers increase by age with the greatest percentage being reported for 5-year-olds. This increase by age may be due to the availability of more preschool opportunities for 4-year-olds and a public elementary education opportunity for 5-year-old children in kindergarten.

Within the federal definition of an early childhood program there are two other categories that are defined by the amount of time children with an IEP spend with typically developing peers. There were 731 children, or 9.3 percent of children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP spending 40-79 percent of time with typically developing peers. There were 164 children, or 2.1 percent of children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP spending 0-39 percent of time with typically developing peers. If the Department were to include these two groups of children in the SPP/APR reporting, the total percent of children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP in an early childhood environment would represent 81.4 percent of all children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP.

The Department examined the reporting of children ages 3 through 5 using the old federal educational environment categories and the new federal educational environment categories. This first year analysis indicated no significant difference in the educational environment categories that included separate school, residential facility, or home.

Children previously reported in the old category of reverse mainstream were now all in the new category “early childhood”. The children previously in a part-time early childhood, early childhood special education program were now in the new category “early childhood”. The children receiving itinerant services in 2004-05 school year either stayed in the itinerant category as “service provider location only” or moved to the category “early childhood” depending on whether they were attending any program or service with typically developing peers. Essentially, the first year crosswalk showed no significant difference as the state began to move from one data collection of educational environments to the new categories approved by the U.S. Department of Education.

LRE Data Reported 2006-07

The data obtained through the new statewide data system, SEDAC, in the 2006-07 school year, indicate that 62.3 percent (n = 4259) of all children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP spend 80-100 percent of their time in the educational environment category of a regular early childhood program. The educational environment category of “early childhood” also indicates that there were 501 children, or 7.3 percent of children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP spending 40-79 percent of time with typically developing peers. There were 237 children, or 3.5 percent of children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP spending 0-39 percent of their time with typically developing peers. The total percent of children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP in an early childhood environment would represent 73.1 percent of all children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP.

This data analysis in the 2006-07 school year indicates that there continue to be no significant difference in the educational environment categories that included separate school, residential facility, or home. The data indicate that 1.0 percent of children were served in a separate school, 0.2 percent served in a residential facility and 0.2 percent were served at home. A total of 443 children or 6.5 percent received services through a service provider location and 1300 children or 19.0 percent were served in an early childhood special education program that had less than a 50-50 ratio of typically developing children to children with an IEP.

Assurance of Valid, reliable Data in 2006-07 and Thereafter

Note that due to changes in the 618 State-reported data collection, this indicator for the educational environment categories for children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP changed for the 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008. The Department emphasis in the 2006-07 school year and annually thereafter will be focused on the collection of valid and reliable data in order to provide baseline and targets in the 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.

Activities for the collection of accurate, timely, reliable and valid data will include:

- Reviewing and amending any directions and definitions in the SEDAC user manual utilized by school districts to ensure that data directions and guidance guarantee data accuracy, validity and reliability.
- Reviewing and revising the statewide training and technical assistance system for school district data managers and other personnel to ensure that the training informs the knowledge base of personnel providing and entering the data.
- Reviewing and amending any state documents such as the statewide IEP Form and Manual to ensure that the data elements that must be collected are aligned to the IEP Form and Manual. The information will be made publicly available through the Department’s web site.
- Providing individual and group targeted technical assistance for school district personnel and parents through the Department and the state Parent Information and Training Center, the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC).
- Contacting and working with private companies and purchased service vendors that provide school districts computerized IEPs to ensure that the purchased programs and IEP forms address all required data elements conform to and align with the collection requirements for the 618 data on the educational environments for children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP.
- Reviewing the 2006-07 and 2007-08 data collection to identify needs and ensure that data reporting by school districts is valid and reliable.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets

To be established after the reporting of baseline in accordance with the timelines established by the SPP/APR and the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | * Not required per OSEP instructions. |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | * Not required per OSEP instructions. |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | * Not required per OSEP instructions. |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | * Not required per OSEP instructions. |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | * Not required per OSEP instructions. |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | * Not required per OSEP instructions. |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | * Not required per OSEP instructions. |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | * Not required per OSEP instructions. |

** Note: The Department recognizes that while it is not inconsistent with the IDEA Part B to include numerical targets to increase the number of preschool and kindergarten-age children with IEPs to receive their special education and related services with typically developing peers, the Department will monitor school districts to ensure that placement decisions are made on an individual basis in conformity with 34 CFR sections 300.550 through 300.556 and that decisions regarding educational placements are not based upon any numerical target established by the Department.*

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------------------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide targeted training and technical assistance to ensure the accuracy, validity and reliability of data reported. | 2005-06 through 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and disseminate policy guidance documents specific to ensuring that children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP are provided a FAPE in the LRE. | 2006-07 school year through 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and disseminate policy guidance and other documents to ensure that the child’s IEP team understands the new data definitions for the educational environment of children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP. | 2006-07 through 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide professional development opportunities for the broad early childhood and early childhood special education community including specific training and technical assistance on LRE and related issues for 3- and 4-year-old children. | 2005-06 through 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department and State Education Resource Center (SERC) personnel • Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use the resources and training opportunities of the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC), the National Professional Development Center on Inclusion and other national centers, resources and training opportunities. | 2005-06 through 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NECTAC, NPDCI resource and training opportunities |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include a specific LRE focus in the Department’s general supervision efforts and activities related to FAPE in the LRE for 3-, 4- and 5-year-old children with disabilities. | <p>2005-06 through 2011</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct Department monitoring to ensure that decisions regarding educational placements for 3-, 4- and 5-year-old children with an IEP are made on an individual basis in accordance with all applicable federal and state laws. Monitoring tools used will include: reviews of student records; interviews with administrators, teachers (general and special education), related service professionals; soliciting input from parents through forums and other venues; and conducting observations of the implementation of a children’s IEPs. | <p>2005-06 through 2011; activities will be continued until such time when no longer appropriate as indicated by data or other sources.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide financial resources to support early childhood accreditation through the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) for programs serving 3-, 4- and 5-year-old children with an IEP as an incentive for providing an LRE and provide related training and technical assistance to support programs in the NAEYC accreditation process. | <p>2005-06 through 2008</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds up to \$40,000 annually • Department personnel • SERC personnel |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a statewide coaching model to support early childhood community-based programs and personnel in meeting the needs of children with social-emotional, challenging behavioral and/or mental health needs | 2005-06 through 2010 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds up to \$100,000 annually Department personnel Partnership with state agency for children’s mental health |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a statewide coaching model and training and technical assistance to support early childhood community-based programs and personnel in implementing a Response to Intervention (RtI) model for preschool-age children called Recognition and Response. | 2005-06 through 2009 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds up to \$40,000 annually Department personnel |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide parent training opportunities to ensure that parents are informed and knowledgeable about LRE settings for children 3, 4, and 5 years of age with disabilities, particularly those families transitioning from the Connecticut Birth to Three System. | 2005-06 through 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part C personnel Department personnel Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) – The Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with Higher Education institutions preparing early childhood personnel, particularly two- and four-year institutions, to ensure that individuals working with young children in community-based settings are prepared to serve all children of varying abilities, including children with disabilities. | 2005-06 through 2010 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department personnel |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure that children with disabilities are included in the design and infrastructure development as the state works toward universal preschool for all children. | 2005-06 through 2015 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Department personnel |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- 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.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):

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 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported

in category (d) divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus [# of preschool children reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

The content in The “Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process” in Indicator #7 is unchanged from the prior years’ submissions.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) established a statewide system to collect data on the developmental and functional progress of 3-, 4- and 5-year-old children with IEPs in the preschool grade. Information obtained through a statewide data collection system are used to report on the three early childhood outcome measurement areas: positive social-emotional skills, including social relationships; acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, including early language/communication and early literacy; and use of appropriate behaviors to meet needs.

Connecticut’s statewide early childhood outcome measurement system for 3-, 4- and 5-year-old children receiving special education and related services consists of three major activities: (1) the development, implementation, evaluation and continued refinement of policies, procedures and practices for measuring child outcomes; (2) the development, implementation, evaluation and continued refinement of training and technical assistance; and (3) the development, implementation, evaluation and continued refinement of a statewide data collection system.

The first major activity, the development and implementation of statewide policies, procedures and practices, is specific to the early childhood outcome reporting requirement. The CSDE has developed policies and procedures that establish state guidance on how the early childhood outcome assessment is to be conducted, by whom, when and within what prescribed timeline. The established policies and procedures were used to develop and disseminate an Early Childhood Outcome (ECO) Question and Answer document which has been updated annually. The document outlines the requirements for all school districts and personnel in the state working with the population of children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP. This ECO Question and Answer document is used as the framework for informing school district personnel of their obligations to collect and report information for this indicator. The CSDE utilized feedback from school district personnel to evaluate the CSDE’s policies and procedures and amended them as appropriate over the course of the implementation of the early childhood outcome requirement starting in 2005-06 and then again in each subsequent year. The CSDE will continue to re-evaluate state policies and procedures for this indicator. Policies and procedures will be updated annually by evaluating implementation at the state and local level and by obtaining continuous feedback from school personnel, families and other stakeholders.

The second major activity, the provision of training and technical assistance to school district administrators and personnel, was a major focus in the 2005-06 school year and again in each subsequent school year. The major goal of the training and technical assistance was to ensure that all school district personnel were knowledgeable about the early childhood outcome requirement and that personnel had the skills and competencies in the use of the assessment instrument in order to ensure consistency, reliability and validity in conducting the assessment and ultimately in ensuring accuracy in the measurement reporting. Focused training and technical assistance has taken place annually since the 2005-06 school year. Targeted training and technical assistance has been available on the administration of the assessment tool, on state policies and procedures for meeting this requirement and on the requirements and mechanisms for data collection and reporting. Within the context of developing and implementing training and technical assistance, CSDE activities embedded evidence-based practices in child assessment in meeting the early childhood outcome requirement. Beginning in 2006-07 and annually thereafter, the CSDE enlisted the state's Regional Educational Service Centers (RESCs) to provide more regionally-based and individualized training and technical assistance to their member school districts. Training and technical assistance materials were developed over the course of the implementation of this requirement and were made available during the trainings and in targeted technical assistance to school districts. All trainings were evaluated by a feedback form completed by participants. The evaluation information from participants was used to review and revise policies and procedures as well as inform future training and technical assistance activities. This type of training and technical assistance and the cycle of evaluation and refinement will continue on an annual basis.

It is anticipated that in future years, statewide and regional training and technical assistance will be directed to topics and areas that are identified as a result of the analysis of the early childhood outcome data on child progress. An example of a training need that could potentially be identified through an analysis of the data might be related to the collection and reporting of accurate and valid data. Another possible example of targeted training and technical assistance could occur if the state data indicates that children do not appear to be making progress in the area of early literacy. Consequently, the CSDE could then focus its training and technical assistance resources on early reading and literacy development.

In relation to general pre-service and in-service training, the CSDE does have an active Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) Council that can advise and assist in the identification of training and technical assistance as well as make pre-service and in-service recommendations in areas identified in the implementation of the early childhood outcome data collection. The CSPD Council may also be instrumental in helping to advise higher education institutions of the state's needs relating to personnel competencies and knowledge. Higher education's attention to the identified needs of the state can lead to better prepared personnel entering the field of early childhood special education, particularly as it relates to child assessment and to creating teaching and learning environments that maximize children's developmental and functional skills.

The third activity is the development, implementation and evaluation of a statewide data system for data input, data verification and data analysis. A data collection system for the 2005-06

school year was developed and implemented. The data collection in 2005-06 consisted of a data disc to collect Point 1 information on all children with an IEP entering special education for reporting in the SPP submitted in February 2007. In the 2006-07 school year, the CSDE developed and implemented a Web-based data collection system. The Web-based data collection system that was developed and implemented is 'live' meaning that access by school districts for reporting child information is available throughout the calendar year except for a small portion of time in which the CSDE closes the system to capture and analyze data for reporting in the SPP/APR. The data collection system captures the child's name, birth date, unique student identification number, the dates the test administration was completed and the specific data collected about the child's developmental and functional progress. The Web-based data collection system collects Point 1 and Point 2 data on individual children and provides the aggregate child progress information that is analyzed and subsequently reported in the SPP and APR.

The CSDE also collects and maintains an e-mail distribution list of all individuals within a school district who have responsibilities related to the early childhood outcome requirement, including the data managers at the school district level who are responsible for the early childhood outcome data. This mechanism for e-mail communication with the districts allows the CSDE to ensure that school districts have up-to-date information and allows for a system of communication for data verification and correction of missing or inaccurate student data.

The parameters for the statewide early childhood outcome measurement system consist of the following:

Who will be included in the State's early childhood outcome system?

For progress reporting on this indicator, all 3-, 4- and 5-year-old children who have been determined eligible for special education and who have an IEP in place for at least six months before entering kindergarten will be included in the early childhood outcome assessment system. All eligible children with an IEP will be administered a single state identified assessment tool to collect child specific data in each of the three early childhood outcome areas. There are no child exceptions for the exclusion of any child for any particular disability category, for the developmental and functional abilities of any child or for the level of service a given child receives. The CSDE's requirement is that every child, ages 3-, 4- and 5-years-old, found eligible for special education and related services and who receives at least six months of special education before kindergarten entry will be included in the progress reporting for this indicator.

The state does not employ a sampling methodology to address this indicator.

Who will conduct the assessment and when?

The child's primary early childhood special education service provider, either the child's early childhood special education teacher and/or the child's speech and language pathologist, will conduct the assessment to collect Point 1 and Point 2 data. The child's early childhood special education service provider must conduct the assessment to collect Point 1 data within the first four weeks that the child begins receiving their special education and related services. It will be the early childhood special education service provider's responsibility to collect Point 2 data for those children exiting preschool special education for any reason and/or prior to entering

kindergarten. The guidance for the collection of Point 2 data identifies that the collection of assessment information should take place in the spring of the school year and at most within eight to ten weeks prior to a child's exit from the preschool grade.

What assessment instrument was selected by the state and why?

The CSDE selected a single statewide assessment instrument, the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development II[®] (Brigance), a criterion-referenced assessment instrument, for the collection and reporting of early childhood outcome data. One reason for the selection of the Brigance was that many of the sub-domains of the Brigance correspond to the early childhood outcome areas that states are required to measure. Another reason for the selection of the Brigance is that many of the Brigance's sub-domain areas could be cross-walked to the Connecticut Preschool Curriculum Framework (2006) and the Connecticut Preschool Assessment Framework (2005).

The CSDE requires school districts to administer the Brigance as a criterion-reference instrument, not as a standardized instrument, which is one of the options of the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development II[®]. By using the Brigance as a criterion-referenced instrument, school district personnel can obtain information from direct testing when required, through observation in a natural setting, through parent report or through the reporting of a child's skills and behaviors by individuals close to the child (e.g., the child's early childhood teacher). The Brigance also allows for the test administration of items to be modified or adapted based upon the needs of individual children. It can be administered across settings and situations with a focus on a child's functioning and performance. The purpose of administering the Brigance over the course of weeks by the professionals with the primary responsibility for the education of the child, is to obtain child specific information based upon an authentic assessment of a child. Observing the child within the context of their learning environment and using information from a child's parents and others close to the child allows for richer and more authentic information regarding a child's developmental and functional skills to be obtained both at entry to and at exit from preschool special education.

It should be noted that Connecticut is not utilizing the same assessment instrument as the state's Part C program. In Connecticut, the Part C program chose the Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP) and the Carolina Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers with Special Needs as the assessment instruments that would be administered in the Part C program in order to collect child specific information. The HELP and the Carolina Curriculum are the two curriculum-based assessment options that Part C providers are required to use to collect early childhood outcome information. When Part C collects information on how each child is functioning, that information is then converted to the seven-point scale for those children receiving early intervention services in the state. The CSDE's IDEA 619 program did not select either curriculum-based assessment tool opting instead to support the use of the state's progress monitoring tool, the Connecticut Preschool Assessment Framework (2005), for all children, including children receiving special education and related services.

The CSDE did purchase a Brigance testing manual for each school district. Each school district also received a small number of Brigance Developmental Record Booklets to be used to collect child specific Point 1 and Point 2 information. The state purchase was intended to off-set some

of the initial costs that a school district would incur in order to move forward in the collection of child progress information, most specifically the collection of Point 1 information in 2005-06 and progress data for 2006-07 and annually thereafter. As needed, school districts are expected to purchase additional testing manuals and record booklets.

What is the Department's purpose in selecting the Brigance?

The CSDE selected the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development II[®] primarily for the purpose of utilizing the assessment instrument for federal reporting purposes and for evaluating, monitoring and publicly reporting on the status of individual school districts in the state with regard to this indicator. The Brigance was not selected, and school districts are not required, to utilize this instrument to determine a child's eligibility for special education. The process of a child's eligibility determination, including the selection of assessment instruments, personnel, methods and procedures should be individually designed by the child's IEP Team with the parent's participation and based upon the presenting concerns that prompted a child's referral to special education. The Brigance was also not selected for the purpose of curriculum planning for a child or for a group of children. The Connecticut State Board of Education endorses and supports the Connecticut Preschool Curriculum Framework (2006) which defines the state's early learning standards. The Connecticut State Board of Education also endorses and supports the Connecticut Preschool Assessment Framework (2005) which is the progress state's progress monitoring tool. Both documents are used statewide for all programs serving the preschool-age population, including preschool-age children with disabilities. The CSDE supports the utilization of curricula for typically developing children in a teaching and learning environment which provides a focus on high expectations for all learners. Separate disability specific curricula could supplement, but should not replace nor serve as the sole basis for planning programs and delivering instruction to young children with an IEP.

What Brigance sub-tests will be administered?

The state selected a subset of Brigance sub-tests which correlate to the early childhood outcome questions for federal reporting. The CSDE sent the list of selected sub-tests to the Brigance IED-II test developer and publisher for review and approval. Feedback from both the developer and publisher of the Brigance IED-II was that the sub-tests selected were sufficiently varied and representative of the instrument, hence not compromising either the intent or the integrity of the instrument and were felt to sufficiently answer the federal questions regarding child progress. The Brigance sub-tests selected by the CSDE are required to be administered to all children 3, 4 and 5-years of age with an IEP entering the preschool grade and receiving special education and related services. The assessment, specifically the state's required sub-tests of the assessment instrument, will be used to collect data at a child's entry to and exit from special education from the preschool grade.

In selecting specific sub-tests of the Brigance for administration, the CSDE selected sub-tests of the Brigance that (a) sufficiently answered the three federally required early childhood outcome questions regarding a child's developmental and functional skills and (b) were as inclusive as possible of the skills and behaviors children might potentially demonstrate between the ages of birth through age 7. The CSDE's goal was to ensure that the sub-tests and the sub-test items were as varied and yet as inclusive as possible in order to capture information on children who might

be demonstrating skills and behaviors either significantly below or significantly above age expectations. The CSDE recognizes that children’s early learning and development are multidimensional and the developmental and functional skills of children are inter-related. Children are capable and competent learners and they can exhibit, at any point in time, individual differences in their developmental and functional growth with a range of skills and competencies that can be quite varied. The CSDE organized the Brigance selected sub-tests by outcome measurement area to assist service providers in seeing how the developmental domains and curricula areas of the assessment correspond to a child’s skills and competencies in functional areas for outcome reporting. The selected sub-tests were organized by outcome area to also allow for the analysis of data in relation to developmental domains, functional skills and pre-academic areas. Information obtained from analysis of data would ultimately provide a vehicle for identifying focused and targeted training and technical assistance in a teaching and learning area.

The state selected the following Brigance sub-tests to answer the three early childhood outcome questions:

Positive Social Relationships *(including social relationships)*

- Sub-Test G-1 General Social-Emotional Development
- Sub-Test G-3 Initiative, Engagement, Behaviors

Acquisition & Use Knowledge and Skills *(including early language/communication and early literacy)*

Language

- Sub-Test E-4 General Speech & Language Development
- Sub-Test E-7 Verbal Directions
- Sub-Test F-6 Directional

Cognition

- Sub-Test E-8 Picture Vocabulary
- Sub-Test F-5 Quantitative
- Sub-Test F-7 Classifying

Literacy

- Sub-Test C-3 Handwriting
- Sub-Test F-1 Response to Experience with Books

Action To Meet Needs

Motor – Gross Motor

- Sub-Test B-1 Standing
- Sub-Test B-2 Walking
- Sub-Test B-4 Running
- Sub-Test B-10 Rolling and Throwing

Motor – Fine Motor

- Sub-Test C-1 General Eye, Hand, Finger Skills

Self-Help

- Sub-Test D-1 Feeding and Eating
- Sub-Test D-3 Dressing
- Sub-Test D-6 Toileting

The CSDE reviewed the cross-walk made available by the Early Childhood Outcome (ECO) Center which cross-walked various sub-test of the Brigance to the early childhood outcome questions. The CSDE also created a cross-walk of some of the selected sub-tests of the Brigance with the Connecticut Preschool Curriculum Framework (2006) and the Connecticut Preschool Assessment Framework (2005). Curriculum Associates, the publisher’s of the Brigance did this as well. The time and attention devoted to completing various cross-walks was an effort to: (a) ensure that the federal questions regarding child progress could be sufficiently answered and (b) identify that information obtained from the administration of the Brigance could be helpful to the child’s service provider because of its link to the state’s early learning standards, the Connecticut Preschool Curriculum Framework (2006) and the state’s on-going progress measurement system, the Connecticut Preschool Assessment Framework (2005). The two state documents serve as the template for the cycle of intentional teaching to all young children, including children with disabilities.

What about an alternate assessment?

The CSDE identified that the state selected sub-tests in the three early childhood outcome areas might not be sufficient for all children receiving special education and related services. In order to ensure that the state was able to collect information on the entire population of children receiving special education at the preschool grade level, the state selected sub-tests of the Brigance IED-II assessment instrument which could be administered as an *alternate assessment* when a specific selected sub-test did not include developmental and functional skills that went down to birth.

The following alternate sub-tests were identified:

Acquisition & Use Knowledge and Skills

Language

- Sub-Test E-2 Pre-speech Gestures
- Sub-Test E-3 Pre-speech Vocalization

Cognition

- Sub-Test E-1 Pre-speech Receptive Language

Action To Meet Needs

Motor – Pre-Ambulatory

- Sub-Test A-1 Supine
- Sub-Test A-2 Prone
- Sub-Test A-3 Sitting
- Sub-Test A-4 Standing

The direction rules for when to administer an alternate skills sub-test include the following:

Some subtests are required to be administered only if a child's mastery cannot be demonstrated on the following specific required subtests including:

- a) For sub-test B-1 - If that sub-test cannot be administered because a child's developmental and functional skills are below the first item on B-1, the state is requiring that sub-tests A-1, A-2, A-3 and A-4 be administered as an alternate assessment in place of sub-tests B-1, B-2, B-4 and B-10. The data collection system includes an automatic prompt for the district to provide data using the alternate assessment.
- b) For sub-test E-4 - If that sub-test cannot be administered because a child's developmental and functional skills are below the first item on E-4, the state is requiring that sub-tests E-2 and E-3 be administered as an alternate assessment in place of sub-tests E-4, E-7 and F-6. The data collection system includes an automatic prompt for the district to provide data using the alternate assessment.
- c) For sub-test E-8 (1) and (2) - If either or both sub-tests cannot be administered because a child's developmental and functional skills are below the first item on E-8 the state is requiring that sub-tests E-1 be administered as an alternate assessment. The data collection system includes an automatic prompt for the district to provide data using the alternate assessment.

The CSDE anticipates that most children will not require assessment with the alternate assessment sub-tests (optional sub-tests) unless the child presents with physical, language and/or cognitive delays so significant that the child's skills cannot be appropriately measured by the required sub-tests selected by the CSDE.

Who will report the data to whom, in what form and how often?

The CSDE is not using the Early Childhood Outcome Summary Form (COSF) to collect and/or report child progress data for this indicator.

The CSDE relied on a data disc in the 2005-06 school year to collect information from across the state on all children who entered special education in the preschool grade. The data disc was sent to all school districts. Districts entered the required information and returned the disc with completed information to the CSDE. Information from the discs was aggregated by the CSDE and was used to present Point 1 information in the SPP submitted in February 2007.

In 2006-07, the CSDE developed and implemented a Web-based system for the collection of early childhood outcome data. Information obtained from the data disc submitted the previous year was pre-populated into the Web-based data application. The Web-based data collection system is the vehicle for collecting data and information in the 2006-07 school year and in subsequent years. The data disc in 2005-06 and the Web-based data collection system for 2006-07 includes elements for reporting on each required Brigance IED-II sub-test and each alternate sub-test, as appropriate. The data fields for entering the child's assessment results for each of the required sub-tests of the Brigance IED-II are organized by the instrument's sub-domain headings. Two types of information are collected on each sub-test and include: (1) the highest skill item number that the child successfully demonstrated (mastery item) in a specific sub-test

and (2) the number of missed items between the first item of the sub-test and the last item that the child demonstrated mastery. The same information is collected at Point 1 and Point 2.

The collective information on Point 1 data representing each child that entered special education from May 1, 2006 to June 30, 2006 was aggregated and used for federal reporting in the SPP submitted February 2007. Beginning in 2006-07, Point 1 and Point 2 data were analyzed and used for reporting progress information in the SPP and APR. The state analysis will be able to answer the following questions:

- (A) Did the child not improve functioning?
- (B) Did the child improve but not at a level comparable to same-age peers?
- (C) Did the child improve functioning close to same-age peers?
- (D) Did the child reach functioning at a level comparable to same-age peers?
- (E) Did the child maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-age peers?

How will ‘comparable to same age peers’ be determined?

The CSDE’s decisions regarding data analysis and reporting is based upon the validity of the Brigance items which provide reference points for skills and behaviors expected of children within certain age bands. The Brigance test items are a result of extensive research and multiple validation studies. The items within each sub-test of the Brigance IED-II are hierarchically ordered to reflect the typical developmental trend of the increasing acquisition of children’s skills over time. In order to assist test administrators with the interpretation of results when the test is administered as a criterion-referenced assessment, certain items within each sub-test were determined by the developers of the Brigance IED-II to serve as age-specific benchmarks of skill acquisition. In conjunction with information gathered from validation and standardization studies, the Brigance IED-II developers determined the developmental age notations ascribed to specific items by compiling information from a comprehensive research base in the area of infant and early childhood development (a detailed bibliography is provided on pages 292-294 of the Brigance IED-II assessment). The ages (in months) ascribed to specific items increase from benchmark item to benchmark item. This corresponds to and reflects the hierarchical order of the items within each sub-test. Due to the inclusion of age-related benchmark items, the Brigance IED-II permits conclusions to be drawn about a child’s performance on a sub-test relative to their chronological age and provides for comparison of skills and behaviors expected of a child’s chronological age. The CSDE uses the instrument’s age-related benchmarks to determine *comparable to same-age peers* in the data analysis.

What is the state’s ability to collect and analyze data?

The CSDE has an electronic statewide data collection system for every student attending public school and an electronic statewide data collection system for every child receiving special education and related services. The statewide electronic data collection system for every student attending public schools is the Public School Information System (PSIS). The statewide electronic data collection system for students with an IEP is the Special Education Data Application and Collection (SEDAC). Both data systems are based upon a unique student identification number. The unique student identification number is called the State Assigned

Student Identification Number (SASID). That number stays with the child throughout their school career and is used across data systems to capture individual student information.

In 2006-07 and annually thereafter, the CSDE assigns each child receiving early intervention in the state's Part C program a SASID. That same number stays with the child into their entry to the Part B system and/or entry to public school education. The utilization of the SASID number will assist the CSDE in using information from multiple database systems in any future analysis. Possible available future information from an analysis of the data could reflect and relate to the children who received or did not receive Part C services, the length of time children received special education, the disability category of children who received special education, the settings in which children received their services, etc., all of which could provide additional information and insight in relation to looking at the data on child progress.

The data collected and aggregated at the state level can also potentially reflect children's progress within various areas of development and functioning beyond the broad outcome areas used for reporting on this indicator. For example, the data system would be able to identify how children in the state are functioning in language, literacy or in their independence and self-help skills. Available data will allow the CSDE to not only identify child progress in each of the three early childhood outcome areas as defined by this indicator but will also be able to provide information on children in each sub-test identified for each outcome area. This type of analysis may assist the CSDE in identifying content and curriculum areas for targeted training and technical assistance. On a school district level, this data may provide additional information as a program evaluation tool to assist individual school districts with improving their services and programs for children ages 3 through 5 with an IEP.

How will the state ensure valid and reliable data?

The CSDE chose a single assessment to be used to collect this information, the Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development II[®]. The instrument chosen has undergone rigorous reliability and validity studies. The state's training and technical assistance, which includes the administration of the assessment instrument and the reporting of data, is designed to help ensure consistency in the test protocols and data reporting. There is also data verification that occurs by a series of validation checks built into the data collection system which helps ensure the reporting of valid and reliable data.

To ensure that the data collected are valid and reliable, consultants in the RESCs were trained to provide support to school districts on test administration and scoring. Training on item scoring is directly related to data collection and data entry thereby helping to ensure the validity and reliability of data. The CSDE also has personnel that provide targeted training and technical assistance to school districts regarding the child specific assessment information that must be entered into the Web-based data collection system. CSDE personnel that provide technical assistance with regard to the data collection include: IDEA Part B personnel; the IDEA Part B data manager; data personnel, including PSIS and SEDAC staff; and the Part B 619 coordinator.

The Web-based data application also provides data checks against the entry of inaccurate data and requires users to enter complete student records prior to having the ability to save a child's test item scores. For each test item, the data menu only allows the selections (i.e., mastery item,

number of items missed) appropriate to individual sub-tests. The data application allows for a review and edits checks of the data in relation to individual children. Periodic review and analysis of the data by CSDE personnel occur to ensure valid and reliable data.

What are the data checks for ensuring valid and reliable data?

Connecticut's Web-based data collection system for collecting outcome data is a secure, Web-based application that is accessible by all school districts in the state. Data users at the school district level must receive an individual user pass code from the CSDE. The policies and procedures developed around the Web-based data collection ensure that student data is confidential and protected. The Web-based application for data entry has been available to districts since the spring of 2007. The data collection system uses Edit Checks/Business Rules specific to the Brigance IED-II assessment to ensure the validity of the data collected on individual children. Since all of the CSDE's data systems rely on a SASID number, data on individual children can be validated against SEDAC, PSIS, and CSDE's Student Registration Records. The Student Registration Records are constantly updated so that the student record system can be used for tracking student movement between schools and school districts. The PSIS data system collects student information in October, January and June which assists the CSDE by providing a snapshot of a district's student roster which allows for validating a student's enrollment as well as for the tracking of students.

In the 2007-08 school year, the data collection was refined and changed from a passive data collection to an active collection. Districts are only allowed to add data for students, who at the time of data entry, were actively registered with their school district. In addition, the PSIS data collections can be used to generate various reports for use by school districts. A data report lists all students in the preschool grade that are reported by a school district as a student who is receiving special education in the October, January or June data collections and who did not yet have Point 1 data entered in the Web-based data collection. There are additional data reports that can be used by school districts including a report which lists all of the students that had Point 1 data on ECO and for whom Point 2 data should have been provided or will need to be provided at a future date. The data system also allows for school districts to explain to the CSDE why Point 2 data might not be available. The CSDE allows for school districts to report that: (a) a child received less than 6 months of service or (b) the child suddenly moved and became unavailable. Both reasons can be verified by the CSDE through the PSIS and SEDAC systems and the Student Registration information collected throughout the year.

How will the data be analyzed?

From data collected in 2005-06 and reported in the SPP in February 2007, the CSDE reported on the percent of children in each outcome area whose Point 1 data indicated that they were performing at a level comparable to same-age peers. This was determined by the proportion of children for whom the skills and behaviors on each sub-test within an outcome area demonstrated mastery at or above an age appropriate level (e.g., the child fell within an age band commensurate with the child's chronological age). Similarly, the percent of children whose Point 1 data indicate that they were not performing at a level comparable to same-age peers was determined by the proportion of children for whom the skills and behaviors in one or more of the sub-tests within an outcome area demonstrated that a child was not demonstrating skills comparable to same-age peers (e.g., the child fell outside of an age band commensurate with the child's chronological age).

From data collected in 2006-07 and reported in the SPP in February 2008 and annually thereafter, the CSDE is able to report on the developmental and functional progress for any child for whom both Point 1 and Point 2 data are available. The Point 1 child specific data will be compared to Point 2 child specific data in order to identify where a child’s progress falls across the five outcome measurement categories. That information will be aggregated for federal reporting. The current general decision points for answering each of the five child progress measures for each of the three early childhood outcome questions include the following:

| Progress Question | Decision Point |
|---|---|
| <p>A. Did the child not improve functioning?</p> | <p>The child’s Point 2 data indicate that the child did not demonstrate skills at a level comparable to same age peers (“post-test score age” <i>determined by the average of highest post-test score items mastered</i> was less than actual post-test age) and at Point 2 the child did not demonstrate any new skill on any of the subtests administered for a particular outcome question (on all subtests, post-test highest item mastered is less than or equal to pre-test highest item mastered).</p> |
| <p>B. Did the child improve but not at a level comparable to same-age peers?</p> | <p>The child’s Point 2 data indicate that the child did not demonstrate skills at a level comparable to same age peers (“post-test score age” <i>determined by the average of highest post-test score items mastered</i> was less than actual post-test age) and between Point 1 and Point 2 the child was able to demonstrate the acquisition of one or more new skills, although the growth in score age was less than the growth in actual age (amount of learning is less than the amount of passed time in special education).</p> |
| <p>C. Did the child improve functioning close to same-age peers?</p> | <p>The child’s Point 2 data indicate that the child did not demonstrate skills at a level comparable to same age peers (“post-test score age” <i>determined by the average of highest post-test score items mastered</i> was less than actual post-test age) and between Point 1 and Point 2 the child was able to demonstrate the acquisition of one or more new skills AND the growth in score age was equal to or greater than the growth in actual age (the amount of learning is greater than or equal to the amount of passed time in special education).</p> |
| <p>D. Did the child reach functioning at a level comparable to same-age peers?</p> | <p>The child’s Point 1 data indicate that the child did not demonstrate skills at a level comparable to same age peers and at Point 2 the child was able to demonstrate skills at a level comparable to same age peers.</p> |

| Progress Question | Decision Point |
|--|---|
| <p>E. Did the child maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-age peers?</p> | <p>The child’s Point 1 data indicate the child was demonstrating skills at a level comparable to same age peers and at Point 2 the child continued to demonstrate skills at a level comparable to same age peers.</p> |

The data collected and analyzed are consistent with the measurement expectations outlined in the early childhood outcome indicator. All data analyzed by the CSDE uses the above decision rules and method in the analysis.

Child Progress Measurement Data for 2008-09

The following chart provides child progress information with the actual numbers used in the calculation and represents the state’s early childhood outcome data collected from July 1, 2008, to June 30, 2009.

Child Progress in Measurement Categories for Children Exiting 2008-2009

| Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships): | Number of Children | Percent of Children |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|
| a) Percent of children who did not improve functioning | 89 | 3.4% |
| b) Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 632 | 24.4% |
| c) Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach | 465 | 18.0% |
| d) Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 544 | 21.0% |
| e) Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 857 | 33.1% |
| Total | N =2587 | 100% |
| Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy): | Number of Children | Percent of Children |
| a) Percent of children who did not improve functioning | 25 | 1.0% |
| b) Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 775 | 30.0% |

| | | |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|
| c) Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach | 932 | 36.0% |
| d) Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 356 | 13.8% |
| e) Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 499 | 19.3% |
| Total | N = 2587 | 100% |
| | | |
| Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs: | Number of Children | Percent of Children |
| a) Percent of children who did not improve functioning | 42 | 1.6% |
| b) Percent of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 1065 | 41.2% |
| c) Percent of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach | 795 | 30.7% |
| d) Percent of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 335 | 12.9% |
| e) Percent of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 350 | 13.5% |
| Total | N = 2587 | 100% |

#

Discussion of 2008-09 Baseline Data

Explanation of currently reported progress data should be provided here. Discussion of the data may include issues such as the extent to which this year's progress data is representative of the children the program serves, and the State's analysis of the data for the purpose of increasing data quality.

Discussion of Child Progress:

The CSDE analyzed data regarding children's developmental and functional progress. Data indicate that there were 2587 children in the data system that had both Point 1 and Point 2 assessment information and who had received at least six months of service for the school year beginning July 1, 2008, and ending June 30, 2009. An explanation of progress data will be provided in the FFY 2009 APR for this indicator since the FFY 2008 data for this indicator establish baseline and targets.

The average length of time for the receipt of special education and related services for the children on whom progress data is reported is 17.6 months of special education and related

services. The following chart is representative of the amount of time that the 2587 children received special education and related services:

| Time (in months) Children Received Special Education | Number of Children | Percent of Children |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 6-12 months | 666 | 25.7% |
| 13-18 months | 667 | 25.8% |
| 19-24 months | 780 | 30.2% |
| 25-30 months | 391 | 15.1% |
| 31-36 months | 70 | 2.7% |
| 36+ months | 13 | 0.5% |
| Total | 2587 | 100.0% |

Of the 2587 children, the following charts represent the gender and race/ethnicity of the children for whom progress information was reported in comparison to the representative population of children served in the final year of preschool. The data provided in the ‘percent of children’ and ‘percent of children exiting’ columns indicate that the data reported for this indicator in the 2008-09 school year is representative of the percent of children exiting preschool special education to kindergarten. The data indicates that a comparable representation of all children receiving special education at the preschool level is evident in the FFY 2008 outcome data in relation to gender and race/ethnicity.

| Gender | Number of Children in ECO Data | Children in ECO Data | Children Served in Pre- K in 2008-09 |
|---------------|---|---------------------------------|---|
| Female | 715 | 27.6% | 26.8% |
| Male | 1872 | 72.4% | 73.2% |
| Total | 2587 | 100% | 100% |

| Race/Ethnicity | Number of Children in ECO Data | Children in ECO Data | Children Served in Pre- K in 2008-09 |
|------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|
| Am. Indian/Native Alaskan | 12 | 0.5% | 0.6% |
| Asian | 76 | 2.9% | 2.9% |
| Black | 329 | 12.7% | 12.7% |
| White | 1679 | 64.9% | 64.9% |
| Hispanic | 41 | 19.0% | 19.0% |
| Total | 2587 | 100.0% | 100% |

The CSDE continues to address the issue of data quality in the collection, analysis and reporting of data for this indicator. Data integration across multiple CSDE data systems has enhanced the

assurance of data accuracy and reporting. The CSDE uses the state’s all student data collection system, PSIS, to assist in tracking children who have moved from one school district to another. PSIS has also assisted in identifying the start date of special education to ensure that all newly identified children are included and that Point 1 data is obtained for all children in the data collection. PSIS also assists in identifying when children have exited preschool to kindergarten to ensure the collection and reporting of Point 2 data for all children who exit. The data collection system for this indicator also has a number of edit checks which help ensure that the data is accurate. Follow-up technical assistance and support on ensuring timely and accurate data is provided by the CSDE. These and other continuing activities allow for enhanced data quality and reliability.

Baseline Data for Preschool Children Exiting 2008-2009

| Summary Statements | |
|--|---------------|
| Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) | % of children |
| 1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 58.3% |
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 54.2% |
| | |
| Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) | % of children |
| 1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 61.7% |
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 33.0% |
| | |
| Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs | % of children |
| 1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 50.5% |

| | |
|---|-------|
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program | 26.5% |
|---|-------|

Measurable and Rigorous Targets [as stated in the Part B Indicator Measurement Table]
 Targets for Preschool Children Exiting in FFY 2009 (2009-10); FFY 2010 (2010-2011); FFY 2011 (2011-2012) and FFY 2012 (2012-2013) and Subsequently Reported in February 2011; February 2012; February 2013 and February 2014.

Established Targets for ECO Summary Statements

| Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) | Target FFY 2009 % of Children | Target FFY 2010 % of Children | Target FFY 2011 % of Children | Target FFY 2012 % of Children |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 56.0% | 56.0% | 56.0% | 56.1% |
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 52.0% | 52.0% | 52.0% | 52.1% |
| Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) | Target FFY 2009 % of Children | Target FFY 2010 % of Children | Target FFY 2011 % of Children | Target FFY 2012 % of Children |
| 1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 59.0% | 59.0% | 59.0% | 59.1% |
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 31.0% | 31.0% | 31.0% | 31.1% |

| Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs | Target FFY 2009 % of Children | Target FFY 2010 % of Children | Target FFY 2011 % of Children | Target FFY 2012 % of Children |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 48.0% | 48.0% | 48.0% | 48.1% |
| 2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. | 24.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% | 24.1% |

Rationale for Established Targets

Provide a rationale for your targets based on your analyses of data quality and strategies for program improvement.

The CSDE identified the early childhood outcome targets in consultation with a number of stakeholder groups. There were a variety of stakeholder groups convened to discuss indicator #7, including the establishment of targets. Stakeholders included: directors of special education; administrators of early childhood special education; the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center, the state’s Parent Training and Information Center; and various professional development planning groups.

The targets established from FFY 2009 to FFY 2012 are conservative. The rationale for establishing conservative targets is that the FFY 2008 outcome data represent the first year of data which include the population of children for whom the state is obligated to report upon. The CSDE, in establishing the targets, is adjusting for a flux in the population of children for whom progress data will be available in the future. The CSDE generally uses three years of data to assess trends in order to establish targets that are less vulnerable. Under other assessment programs in the state, Connecticut, in consultation with stakeholders, chooses to maintain identical or similar targets for two to three years. This should permit sufficient time for program improvements to impact children’s progress and ultimately would be demonstrated in the data.

Improvement activities, particularly those that relate to this indicator: data refinement; training and technical assistance; policy development; and district monitoring will continue to ensure reliable and valid data. Trend data will be used to inform future improvement activities.

#

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

The following improvement activities, timelines and resources highlight the state activities relative to this indicator. Stakeholders reviewed the improvement activities, timelines and

resources and supported the continuation of each. Each activity will be reviewed and re-assessed annually in relation to the data collected and reported.

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|----------------------------------|--|
| 7.1 Use information and feedback obtained from school district administrators, school personnel, families and from other stakeholders to update the state’s policies and procedures on the implementation of the early childhood outcome requirement. | 2008-09 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 619 Coordinator • Department personnel • SPP Workgroup • RESC training and technical assistance providers |
| 7.2 Develop and update materials to be used in training and technical assistance, in outreach and public awareness and in other professional development and informational venues. | 2008-09 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 619 Coordinator • Department personnel • SPP Workgroup • RESC training and technical assistance providers |
| 7.3 Provide and evaluate training and technical assistance and revise and refine the training and technical assistance and other professional development opportunities based on evaluation feedback. | 2008-09 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 619 Coordinator • Department personnel • SPP Workgroup • RESC training and technical assistance providers |
| 7.4 Ensure that materials and other information developed and disseminated is coordinated with the state’s Part C program and Department personnel working on this and other Part B SPP/APR indicators. | 2008-09 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 619 Coordinator • Part C Coordinator • Department personnel • SPP Workgroup |
| 7.5 Use the annual data collection and analysis to inform and refine the data collection, the decision rules and the analysis in future reporting. | 2008-09 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 619 Coordinator • Department personnel |
| 7.6 Utilize national resources to inform the state system, including accessing | 2008-09 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 619 Coordinator • Department personnel |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| professional development opportunities and training and technical assistance through the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC), US DOE/OSEP, and the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO Center). | | |
| 7.7 Utilize information and resources from national professional organizations to embed evidence-based assessment practices into the state outcome system (e.g., National Association for the Education of Young Children, the Division of Early Childhood, etc). | 2008-09 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 619 Coordinator • Department personnel |

#

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

| |
|---|
| Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE |
|---|

Indicator 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

| |
|---------------------|
| Measurement: |
|---------------------|

| |
|---|
| Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100. |
|---|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In the 2004-05 school year, the Department developed and disseminated a Special Education Parent Survey. The survey was developed with guidance from the CSDE Parent Workgroup. The questionnaire asked parents of children ages 3 - 21 with disabilities to respond to a series of statements related to 1) satisfaction with their child's special education program; 2) participation in developing and implementing their child's program; 3) their child's participation in the IEP process; 4) transition planning for preschool children and secondary students; 5) parent training and support; and 6) the child's skills. In 2005-06 the Parent Survey was revised to collect data that directly addresses Indicator 8. Parents were asked to respond to survey statements according to their experiences over the past 12 months using a 6-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, with the option of responding don't know or not applicable. Parents were also asked to provide demographic data on their child, including age, gender, race and ethnicity, grade level and primary eligibility for services.

Responses from the 2005-06 school year survey were analyzed using factor analysis to determine which subset of other items from the survey could provide further evidence of a school's facilitation of parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. Factor analysis is a statistical technique which uses the correlations between observed variables to estimate common factors or the structural relationships linking the observed variables together. These data generated relationships or constructs are examined for their ability to explain the variation among the items in the survey. Understanding how items are interpreted and linked together by survey respondents and the variation in responses among the items allows for the derived factor or set of related survey items to be used as supporting evidence for the conclusions drawn from the specific question asked in response to Indicator 8. Survey item 12 was included in a factor with 10 other items, all with factor loadings from 0.609 to 0.882. The conclusion that can be drawn from the factor analysis is that yes, the survey items

appear to be valid; they are measuring what the survey was intended to measure about parental involvement in improving services and outcomes for their child.

Alpha reliability was conducted for this factor and indicated a very high overall internal-consistency reliability ($\alpha = 0.932$; $\alpha > 0.70$ are generally considered high or acceptable in survey research). The issue that a reliability analysis helps to address is measurement error. When a survey uses a single survey item to measure an intended outcome, conclusions can be drawn that are completely invalid because the measurement error cannot be determined accurately. The construct validity analysis, above, identified other survey items that appear to measure the same intended outcome. The reliability analysis of this group of survey items helps to ascertain the consistency or reliability that can be assumed of the conclusions drawn from the survey responses to the items. The conclusion from this reliability analysis is that yes, the parent survey is measuring the intended outcome regarding parental involvement in improving services and outcomes for their child both consistently and reliably.

In each year, 2005-06 through 2011, the Department will survey a statewide representative sample of parents of students with disabilities (see attached revised sampling plan). In the 2005-06 school year, LEAs were assigned to one of six data collection years based on demographic characteristics. Particular attention was paid to the representativeness of the sample with respect to disability, gender, race and ethnicity and age. Data will be reported out on specific LEAs in the LEA-Level Annual Performance Report each winter, as long as the number of responses for a given LEA meets the Department's minimum standard for the reporting of LEA-level data ($n = 20$). This rule safeguards against possible breaches in confidentiality. By 2010-11, data will have been collected from every LEA in Connecticut.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Of parents surveyed from 21 LEAs in Connecticut during the 2005-06 school year, 86.9 percent agreed that their school(s) facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for their children with disabilities. Data are valid and reliable.

(1,141 agreements with item 12 / 1,313 survey respondents x 100 = 86.9%)

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The survey sample included 21 districts and had an overall response rate of 21.7 percent. Thirteen districts had an overall response rate between 20 percent and 30 percent; four districts had an overall response rate greater than 30 percent.

Parent responses to survey item 12, "In my child's school, administrators and teachers encourage parent involvement in order to improve services and results for children with disabilities," were analyzed to determine state performance on Indicator 8. Parent responses in the categories of strongly agree, moderately agree, and slightly agree constitute the 86.9 percent reported above.

The responses collected from 21 districts in this year's survey sample were analyzed for representativeness by age, gender, race and ethnicity, grade and disability as compared to the total statewide population of students with disabilities. The analysis for response representativeness was conducted using both a statistical significance test (chi-square) and a

practical or meaningful significance test (effect size). Below are the actual proportions for each area assessed.

| Variable | Grouping | 2005-06 statewide data | 2005-06 survey data |
|----------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Age | 3 – 5 | 10.9% | 14.3% |
| | 6 – 12 | 45.5% | 46.2% |
| | 13 – 14 | 15.7% | 14.6% |
| | 15 – 17 | 22.5% | 19.9% |
| | 18 - 21 | 5.2% | 5.1% |
| Gender | Male | 69.3% | 70.3% |
| | Female | 30.7% | 29.7% |
| Race/Ethnicity | American Indian/ Alaskan Native | 0.4% | 1.7% |
| | Asian | 1.5% | 2.2% |
| | Black | 16.0% | 12.5% |
| | White | 64.7% | 68.2% |
| | Hispanic | 17.4% | 15.4% |
| Grade | PK | 7.2% | 12.4% |
| | Elementary | 37.3% | 39.6% |
| | Middle | 23.8% | 25.4% |
| | High | 26.3% | 19.9% |
| | Transition | 5.2% | 2.6% |
| Disability | LD | 34.1% | 28.9% |
| | ID/MR | 4.2% | 4.6% |
| | ED | 9.1% | 4.6% |
| | Speech/LI | 21.5% | 17.9% |
| | OHI | 15.4% | 19.0% |
| | Autism | 4.5% | 11.3% |
| | Other | 11.1% | 13.7% |

Of the five areas assessed, only gender demonstrated no statistical difference between the sample and statewide population proportions (see below). While there was statistical support for differences between the sample and the statewide population of students with disabilities across age, race and ethnicity, grade and disability, only disability had an effect size or practical significance level that warranted consideration. All effect sizes for age, race and ethnicity and grade were small (below 0.30) and do not indicate a practical or meaningful difference between the sample and the actual population. It is important to assess the effect size of any statistical significance test outcome as statistical significance tests are highly influenced by sample size. Effect sizes are not influenced by sample size and thus allow for the interpretation of statistical differences for their meaningful and practical application when drawing conclusions from the data. Below are the chi-square and effect size results for each of the areas assessed.

| Variable | Chi-Sq Test (χ^2) | Cohen's Effect Size | Interpretation |
|----------------|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Age | $\chi^2 = 19.2$ | 0.12 | Small |
| Gender | $\chi^2 = 0.6$ (not sign.) | n/a | |
| Race/Ethnicity | $\chi^2 = 34.4$ | 0.16 | Small |

| Variable | Chi-Sq Test (χ^2) | Cohen’s Effect Size | Interpretation |
|-----------------|--|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Grade | $\chi^2 = 91.8$ | 0.26 | Small |
| Disability | $\chi^2 = 201.1$ | 0.39 | Moderate |

One issue to be considered when interpreting the disability representativeness of the sample is that parents tend to identify more than one disability when asked to select only their child’s primary disability. Therefore, interpretation of the disability data from the survey is suspect regarding accuracy. The Department and Parent Workgroup will continue to stress the importance of accurate reporting of disability on the parent survey and investigate methods for ensuring the validity of the disability data collected in order to improve the representativeness of parent survey data collected and reported for this indicator. Considering the effect sizes of the other indicators, the Department is satisfied with the overall representativeness of the survey sampled in 2006 and feel the conclusions drawn from this sample are both valid and reliable.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | Not applicable/baseline data year |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 87.0% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 87.1% |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 87.5% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 88.0% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 88.0% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 88.0% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 90.0% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| 8.1 Provide parent training opportunities to ensure that parents are informed and knowledgeable about LRE settings for children 3, 4, and 5 years of age with disabilities, particularly those families transitioning from the CT Birth to Three System. | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) – The Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) |
| 8.2 Participate in statewide summit on dropout prevention, graduation and alternatives to suspension. | 2006–07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • CSDE Parent Workgroup • CSDE Transition Task Force members • Allocate a portion of the IDEA funds to SERC |
| 8.3 Update the Department’s Special Education Policy and Procedures Manual for district adoption. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 8.4 Update the Department’s “A Parent’s Guide to Special Education in Connecticut” in English and Spanish and disseminate to parents, districts and public. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • CSDE Parent Workgroup • translation service • outside evaluator |
| 8.5 Prepare Department brochure on dispute resolution options entitled “Opportunities for Solutions” and disseminate to parents, districts and public. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • CSDE Parent Workgroup |
| 8.6 Offer statewide workshops to parents and districts on effective transitions for children with special needs in early childhood education, diversity in education, integrated student support services, and resolving disputes in special education. | 2006-07 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SERC personnel • CSDE personnel • Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) – The Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) |
| 8.7 Assign a consultant from the Department to act as the liaison with the Parent Information Resource Center at SERC (PIRC@SERC). | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|---|--|
| <p>8.8 Provide a 3-part parent training “Promoting School Success” in four communities in collaboration with the Connecticut Department of Mental Retardation and CPAC.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) – The Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) • Connecticut Coalition for Inclusive Education (CCIE) • Connecticut Department of Mental Retardation |
| <p>8.9 Present at statewide inclusion conference to parents and district staff on making the most of PPT meetings.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) – The Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) |
| <p>8.10 Provide one, day long training to parent trainers on the education benefit review process.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSDE Parent Workgroup • SERC personnel |
| <p>8.11 Pilot use of pre-PPT meeting checklist in two districts.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • CSDE Parent Workgroup • CPAC with funding from the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) |
| <p>8.12 Pilot use of post-PPT meeting comment postcard in two districts.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • CSDE Parent Workgroup • CPAC with funding from the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) |
| <p>8.13 Administer the Department’s Parent Survey in English and Spanish.</p> | <p>2010-11; 2011-12; 2012-13 school years</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • CSDE Parent Workgroup • translation service • outside evaluator |
| <p>8.14 Analyze the Department’s Parent Survey and make available a summary of the results in English and Spanish to the public. Translation resources in a variety of languages will be provided upon request.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • CSDE Parent Workgroup • translation service • outside evaluator |
| <p>8.15 Include a parent representative on the Department’s focused monitoring teams.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|------------------------------------|---|
| 8.16 Include parent input and participation in the Department’s focused monitoring system. | 2006-07 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 8.17 Provide “Families as Partners” training to parents and districts. | 2006-07 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide \$10,000 to joint university project through the University Center on Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD) to conduct training |
| 8.18 In connection with SPDG, partner with selected districts to develop and implement individualized local plans to enhance collaboration between families and schools. | 2006-07 school year through 2010 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • CPAC with funding from the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) |
| 8.19 Develop and provide training to districts and families regarding tools for writing measurable postsecondary goals and objectives (e.g., checklist, Summary of Progress, CT Frameworks) to improve transition services. | 2007-08 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • CSDE Transition Task Force members • CPAC with funding from the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) • Allocate a portion of the IDEA funds to SERC |
| 8.20 Develop a model improvement plan and disseminate to districts as a resource to increase parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. | 2010-2011 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department personnel SERC personnel CSDE Parent Workgroup |
| 8.21 The Parent Workgroup will explore revising the Department’s Parent Survey for the next SPP cycle. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department personnel SERC personnel CSDE Parent Workgroup |
| 8.22 (New) Partner with selected schools to develop and implement individualized local plans to enhance collaboration between families and schools specifically to promote PBIS and literacy initiatives, in connection with new State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG). | 2011-2012 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC • CPAC • Funding from the SPDG |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

| |
|--|
| Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality |
|--|

Indicator 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

| |
|---------------------|
| Measurement: |
|---------------------|

| |
|---|
| <p>Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.</p> |
|---|

| |
|---|
| <p>Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> |
|---|

| |
|---|
| <p>Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2008, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and underrepresentation) of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2008 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2009. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.</p> |
|---|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In response to the FFY 2003 Annual Performance Report letter dated October 18, 2005, the following information is provided.

Race and ethnic disproportionate representation will be assessed by comparing the proportion of students with disabilities by race and ethnicity (from the State 618 data) to the expected race and ethnicity proportion found in the LEA or state all student data. This analysis will be conducted using the formula $\pm 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{P \times Q}{n}}$ for the standard error of the sample proportion. For areas of identified statistically significant overrepresentation, relative risk index will be calculated to aid in the interpretation of the overrepresentation.

To determine "disproportionate representation" statistical overrepresentation is identified. LEAs, where statistical overrepresentation is identified, will receive correspondence from the Department requiring them to conduct a self-assessment and, if noncompliance is evident, develop an action plan with improvement strategies to address the following areas:

- verification that data are accurate;
- review of how disproportionate identification is being addressed through district and school improvement plans;

- examination of special education eligibility policies, procedures and practices to ensure that they are race neutral; and
- examination of professional development activities, curriculum and instructional practices and early intervening services, including academic and behavioral interventions.

Additional monitoring activities and corrective actions will be applied as appropriate.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

In the 2005-06 school year, zero districts in Connecticut had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

$$0/169 \times 100 = 0\%$$

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Beginning in the 2002-03 school year, a Department initiative called “Closing the Achievement Gaps: Connecticut Summit on Overidentification and Disproportion in Special Education” began with the creation of a statewide stakeholder group. There began a focus on district and statewide data in the area of identification and placement by race and ethnicity. Suspension, graduation and dropout analyses by race were also included in this initiative’s annual activities including data, a statewide summit, and technical assistance.

Connecticut was one of nine states that received a grant from the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCRESt) in the 2004-05 school year, which included technical assistance from the center. The Department and the State Education Resource Center (SERC) presented at the national conference hosted by NCCRESt in February 2006 regarding the Department’s efforts to eliminate disproportionate representation of students with disabilities by race and ethnicity. Currently, the center is conducting two case studies of Connecticut school districts that have made significant progress in the area of overrepresentation. Data is obtained from a statewide data source. Sampling is not used. Data are valid and reliable.

Analysis of disproportionate representation of students with disabilities by race and ethnicity began in the 2002-03 school year using 2001-02 data and continues to date using the same data reported to OSEP under section 618 (Table 1). In the 2004-05 school year, using 2003-04 data, the Department identified, for the first time, overrepresentation as a result of inappropriate identification. In that year, multiple districts demonstrated data of concern in this area; through Connecticut’s System of General Supervision and Focused Monitoring it was determined that one of these districts demonstrated overrepresentation as a result of inappropriate identification. In 2005-06, using 2004-05 data, two additional districts were identified for overrepresentation as a result of inappropriate identification. Using 2005-06 data, zero districts demonstrated overrepresentation as a result of inappropriate identification.

Through Connecticut’s System of General Supervision and Focused Monitoring an analysis of data is conducted to determine districts with data of concern. From that information,

correspondence to the district requires an analysis of policies, procedures and practices and a response regarding issues contributing to the concerns seen in these data. The response from the district is analyzed to determine which districts receive a focused monitoring visit. The focused monitoring review consists of discussion with central office staff, a weeklong visit to district schools, student and staff interviews, file reviews, a parent forum and an exit conference. The Department issues a report that identifies both compliance issues and recommendations for improvement. Districts participate in an improvement planning session designed to outline technical assistance options provided by Department and SERC staff. A district plan is then developed in response to the report which includes the submission of periodic reviews of their plan implementation and progress.

Inappropriate identification is determined in the context of a focused monitoring site visit. Policies, practices and procedures are reviewed. Administrators, staff and students are interviewed, a parent forum is conducted, records are reviewed and students are observed. The combination of these activities may result in inappropriate identification practices. Findings of noncompliance are identified in the preliminary report with corresponding required corrective actions and timelines. Completion of corrective actions is tracked through ongoing program reports, provision of technical assistance, and ongoing contact with the lead consultant who conducted the review.

In closing, the state's system of general supervision for identified noncompliance, used both quantitative and qualitative information data to analyze and drill down to identify specific issues, followed up with school districts by providing targeted technical assistance and guidance to correct noncompliance, and followed up to ensure that noncompliance was addressed before notifying school districts that they would no longer be monitored. All activities took place within one year of the identification of noncompliance.

State's Definition of Disproportionate Representation

The Department has adopted a two-step process for the analysis of disproportionate representation: the use of a confidence interval to adjust for the effect of sample size and the calculation and interpretation of a relative risk index (RRI).

Confidence Interval

To ensure that the determination of disproportionate representation is not adversely affected by sampling error, a confidence interval is calculated and used to make certain that analyses are conducted free from the effects of random error and, therefore, are beyond any reasonable doubt of the accuracy or reliability of these determinations.

Within the disproportionality analysis, the major source of error is sampling error which varies as a function of the size of the group being analyzed. As a group gets larger, this error is reduced because larger groups are more resistant to the fluctuations of percentages calculated using small counts (n 's). Sampling error is controlled for by calculating a 95 percent confidence interval around the subgroup racial composition. In doing this, we are more confident that the disproportionality identification is accurate for a subgroup.

Without using the confidence interval, districts that are close to, but above, the comparison district all-student racial composition statistics could be adversely affected by the

identification of a single student. Because of this, the final disproportionality identification is made after giving a district every reasonable benefit of doubt. It is especially important, however, to note that the confidence interval will be an aid only to districts with small group or subgroup *n*'s and racial compositions that are close to the district all student composition for that year.

The formula $\pm 1.96 \{\sqrt{[(P \times Q) / n]}\}$ for the standard error of the sample proportion is used to calculate the 95 percent confidence interval. (Where P = composition of the subgroup being assessed, Q = 100 – P, and n = the number of students in the subgroup being assessed for overrepresentation.)

Confidence Interval Example:

Learning Disability = 1,000 students

| | | | | |
|--------------------|----------|------------|------------|---------------|
| 0: Native American | 0: Asian | 200: Black | 700: White | 100: Hispanic |
| 0% | 0% | 20% | 70% | 10% |

District Enrollment = 10,000 students

| | | | | |
|--------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| 0: Native American | 0: Asian | 2,500: Black | 7,200: White | 300: Hispanic |
| 0% | 0% | 25% | 72% | 3% |

A) If 100 Hispanic LD students are 10 percent of the district's total LD population (1,000): take 0.10 times 0.90 which is equal to 0.09. Divide that by 100 (number of Hispanic LD students) and take the square root which is 0.03. Multiply this by 1.96 which equals 0.059. Add and subtract this to the original 0.10 composition statistic and you have a confidence interval of 4.1 percent to 15.9 percent.

B) If these same students were 10 percent of a district with only 500 LD students, the confidence interval would be 1.6 percent to 18.3 percent. (The smaller the population, the larger the confidence interval will be.)

Finally compare the district all-student Hispanic population percentage to the established confidence interval. In this scenario, the district has 3 percent of its students identified as Hispanic. In example A (10 percent of 1,000 LD) the Hispanic LD students would be potentially overidentified and a Relative Risk Index (RRI) should be calculated. In example B (10 percent of 500 LD) the data would not indicate concern regarding overidentification.

Relative Risk Index

For areas indicating possible overrepresentation using the 95 percent confidence interval test, a RRI should be calculated to aid in the interpretation of the identified overrepresentation.

Learning Disability = 1,000 students

| | | | | |
|--------------------|----------|------------|------------|---------------|
| 0: Native American | 0: Asian | 200: Black | 700: White | 100: Hispanic |
|--------------------|----------|------------|------------|---------------|

District Enrollment = 10,000 students

| | | | | |
|--------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| 0: Native American | 0: Asian | 2,500: Black | 7,200: White | 300: Hispanic |
|--------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|

First, the Hispanic LD Risk should be calculated by dividing the number of Hispanic LD students by the number of all district Hispanic students ($100 / 300 = 0.333$). Second, calculate the Risk for all other races to be identified as LD by dividing the number of all other LD students by the number of all district students from all racial categories except Hispanic ($900 / 9,700 = 0.093$).

Finally, calculate the Relative Risk by dividing the Risk for Hispanic LD by the LD Risk for all other races ($0.333 / .093 = 3.6$). In this scenario, Hispanic students are 3.6 times as likely as their non-Hispanic peers to be identified as students with learning disabilities.

Interpretation Criteria for Disproportionality

No guidance is provided in the IDEA statutes or regulations regarding the criteria for a RRI to be considered “significant.” Absent guidelines from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), each SEA must establish guidelines regarding disproportionate representation that are flexible enough to avoid violating the Grutter and Gratz prohibitions of numerical quotas (*Grutter v. Bollinger et al.*, No. 02-241 U.S. Supreme Court, opinion June 23, 2003 and *Gratz v. Bollinger et al.*, No. 02-516 U.S. Supreme Court, opinion June 23, 2003).

The following criteria have been adopted by the Department as flexible guidelines regarding the identification of disproportionate representation based on race and ethnicity with respect to the identification of children as students with disabilities [20 U.S.C. 1418(d); 34 C.F.R. Section 300.646].

- 0.25 < RRI < 2.0 RRI is not significant; disproportionate representation not indicated – district receives data
- 0.25 ≥ RRI ≥ 2.0 RRI of concern; district receives correspondence from the Department; district submits self assessment of data, policies, procedures and practices regarding identification of students for special education to the Department; if individual student or systemic noncompliance is found, the Department issues, monitors and verifies corrective actions.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 0% |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 0% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 0% |

| | |
|-----------------------------|----|
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 0% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 0% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 0% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 0% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 0% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| 9.1 Provide training around the <i>Guidelines for Identifying and Educating Students with Serious Emotional Disturbance</i> to ensure appropriate implementation and alignment with intervention frameworks such as PBIS and SRBI. | 2010-11 school year through 2012 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Special Education • RESC/SERC Alliance |
| 9.2 Disseminate data on disproportionate representation in special education by race/ethnicity via the Bureau Bulletin and the CSDE Web site to highlight areas of overrepresentation and underrepresentation in the state and direct attention to the importance of SRBI and the appropriate identification of students with learning disabilities. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Special Education • Bureau of Data Collection, Evaluation, and Research |
| 9.3 (Deleted) Continue to hold the annual statewide symposium titled, “The Intersection of Race and Education.” Breakout sessions to include explicit connections to race as it relates to disproportionality in the identification of students for special education, discipline practices, and an overview of indicators 9 and 10 including the self assessment and best practices. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Special Education • SERC |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|---|--|
| <p>9.5 Provide CALI training to districts around English Language Learners, School Climate to Support Student Achievement, and Culturally Responsive Education to address the needs of students from diverse backgrounds prior to a referral for special education.</p> | <p>2010-11 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Accountability and Improvement • SERC/RESC Alliance |
| <p>9.6 Coordinate activities with early intervention initiatives such as positive behavior supports, early intervention, and Connecticut’s Scientific Research Based Interventions (SRBI) to ensure consistency and alignment in the language, strategies, beliefs, and structures that support districts in appropriately supporting and/or identifying students with disabilities.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year through 2011</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRBI State Leadership Team • SERC/RESC Alliance |
| <p>9.8 Coordinate Department activities concerning the <i>Addressing the Needs of the Whole Child: A Connecticut Framework for Academic Achievement, Social, Emotional, Behavioral, Mental and Physical Health</i> document to guide practices and promote the integration of this framework into current work with districts, educational organizations, and policy makers.</p> | <p>2010-11 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Division of Family and Student Support Services |
| <p>9.9 As a result of our persistent achievement gaps, Department personnel created a Racial Equity Team. The Racial Equity Team consists of representatives from across the Department whose purpose is to evaluate and provide recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding Department policies and practices as they pertain to racial equity and Department employee interactions internally and externally. A secondary purpose of this team is to increase the number of Department personnel who effectively communicate about issues of race in all areas of the Department’s work.</p> | <p>2007-08, 2008-09</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| <p>9.10 Develop a brief publication outlining the key points around what families should know about good evaluations for special education. Ensure alignment with SRBI framework.</p> | <p>2009-10 school year</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Special Education • CPAC |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

| |
|--|
| Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality |
|--|

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

| |
|---|
| <p>Measurement: Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.</p> |
|---|

| |
|---|
| <p>Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> |
|---|

| |
|---|
| <p>Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2008, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and under representation) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2008, i.e., after June 30, 2009. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.</p> |
|---|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

In response to the FFY 2003 Annual Performance Report letter dated October 18, 2005, the following information is provided.

Race and ethnic disproportionate representation will be assessed by comparing the proportion of students with disabilities by race and ethnicity within each disability category (from the State 618 data) to the expected race and ethnicity proportion found in the LEA or state all-student data. This analysis will be conducted using the formula $\pm 1.96 \{ \sqrt{[(P \times Q) / n]} \}$ for the standard error of the sample proportion. For areas of identified statistically significant overrepresentation, relative risk index will be calculated to aid in the interpretation of the overrepresentation.

To determine "disproportionate representation" statistical overrepresentation is identified. LEAs, where statistical overrepresentation is identified, will receive correspondence from the Department requiring them to conduct a self-assessment and if noncompliance is evidence, develop an action plan with improvement strategies to address the following areas:

- verification that data are accurate;
- review of how disproportionate identification is being addressed through district and school improvement plans;

- examination of special education eligibility policies, procedures and practices to ensure that they are race neutral; and
- examination of professional development activities, curriculum and instructional practices and early intervening services, including academic and behavioral interventions.

Additional monitoring activities and corrective actions will be applied as appropriate.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

In the 2005-06 school year, four districts (2.4 percent) in Connecticut had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

$$4/169 \times 100 = 2.4\%$$

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Beginning in the 2002-03 school year, a Department initiative called “Closing the Achievement Gap: Connecticut Summit on Overidentification and Disproportion in Special Education” began with the creation of a statewide stakeholder group. There began a focus on district and statewide data in the area of identification and placement by race and ethnicity. Suspension, graduation and dropout analyses by race were also included in this initiative’s annual activities including data, a statewide summit, and technical assistance.

Connecticut was one of nine states that received a grant from the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCRESt) in the 2004-05 school year, which included technical assistance from the Center. The Department and the State Education Resource Center (SERC) presented at the national conference hosted by NCCRESt in February 2006 regarding the Department’s efforts to eliminate disproportionate representation of students with disabilities by race and ethnicity. Currently, the Center is conducting two case studies of Connecticut school districts that have made significant progress in the area of overrepresentation.

Analysis of disproportionate representation of students with disabilities in specific disability categories by race and ethnicity began in the 2002-03 school year using 2001-02 data and continues to date using the same data reported to OSEP under section 618 (Table 1). In the 2004-05 school year, using 2003-04 data, the Department identified, for the first time, overrepresentation as a result of inappropriate identification. In that year, multiple districts demonstrated data of concern in this area; through Connecticut’s System of General Supervision and Focused Monitoring it was determined that three of these districts demonstrated overrepresentation as a result of inappropriate identification. In 2005-06, using 2004-05 data, two additional districts were identified for overrepresentation as a result of inappropriate identification. Using 2005-06 data, a total of four districts demonstrated overrepresentation in specific disability categories as a result of inappropriate identification. Two of these districts were included in previous year identification and two were new identifications.

Overrepresentation by disability, 2005-06 school year data:

| District | Overrepresentation Category |
|----------|-----------------------------|
| 11 | black LD |
| 103 | black ED |
| 135 | black ED |
| 155 | black ED |

Through Connecticut’s System of General Supervision and Focused Monitoring an analysis of data is conducted to determine districts with data of concern. From that information, correspondence to the district requires an analysis of policies, procedures and practices and a response regarding issues contributing to the concerns seen in these data. The response from the districts is analyzed to determine which districts receive a focused monitoring visit. The focused monitoring review consists of discussion with central office staff, a week long visit to district schools, student and staff interviews, file reviews, a parent forum and an exit conference. The Department issues a report that identifies both compliance issues and recommendations for improvement. Districts participate in an improvement planning session designed to outline technical assistance options provided by Department and SERC staff. A district plan is then developed in response to the report which includes the submission of periodic reviews of their plan implementation and progress.

Inappropriate identification is determined in the context of a focused monitoring site visit. Policies, practices and procedures are reviewed. Administrators, staff and students are interviewed, a parent forum is conducted, records are reviewed and students are observed. The combination of these activities may result in inappropriate identification practices. Findings of noncompliance are identified in the preliminary report with corresponding required corrective actions and timelines. Completion of corrective actions is tracked through ongoing program reports, provision of technical assistance, and ongoing contact with the lead consultant who conducted the review.

In closing, the state’s system of general supervision for identified noncompliance, used both quantitative and qualitative information data to analyze and drill down to identify specific issues, followed up with school districts by providing targeted technical assistance and guidance to correct noncompliance, and followed up to ensure that noncompliance was addressed before notifying school districts that they would no longer be monitored. All activities took place within one year of the identification of noncompliance.

State’s Definition of Disproportionate Representation

The Department has adopted a two-step process for the analysis of disproportionate representation: the use of a confidence interval to adjust for the effect of sample size and the calculation and interpretation of a relative risk index (RRI).

Confidence Interval

To ensure that the determination of disproportionate representation is not adversely affected by sampling error, a confidence interval is calculated and used to make certain that analyses are conducted free from the effects of random error and, therefore, are beyond any reasonable doubt of the accuracy or reliability of these determinations.

Within the disproportionality analysis, the major source of error is sampling error which varies as a function of the size of the group being analyzed. As a group gets larger, this error is reduced because larger groups are more resistant to the fluctuations of percentages calculated using small counts (*n*'s). Sampling error is controlled for by calculating a 95 percent confidence interval around the subgroup racial composition. In doing this, we are more confident that the disproportionality identification is accurate for a subgroup.

Without using the confidence interval, districts that are close to, but above, the comparison district all-student racial composition statistics could be adversely affected by the identification of a single student. Because of this, the final disproportionality identification is made after giving a district every reasonable benefit of doubt. It is especially important, however, to note that the confidence interval will be an aid only to districts with small group or subgroup *n*'s and racial compositions that are close to the district all student composition for that year.

The formula $\pm 1.96 \{ \sqrt{[(P \times Q) / n]} \}$ for the standard error of the sample proportion is used to calculate the 95 percent confidence interval. (Where P = composition of the subgroup being assessed, Q = 100 – P, and n = the number of students in the subgroup being assessed for overrepresentation).

Confidence Interval Example:

Learning Disability = 1,000 students

| | | | | |
|--------------------|----------|------------|------------|---------------|
| 0: Native American | 0: Asian | 200: Black | 700: White | 100: Hispanic |
| 0% | 0% | 20% | 70% | 10% |

District Enrollment = 10,000 students

| | | | | |
|--------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| 0: Native American | 0: Asian | 2,500: Black | 7,200: White | 300: Hispanic |
| 0% | 0% | 25% | 72% | 3% |

A) If 100 Hispanic LD students are 10 percent of the districts total LD population (1,000): take 0.10 times 0.90 which is equal to 0.09. Divide that by 100 (number of Hispanic LD students) and take the square root which is 0.03. Multiply this by 1.96 which equals 0.059. Add and subtract this to the original 0.10 composition statistic and you have a confidence interval of 4.1 percent to 15.9 percent.

B) If these same students were 10 percent of a district with only 500 LD students, the confidence interval would be 1.6 percent to 18.3 percent. (The smaller the population, the larger the confidence interval will be.)

Finally compare the district all-student Hispanic population percentage to the established confidence interval. In this scenario, the district has 3 percent of its students identified as Hispanic. In example A (10 percent of 1,000 LD) the Hispanic LD students would be potentially overidentified and a Relative Risk Index (RRI) should be calculated. In example B (10 percent of 500 LD) the data would not indicate concern regarding overidentification.

Relative Risk Index

For areas indicating possible overrepresentation using the 95 percent confidence interval test, a RRI should be calculated to aid in the interpretation of the identified overrepresentation.

Learning Disability = 1,000 students

0: Native American 0: Asian 200: Black 700: White 100: Hispanic

District Enrollment = 10,000 students

0: Native American 0: Asian 2,500: Black 7,200: White 300: Hispanic

First, the Hispanic LD Risk should be calculated by dividing the number of Hispanic LD students by the number of all district Hispanic students ($100 / 300 = 0.333$). Second, calculate the Risk for all other races to be identified as LD by dividing the number of all other LD students by the number of all district students from all racial categories except Hispanic ($900 / 9,700 = 0.093$).

Finally, calculate the Relative Risk by dividing the Risk for Hispanic LD by the LD Risk for all other races ($0.333 / .093 = 3.6$). In this scenario, Hispanic students are 3.6 times as likely as their non-Hispanic peers to be identified as students with learning disabilities.

Interpretation Criteria for Disproportionality

No guidance is provided in the IDEA statutes or regulations regarding the criteria for a RRI to be considered “significant.” Absent guidelines from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), each SEA must establish guidelines regarding disproportionate representation that are flexible enough to avoid violating the Grutter and Gratz prohibitions of numerical quotas (*Grutter v. Bollinger et al.*, No. 02-241 U.S. Supreme Court, opinion June 23, 2003 and *Gratz v. Bollinger et al.*, No. 02-516 U.S. Supreme Court, opinion June 23, 2003).

The following criteria have been adopted by the Department as flexible guidelines regarding the identification of disproportionate representation based on race and ethnicity with respect to the identification of children as students with disabilities [20 U.S.C. 1418(d); 34 C.F.R. Section 300.646].

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| $0.25 < RRI < 2.0$ | RRI is not significant; disproportionate representation not indicated – district receives data |
| $0.25 \geq RRI \geq 2.0$ | RRI of concern; district receives correspondence from the Department; district submits self assessment of data, policies, procedures and practices regarding identification of students for special education to the Department; if individual student or systemic noncompliance is found, the Department issues, monitors and verifies corrective actions. |

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 0% |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 0% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 0% |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 0% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 0% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 0% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 0% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 0% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| 10.1 Provide training around the <i>Guidelines for Identifying and Educating Students with Serious Emotional Disturbance</i> to ensure appropriate implementation and alignment with intervention frameworks such as PBIS and SRBI. | 2010-11 school year through 2012 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Special Education • RESC/SERC Alliance |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>10.2 Disseminate data on disproportionate representation in special education by race/ethnicity via the Bureau Bulletin and the CSDE Web site to highlight areas of overrepresentation and underrepresentation in the state and direct attention to the importance of SRBI and the appropriate identification of students with learning disabilities.</p> | <p>2010-11 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Special Education • Bureau of Data Collection, Evaluation, and Research |
| <p>10.3 (Deleted) Continue to hold the annual statewide symposium titled, “The Intersection of Race and Education.” Breakout sessions to include explicit connections to race as it relates to disproportionality in the identification of students for special education, discipline practices, and an overview of indicators 9 and 10 including the self assessment and best practices.</p> | <p>2010-11 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Special Education • SERC |
| <p>10.5 Provide CALI training to districts around English Language Learners, School Climate to Support Student Achievement, and Culturally Responsive Education to address the needs of students from diverse backgrounds prior to a referral for special education.</p> | <p>2010-11 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Accountability and Improvement • SERC/RESC Alliance |
| <p>10.6 Coordinate activities with early intervention initiatives such as positive behavior supports, early intervention, and Connecticut’s Scientific Research Based Interventions (SRBI) to ensure consistency and alignment in the language, strategies, beliefs, and structures that support districts in appropriately supporting and/or identifying students with disabilities.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year through 2011</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRBI State Leadership Team • SERC/RESC Alliance |
| <p>10.8 Coordinate Department activities for <i>Addressing the Needs of the Whole Child: A Connecticut Framework for Academic Achievement, Social, Emotional, Behavioral, Mental and Physical Health</i> to guide practices and promote the integration of this framework into current work with districts, educational organizations, and policy makers.</p> | <p>2010-11 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Division of Family and Student Support Services |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>10.9 As a result of our persistent achievement gaps, Department personnel created a Racial Equity Team. The Racial Equity Team consists of representatives from across the Department whose purpose is to evaluate and provide recommendations to the State Board of Education regarding Department policies and practices as they pertain to racial equity and Department employee interactions internally and externally. A secondary purpose of this team is to increase the number of Department personnel who effectively communicate about issues of race in all areas of the Department’s work.</p> | <p>2007-08, 2008-09</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| <p>10.10 Develop a brief publication outlining the key points around what families should know about good evaluations for special education. Ensure alignment with SRBI framework.</p> | <p>2009-10 school year</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Special Education • CPAC |
| <p>10.11 Investigate the identification policies procedures and practices around Autism in all racial categories. Develop and coordinate professional development and training opportunities for districts and families to ensure appropriate identification of students with Autism.</p> | <p>2009-10 school year, annually as needed</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Special Education • SERC |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

| |
|---|
| Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find |
|---|

Indicator 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

| |
|---------------------|
| Measurement: |
|---------------------|

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received. b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline). |
|---|

| |
|---|
| <p>Account for children included in a but not included in b. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.</p> |
|---|

| |
|--|
| <p>Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.</p> |
|--|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (RCSA) Section 10-76d-13 provides that “special education and related services shall be provided as soon as possible after the planning and placement team meeting held to review, revise or develop the child’s individualized education program (IEP), but in any event not later than the following timelines:

- (a) School year. In the case of a referral made during the academic year, the timelines shall be as follows.
 - i. The IEP shall be implemented within 45 days of referral or notice, exclusive of the time required to obtain parental consent.
 - ii. In the case of a child whose IEP calls for out-of-district or private placement, the IEP shall be implemented within 60 days of referral or notice, exclusive of the time required to obtain parental consent.
- (b) Between school years. In case of a referral made in between school years, the effective date of the referral may be deemed to be the first school day of the next school year.”

The Department developed and implemented a new online data collection system for this indicator for the purpose of meeting the reporting requirements of the SPP. The Department required electronic data submission of referral and evaluation data by each LEA for the previous

fiscal year. Data was collected beginning July 1, 2006 – August 15, 2006, and will be collected annually thereafter.

Data were collected for all children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received, including children placed by their parents in private/religiously affiliated schools. Data were not obtained from sampling. Data included:

- the number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received;
- the number of children determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 45 school days;
- the number of children determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 45 school days;
- for any child not evaluated within 45 school days and determined not eligible, the number of days beyond the 45-day school-day timeline when eligibility was determined and the reasons (if known) that the evaluation was not completed according to required timelines;
- for any child not evaluated within 45 school days and determined eligible, the number of days beyond the 45-day school-day timeline when eligibility was determined and the reasons (if known) that the evaluation was not completed according to required timelines; and
- required explanation regarding all evaluations not completed within timelines including the number of days beyond the timeline and the reason for the delay.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Percentage of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 45 school days (state established timeline) was 87.5 percent in the 2005-06 school year.

$(12,856 / 14,697 \times 100 = 87.5\%)$

A report of the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluations were completed was between one and 129 days.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

As addressed in the overview, five data points were collected to address this indicator:

- a. Consent to evaluate = 14,697
- b. Not eligible within timeline = 4,324
- c. Eligible within timeline = 7,948
- d. Not eligible beyond timeline = 913
- e. Eligible beyond timeline = 1,512

Using this data, the percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 45 school days (state established timeline) was 83.5 percent $((4,324 + 7,948) / 14,697 \times 100 = 83.5\%)$. Baseline was established after reviewing the explanations regarding failure to meet timelines and an additional 584 students were recoded as “within timeline” due to reasonable explanations. The baseline was recalculated to include the 584 recoded students, which resulted in a new percentage of 87.5 percent.

$$(4,324 + 7,948 + 584) / 14,697 \times 100 = 87.5\%$$

Each LEA was required to submit with its data an explanation regarding all evaluations not completed within timelines and the reason for the delay. These explanations were used to conduct the above recoding. Criteria were established to determine acceptable and unacceptable reasons. The Department individually analyzed each of these cases to determine if the reason was acceptable or unacceptable. If the reason was determined to be acceptable and the evaluation was completed, the case was included in the recalculation of the “within timeline” percentage. The following is a list of the criteria used for the analysis.

Acceptable explanations regarding failure to meet the evaluation timelines criteria:

1. Excessive student absences and/or hospitalization with medical documentation
2. School closures (weather/emergency)
3. Parent fails to produce the child for evaluation
4. Parent request for delay
5. Trial placement for diagnostic purposes to determine eligibility
6. Student moved/withdrew from school
7. FAPE at age three; child transitioning from Connecticut Birth to Three System, referral made at 90 day transition conference, evaluation completed by third birthday

Unacceptable explanations regarding failure to meet the evaluation timelines criteria:

1. Parent did not return phone calls
2. Parent did not have transportation
3. CMT/CAPT testing (statewide assessments)
4. Staff illness
5. Extensive observation needed
6. Need time to determine student’s dominant language
7. Not enough staff/staff schedules/increases in staff caseloads
8. Student not available due to school activities
9. Eye issues (student needs testing and/or reading glasses)
10. Parent schedule inflexible
11. Student refusal

The data utilized to report on this indicator are statewide data that are inclusive of every school district in the state that provides special education and related services. The data are collected annually in accordance with the established timelines for federal reporting. Data are not obtained from sampling. Inclusive of the recode, data reported here are valid and reliable.

The data indicate that we are below the required 100 percent target. The data analysis and subsequent recoding revealed a need for clarification to LEAs regarding acceptable reasons for delay. The Department has responded with policy clarification to the field in preparation for data collection this year. In addition, this is the first year many LEAs collected and analyzed their local data to this extent. It is expected that the statewide policy clarification and local analysis will lead to significant improvements in the 2006-07 school year.

In addition, some of the delays reported for evaluations conducted for students in nonpublic settings were due to the changes in IDEA regulations regarding which LEA is responsible to conduct these evaluations.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 100% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|---------------------|---|
| 11.1 Develop data collection system for evaluation timelines. | 2005-06 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Office of Information Systems database development |
| 11.2 Enhance data collection system for evaluation timelines. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Office of Information Systems database development |
| 11.3 Issue policy memo for clarification of evaluation timelines. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department personnel |
| 11.4 Post policy memo on evaluation timelines on the Department website. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Bureau of Special Education Bureau Bulletin |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------------------|---|
| 11.5 Update the Department’s Special Education Policy and Procedures Manual for LEA adoption. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel and CSDE Parent Workgroup |
| 11.6 Attestation by all LEAs for adoption of Policy and Procedures Manual. | 2007-08 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel and IDEA grant application |
| 11.7 Issue District Annual Performance Report and Determinations. | 2006-07 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 11.8 Establish and implement an automated corrective action notification system. Action Step: Notify districts of compliance status via the certification confirmation report. Action Step: Issue a series of corrective actions for programs that fail to meet the 45-day timeline. Action Step: Districts with less than 100 percent compliance on this indicator will be required to submit subsequent data to demonstrate that they are correctly implementing the related regulatory requirements. Action Step: Provide technical assistance to districts as needed. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC • Regional Education Service Center personnel • Stakeholders including: district personnel, independent consultancies, due process staff, private school staff, parent advocates, bilingual evaluation specialists, and individuals representing recruitment shortage areas. • Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation |
| 11.9 Review data on complaints, mediations and due process hearings on an annual basis for trends related to evaluation timelines. | 2006-07 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 11.10 Establish a Department leadership team and statewide stakeholder group to develop and provide guidance on RtI and for referral and evaluation for determining special education eligibility. | 2006-07 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Associate Commissioner of Division of Family and Student Support Services • Associate Commissioner of Division of Teaching, Learning and Instructional Leadership • Department personnel • SERC • Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) –Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|---|--|
| <p>11.11 Increase awareness and availability of technical assistance aligned with noncompliance areas: Action Step: Analyze reasons for any noncompliance barriers to timely compliance. Action Step: Identify supports for districts based on a current review of the literature given needs of the districts. Action Step: Design or locate multi-media technical assistance support and disseminate using Bureau newsletter, SERC website, and electronic mailings to representative stakeholder groups.</p> | <p>2007-08 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Indicator 11 Work group • SERC |
| <p>11.12 Increase the quality of data received and verified by districts for this data collection. Action Step: Develop and implement training module for Evaluation Timelines Data Collection (online with a training segment for SEDAC). Action Step: Definition of terms handout. Action Step: Ensure compatibility of databases with data collection expectations.</p> | <p>2008-09 school year through 2011</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC • Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation |
| <p>11.13 Assess appropriateness of data collection timing. Action Step: Review data collection timing and federal requirements. Action Step: Survey districts and programs for timing considerations.</p> | <p>2008-09 school year</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation |

Part B State Performance Report for FFY 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Report:

See Overview, page i

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c, d or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The IDEA Part C Program is operated under the authority of the Connecticut State Department of Developmental Services (DDS) and is named the Connecticut Birth to Three System. The IDEA Part B falls under the authority of the Connecticut State Department of Education. Hence, the two IDEA programs in Connecticut operate out of two different state agencies.

Eligible toddlers from the Connecticut Birth to Three System transition from 47 early intervention programs into 159 school districts that provide special education and related services to eligible 3-year-old children with disabilities. Both state agencies work together to ensure that toddlers transitioning from the Connecticut Birth to Three System are referred to their school district no later than six months before their third birthday and that a transition conference is convened by the child’s early intervention program no later than 90 days before the child’s third birthday.

School districts convene IEP team meetings to review referrals, conduct evaluations, determine eligibility and develop and implement a child’s IEP. These meetings are expected to take place by the third birthday in order to ensure that each eligible child receives a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) by his/her third birthday. If a child’s birthday falls over the summer months and the child is not eligible for extended school year services then a FAPE must be provided to the child by the first day of school.

In the last few years, the two state agencies have engaged in multiple joint, coordinated policy and program activities. One of those activities includes a data merge to assist in the identification of

both compliance and programmatic issues relative to transition from the Connecticut Birth to Three System to special education. Data merge activities between the two state agencies reflect adherence to IDEA confidentiality requirements and the confidentiality provisions under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). The provision of a FAPE for children transitioning from the Connecticut Birth to Three System is a compliance issue. Both state agencies work together to ensure a smooth and effective transition for children and their families that meets the compliance expectations for the two IDEA programs.

The Department's data definition for this indicator reflects a stringent definition of the FAPE provisions of IDEA as reflected in statutory language in Section 612 (9) which states that "By the third birthday of such a child, an individualized education program or, if consistent with sections 614(d)(2)(B) and 636(d), an individualized family service plan, has been developed and is being implemented for the child." This statutory language has been defined for state data collection purposes. The data is collected by identifying the "start date" of services indicating that an IEP is "being implemented" for a child. The "start date" is compared to the child's birth date to match the date of a child's IEP implementation with the child's third birthday. Statewide data collection and analysis do not allow for variability in the data relative to situations such as differing start and end days of school (which vary across the state), weekends, holidays, etc., hence the data reported may under-represent the actual numbers of children who received a FAPE by their third birthday. Compliance monitoring and follow up on this indicator in previous years indicates that there are other variables which the data does not capture. Those variables include parental choice to refuse and/or delay the provision of a FAPE, mobility of children and their families, nexus and no-nexus issues for children in foster care, etc., all of which may be factors that under-represent the actual number and percent of children who have an IEP in effect by their third birthday.

Annually, the two state agencies engage in collaborative and coordinated activities to ensure accurate data and reporting of children. These activities address compliance as well as program challenges and barriers for those children who transition from one service system to another. Activities include: refining of data and data verification, training and technical assistance on transition issues, on-going refinement of policies and procedures across the two service systems, and joint development of information, materials and products.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

For the 2004-05 school year, a data merge of Part C and Part B found that 85.4 percent of children that were referred and found eligible for special education and related services had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The data merge of Part C and Part B data and analysis indicates that a total of 1,543 children were referred by the Connecticut Birth to Three System to school districts. Of the 1,543 children referred, 459 or 29.7 percent were determined not eligible for special education. Of the 1,084 children found eligible, 926 children or 85.4 percent received a FAPE by their third birthday. There were 158 children who did not receive a FAPE by their third birthday. The data indicates that the range of days beyond a child's receipt of a FAPE was between eight to 365 calendar days. The majority received a FAPE within 60 days.

Children who did not receive a FAPE by their third birthday in 2004-05 school year came from 68 school districts. The data indicated that there were 32 school districts that had one child and 15 school districts that had two children who did not receive a FAPE by their third birthday. Of the remaining school districts: eleven school districts had three children, four school districts had four children, two school districts had six children, two school districts had seven children, one school district had eight children and one school district had 13 children who did not have a FAPE by their third birthday. Since the provision of a FAPE by the third birthday is a compliance issue for children transitioning from the IDEA Part C Program, the state will follow-up with all school districts in the 2005-06 school year by contacting each school district and engaging in dialogue to ascertain the accuracy of data. If noncompliance in this area is identified, follow up activities will include one or more of the following: dialogue with school districts, data verification activities, record review, interviews with parents and/or school personnel, recommended and/or required training and technical assistance, and the development of a corrective action plan if necessary. Follow up information on monitored school districts will be available in the February 2007 Annual Performance Report (APR).

The two state agencies will work together to resolve any challenges or barriers that may be identified that cross the two service delivery systems.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 100% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|----------------------------------|--|
| 12.1 Conduct data merge activities between IDEA’s Part C and Part B to inform and guide future collaborative activities, including reporting activities, while ensuring compliance with IDEA and FERPA. | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Part C personnel |
| 12.2 Work with Part C to provide unique student identification numbers that could follow a child from Part C to Part B to enhance the current data merge activities. | 2007-08 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Part C personnel |
| 12.3 Refine Department systematic follow-up and corrective action activities with school districts to ensure that the free and appropriate public education (FAPE) by age 3 demonstrates 100% compliance. | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 12.4 Provide parent training opportunities across both service delivery systems to ensure that parents are familiar with transition activities and that parents understand the similarities and differences between the Part C and Part B. | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Part C personnel • Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) – Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) |
| 12.5 Work with Part C to encourage early intervention programs to provide small and large group opportunities for children transitioning in order to introduce the child to activities outside of the home in groups with other children. | 2005-06 school year through 2008 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Birth-3 providers |
| 12.6 Redefine current policies and procedures across both service delivery systems to reflect the reauthorized IDEA and the new regulations. | 2008-09 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Part C personnel |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

| |
|---|
| Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition |
|---|

Indicator 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 Planning and Placement Team (PPT) meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the PPT meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

| |
|---------------------|
| Measurement: |
|---------------------|

| |
|---|
| <p>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 PPT meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the PPT meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.</p> |
|---|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Department added a new data element to the 2005-06 state data system to collect whether or not students' Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) include coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services. This element was collected annually for all youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP. The state ensured the accuracy of this data through the general supervision system such as data system accuracy checks, monitoring and complaints. The Department also created an Indicator #13 Transition Services Checklist for use by local education agencies (LEAs) and the state to assess whether or not the IEP goals and transition services are coordinated, measurable, and will reasonably enable a student to meet his/her postsecondary goals. The checklist, which is still currently being used, covers the three major outcome areas that must be considered in the development of student transition goals and objectives as well as whether the student and any outside/participating agency were invited to the planning and placement team (PPT) meeting where transition planning is being discussed. These outcomes areas are postsecondary education or training, employment, and independent living/community participation and the subsequent IEP goals must be based on age-appropriate transition assessment. The Transition Checklist was adapted to the Connecticut IEP in collaboration with the Interagency Transition Task Force and was modeled after the instrument

created by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) and approved by OSEP as a rigorous, valid and reliable tool to assess performance on this Indicator. It is coordinated with the State Initiative for Transition Services as well as all transition training and technical assistance offered in conjunction with the State Education Resource Center (SERC).

Due to changes in the Indicator 13 measurement language, in 2009-10 the Department added two additional fields to the state data system to collect if the student had been invited to attend the PPT meeting to develop Transition Goals and Objectives and if appropriate, if a representative from any outside/participating agency was also invited to attend. As one further way to ensure data accuracy, the Department initiated a desk audit of randomly selected IEPs. In addition to the aforementioned fields, the secondary transition component of the desk audit also included a review of the appropriate, measurable postsecondary and annual goals based on age-appropriate transition assessment, including transition services.

Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):

Youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that included appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that were 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 was 77.8 percent in the 2009-10 school year. Target not met.

There was also evidence that the student was invited to the PPT meeting where transition services were discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any outside/participating agency was invited to the PPT meeting with the prior written consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

$$10,222/13,136 \times 100 = 77.8\%$$

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The data utilized to report on this indicator are statewide data that are inclusive of every school district in the state that provides special education and related services. The data are the federally required Section 618 data. The data are collected annually in accordance with the established timelines for federal reporting. Data were not obtained from sampling. All data reported here are valid and reliable.

Of the 143 districts in Connecticut who serve youth with disabilities aged 16 and above who have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services, nineteen districts meet the 100 percent target for this indicator. One hundred and twenty-four districts contributed to the 22.2 percent of students ($n = 2914$) without coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services or who were not invited to the PPT meeting or did not have appropriate outside/participating agencies invited.

This indicator is quite complex as there are three distinct ways for a student's IEP to fail to meet the criteria necessary to answer "yes" to the overarching indicator question. First, the student's

IEP may not meet the criteria for coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services; second, the student may not have been invited to the PPT meeting to plan transition activities; and third, appropriate outside/participating agencies may not have been invited to attend the PPT planning meeting. The 2,914 IEPs with the answer “no” may have failed any one or a combination of all three criteria. In light of this complexity and the large proportion of student IEPs not meeting the overall goal, the Department has chosen to analyze each IEP and LEA from the perspective of each of the three criteria that must be met for compliance. In FFY 2009, the Department used a consistently applied strategy (detailed below) across all bureaus when working with LEAs. This strategy was used to direct training and technical assistance to each of the 124 districts not meeting the 100 percent target and to inform all 143 districts serving secondary students about appropriate transition planning policies, practices and procedures.

Coordinated, Measurable, Annual IEP Goals and Transition Services

Statewide, 99.7 percent of student IEPs met the goals and services criteria (13,095/13,136 = 99.7%). Seventeen districts were responsible for the 41 students without appropriate post-secondary goals and transition services. Eleven of these districts had only one IEP fail the criteria and six districts had between 2 and 12 IEPs fail the criteria. Only two of these districts fell below 95 percent compliance.

In order to answer “yes” to this individual compliance component that indicates that a student’s transition goals are coordinated, measurable, and annual, an LEA must answer “yes” to each of the following five criteria [NOTE: In Connecticut, the “postsecondary goal” is called a “Post-School Outcome Goal Statement”]:

- Post-School Outcome Goal Statement (PSOGS) for Postsecondary Education/Training;
- Post-School Outcome Goal Statement for Employment;*
- Annual Goal and Objectives for PSOGS in Postsecondary Education/Training;
- Annual Goal and Objectives for PSOGS in Employment;* and
- All PSOGSs are based on age-appropriate transition assessment.

* AND if appropriate Independent Living Skills.

Student Invited to Transition PPT Meeting

Statewide, 95.5 percent of student IEPs met the student invited criteria (12,547/13,136 = 95.5%). Ninety-three districts were responsible for the 589 students who were not invited to the PPT meeting to plan transition services. Forty-one of the 93 districts fell below 95 percent compliance. The table below demonstrates the wide range of the number of students not invited to the transition planning PPT meeting.

| | <i>1 Student not Invited</i> | <i>2-4 Students not Invited</i> | <i>5-9 Students not Invited</i> | <i>10 or more Students not Invited</i> |
|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Number of Districts | 19 | 43 | 13 | 18 |

Appropriate Outside/Participating Agencies Invited to Transition PPT Meeting

Statewide, 81.7 percent of student IEPs met the agency invited criteria (10,732/13,136 = 81.7%). One hundred and ten districts were responsible for the 2,404 IEPs where an outside/participating agency was not invited to the transition planning PPT meeting. Eighty-five of the 110 districts fell below 95 percent compliance. The table below demonstrates the wide range of the number of IEPs where outside /participating agencies were not invited to the transition planning PPT meeting.

| | <i>1 IEP - Agency not Invited</i> | <i>2-4 IEPs - Agency not Invited</i> | <i>5-9 IEPs - Agency not Invited</i> | <i>10-49 IEPs - Agency not Invited</i> | <i>50 or more IEPs - Agency not Invited</i> |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| Number of Districts | 12 | 23 | 20 | 45 | 10 |

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | Not applicable/baseline data year |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 100% |

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| 13.1 Revise state recommended Individualized Education Program (IEP) form and Summary of Performance (SOP) form to reflect IDEA regulations related to transition and provide training to district transition and administrative personnel, agency personnel, and families on revised forms with respect to issues of compliance. | 2010- 11 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • State Education Resource Center (SERC) • Transition Task Force (TTF) • Connecticut Council for Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE) |
| 13.2 (Revised) Develop and provide a series of trainings for districts regarding tools for providing age-appropriate transition assessment, and using the results to develop measurable Post-School Outcome Goal statements, functional performance statements, and annual IEP goals and objectives within the general curriculum framework (Common Core Standards) that will reasonably enable students to meet their postsecondary goals (e.g., Transition Assessment & the IEP; Education Benefit – Making the IEP a Living Document) to be college and career ready. | 2010- 11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC • TTF |
| 13.3 Develop four topic briefs on Writing Transition Goals and Objectives; Guidelines on Writing Post-School Outcome Goal Statements (PSOGS); PSOGS Frequently Asked Questions; and PSOGS Sample Statements and implement in training with parents/families, special education directors, PPT chairpersons and transition contact persons as well as | 2010- 11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC • Parent Training and Information Center (PTI)-CPAC • ConnCASE |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| posting documents on the Department, Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) and SERC Web sites. | | |
| 13.4 Provide training to parents/families, transition and special education personnel, secretaries, administrators, PPT chairpersons, related services personnel (e.g., school nurses, school counselors, school psychologists, social workers) and agency personnel to support best practices in secondary transition that will contribute to successful post-school outcomes. | 2010- 11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC • TTF • CPAC • ConnCASE • Department of Social Services, Bureau of Rehabilitation Services (BRS) • Department of Developmental Disabilities (DDS) |
| 13.5 Provide training on transition services and resources to district and adult agency personnel and parents/families and students with disabilities (e.g., Connect-Ability Web site; Person-Centered Planning; Job Coaching and Job Development; Self Advocacy & Self-Determination). | 2010- 11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC • CPAC |
| 13.6 Provide training to students, parents, and professionals about preparation for students with disabilities for postsecondary education (e.g., Transition to College). | 2010- 11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC • TTF members • CPAC • Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) |
| 13.7 Collaborate with Division of Career Development and Transition (DCDT) national organization and CT Chapter, SERC, and the TTF to offer a national transition conference in Mystic, CT in October 2010 for professionals, parents and students. | 2010 -2011 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC • DCDT • BRS • Department of Public Health (DPH) |
| 13.8 Revise or develop transition resource publications: <i>CT Transition Manual</i> ; <i>Directory of Transition/Vocational Service Providers</i> ; and <i>Directory of Transition Services in College, University and Community-Based Settings</i> . | 2010 -2011 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC • TTF • CPAC |
| 13.9 Conduct a Train-the-Trainer multiple session training to prepare a second cadre of professionals and parents to offer basic transition training to parents, families, students and district personnel. | 2010- 11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC • CSDE Transition and Parent Workgroups |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPAC • TTF |
| <p>13.10 Develop email lists/databases for dissemination of transition information to related services personnel (e.g., middle and high school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, school nurses, transition contact persons).</p> | <p>2010 -2011 school year</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC • University of Connecticut • BRS • DPH |
| <p>13.11 In collaboration with BRS, SERC, and CPAC, develop the capacity of the Regional Education Service Centers (RESCs) to provide information, training, and resources to parents, families, districts, students, and adult agencies through regional Resource Counselors regarding: 1) the eligibility and referral processes for students with disabilities to access adult agencies; 2) community resources for providing adult services to students with disabilities transitioning from high school; and 3) feedback from families, students and districts to improve the consistency and provision of services by adult agencies.</p> | <p>2010 - 11 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • RESCs • CPAC • BRS • DDS • DDS, Division of Autism Spectrum Services (DASS) • Bureau of Education and Services for the Blind (BESB) • Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS) • DPH |
| <p>13.12 Refine and expand the implementation of the secondary transition on-site technical assistance and training visits to districts to ensure that the IEPs of youth aged 16 and above include coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services that are reasonably designed to enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals to include but not be limited to: 1) training on the adapted NSTTAC Indicator #13 Checklist; 2) providing training to site visit team members from a wide range of stakeholder groups, and 3) development of brief feedback reports/checklists to assist in the expansion/refinement of district transition services and encourage on-going district improvement planning.</p> | <p>2010 - 11 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC • TTF • CPAC • IHE • Adult agencies |
| <p>13.13 Facilitate the reorganization of the state’s longstanding (20+ years) TTF to</p> | <p>2010 - 11 school year</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| support the Department in its efforts to inform and guide students with disabilities, families, school districts, and community organizations to facilitate the movement from school to post-school activities, including postsecondary education, employment and independent living/community participation. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TTF |
| <p>13.14 (New) In alignment with its revised Mission Statement and 12 Guiding Principles, the TTF will work on two new activities to support the Department in its efforts to inform and guide students with disabilities, families, school districts, and community organizations to facilitate the movement from school to post-school activities, including: 1.) A crosswalk of the Student Success Plan with the IEP, 504 Plan, Individualized Healthcare Plan, and the Summary of Performance, and 2.) A review of the Common Core Standards to cull out career and college ready transition standards for students with disabilities.</p> | 2011- 12 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC • TTF |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

| |
|---|
| Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition |
|---|

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

| |
|---------------------|
| Measurement: |
|---------------------|

| |
|---|
| <p>A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.</p> |
|---|

| |
|--|
| <p>B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.</p> |
|--|

| |
|--|
| <p>C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.</p> |
|--|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) recognizes Indicator 14 as having been sufficiently changed from previous reporting periods as to require the designation as a *new* indicator for the current reporting period. However, it is valuable to include some historical information for the purposes of understanding.

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) has been collecting outcome data on all students that exit from special education and are no longer in secondary schools, since 2000,

using census methodology. The CSDE has a broad stakeholder group represented on the Transition Task Force (TTF) whose input is solicited for the SPP Indicator 14. Students defined as exiters and targeted as potential respondents of the Post-School Outcomes Survey (PSOS) include students that left special education services for one of the following reasons: graduated with a standard diploma; obtained a Certificate of Completion; reached maximum age of eligibility for special education services or; dropped out of school.

The original instrument used was developed in 2000 by the CSDE with input from the TTF. A panel of content experts with expertise in special education, transition and survey methodology reviewed the original instrument. Subsequent revision of this instrument occurred in 2002, 2004, and 2010 based on ongoing stakeholder feedback. For each revision, the CSDE received recommendations and/or technical support from varied stakeholders, the TTF and the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO). The CSDE has a Memorandum of Agreement with the University of Connecticut to conduct data collection activities and training for Indicator 14. Data were solicited from all 2008-09 exiters in three waves of mailings beginning in June 2010. In an effort to increase survey response rate, the second and third mailings targeted exiters who had not responded to the original mailing.

The current instrument (see Appendix) consists of items across three main categories: Part I) Postsecondary Education and Training Status; Part II) Employment Status; and Part III) Additional Information (i.e., participation in state agency support systems, participation in other support systems, and information related to the respondent's high school experience). The first seven of twelve survey questions (Parts I and II) are multiple choice from which respondents select either the single most appropriate response or all responses that apply. The final five questions (Part III) are open-ended narrative responses.

Definitions

The following definitions are specific to SPP Indicator 14:

Competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Higher Education means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (2-year program), or college/university (4- or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Some Other Employment means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

Other postsecondary education or training means youth enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least one complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, or vocational technical school which is less than a 2-year program).

Per OSEP’s instructions, the CSDE does not recognize “*any school that provides not less than a 1-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation*” as an Institution of Higher Education as articulated in the 1998 Amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965, 20 U.S.C. Section 101(b) (1998).

Baseline Data for Measures A, B, and C for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):

The results of the CSDE’s 2010 survey of students who exited special education in 2008-09 and were no longer in secondary education found the following:

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(364 youth enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by (787 survey respondents)] x 100 = 46.3%.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(481 youth enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by (787 survey respondents)] x 100 = 61.2%.
- C. Percent 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 = [(619 youth enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by (787 survey respondents)] x 100 = 78.7%.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Count of Respondents Enrolled in Higher Education | 364 |
| Count of Respondents Competitively Employed | 117 |
| Count of Respondents Enrolled in Other Education/Training | 57 |
| Count of Respondents in Some Other Employment | 81 |

2010 survey administration sample total:
 Surveys sent = 4,678
 Surveys returned completed = 787
 Response rate = 16.8%
 Surveys returned nondeliverable = 922
 Nondeliverable rate = 19.7%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Survey responses were analyzed to determine state performance on Indicator 14. The responses in this year’s survey sample were analyzed for representativeness by gender, race/ethnicity, exit type and disability as compared to the total statewide population of students with disabilities. The analysis for response representativeness was conducted using both a statistical significance test (chi-square) and a practical or meaningful significance test (effect size). Below are the actual proportions for each area assessed.

| Variable | Grouping | 2008-09 Statewide Exit Data | 2008-09 Exit Survey Data |
|----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Gender | Male | 66.6% | 68.5% |
| | Female | 33.4% | 31.5% |
| Race/Ethnicity | American Indian/ Alaskan Native | 0.3% | 0.1% |
| | Asian | 1.1% | 1.8% |
| | Black | 18.4% | 11.1% |
| | White | 62.5% | 77.5% |
| | Hispanic | 17.7% | 9.5% |
| Exit Reason | Grad. w/Diploma | 76.0% | 88.3% |
| | Grad. w/Certificate | 2.0% | 1.2% |
| | Dropped Out | 18.8% | 6.2% |
| | Reached Max. Age | 3.2% | 4.3% |
| Disability | LD | 39.7% | 38.6% |
| | ID | 5.1% | 5.7% |
| | ED | 17.7% | 12.2% |
| | SLI | 6.8% | 8.5% |
| | OHI | 21.9% | 21.5% |
| | Autism | 3.4% | 5.3% |
| | Other | 5.4% | 8.2% |

| Variable | Chi-Sq Test (χ^2) | Cohen's Effect Size | Interpretation |
|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Gender | $\chi^2(1) = 1.3$ | n/a | n/a |
| Race/Ethnicity | $\chi^2(4) = 83.1^*$ | 0.32 | medium |
| Exit Reason | $\chi^2(3) = 87.2^*$ | 0.33 | medium |
| Disability | $\chi^2(6) = 35.9^*$ | 0.21 | small |

* Significant at .001 level.

Of the four areas assessed, only gender demonstrated no statistical difference between the sample and statewide population proportions. There was statistical support for differences between the respondents and the statewide population of exiters across, race/ethnicity, exit reason and disability; however, the effect size or practical significance level warranted minimal consideration. Effect size for disability was small (below 0.30) and did not indicate any practical or meaningful difference between the sample and the actual population, and both race/ethnicity and exit reasons were border-line between a small and medium practical significance. It is important to assess the effect size of any statistical significance test outcome as statistical significance tests are highly influenced by sample size. Effect sizes are not influenced by sample size and thus allow for the interpretation of statistical differences for their meaningful and practical application when drawing conclusions from the data.


Considering the chi-square results, the CSDE is satisfied with the overall representativeness of the 2008-09 exit survey respondents and asserts the conclusions drawn from this survey are both valid and reliable.

Our overall response rate was 16.8 percent, slightly lower than past years. One explanation for the lower response rate is the unusually high number of surveys (922 or 19.7%) returned as undeliverable. Another explanation for the lower response rate and increased undeliverable rate might include the high unemployment and cost of living in Connecticut. Studies show that young adults are leaving our state for employment opportunities and lower cost of living available elsewhere. Improvement activities have been developed to foster a decrease in missing or invalid post-school exiter contact information.

The survey found that 21.3 percent ($n = 168$) of the 2008-09 exiters who responded to the survey were not engaged in higher education or in any other postsecondary education or training program; and/or competitively employed or in some other employment. One item on Connecticut’s PSOS collected information specific to unengaged exiters with respect to involvement in Adult Day Services, Adult Day Vocational Programs, Independent Living Skills Program, Volunteer/Community Services, or engagement in other unspecified activities.

These data for unengaged exiters represent involvement in four valuable aspects of post-school life and are collected in addition to Indicator 14 criteria.

Figure 1 - Activities of Unengaged Exiters



Based on the post-school outcomes data, the following targets were set for Measures A, B and C.

The TTF Indicator 14 Stakeholder Workgroup assisted the CSDE in setting measurable and rigorous targets as well as improvement activities.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Targets | | |
|---------------------|--|------------------------|------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 81.1% | | |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 81.2% | | |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 81.5% | | |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 82% | | |
| | Measure A | Measure B | Measure C |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 46.3% baseline data | 61.2% baseline data | 78.7% baseline data |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 46.3% | 61.2% | 78.7% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 46.3% | 61.2% | 78.7% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 46.4% | 61.3% | 78.8% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| 14.1 Develop and implement pilot program process for using district personnel to follow up on post-school outcome non-responders. | 2010-11 school year through 2012 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • State Education Resource Center (SERC) personnel • TTF Members • University of Connecticut (UCONN) personnel |
| 14.2 Collaborate with peer states regarding PSOS data collection methodology and format. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • UCONN personnel |
| 14.3 Develop protocols for district-level PSOS reporting for the purpose of offering data to inform transition planning efforts. | 2010-11 school year through 2012 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • UCONN personnel • TTF members |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| 14.4 Pilot electronic version of the PSOS. | 2010-11 school year through 2012 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • CSDE Transition Workgroup • UCONN personnel |
| 14.5 Employ cross-categorical PSOS data analysis to assist in identifying and addressing emergent themes. | 2011-12 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • CSDE Transition Workgroup • UCONN personnel |
| 14.6 Provide training or technical assistance to districts, families, state agency personnel, and other relevant stakeholder groups regarding transition and post-school services available via state agencies. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • CSDE Transition and Parent Workgroups • CT Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) • Department of Social Services, Bureau of Rehabilitation Services (BRS) |
| 14.7 Provide training or technical assistance to Department personnel and relevant stakeholder groups to support best practices in secondary transition that will contribute to successful post-school outcomes. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • TTF • CPAC • ConnCASE |
| 14.8 Display state-wide PSOS results on the Department’s Web site. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 14.9 Provide training or technical assistance to districts in accessing and analyzing district-level PSOS data to inform program improvement decisions. | 2010-11 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • UCONN personnel |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

The Department has a Focused Monitoring Steering Committee comprised of parents, advocates, Department consultants, training and technical assistance providers from the State Education Resource Center (SERC) and district directors of special education. This group was originally convened in 2003-04 to assist the Department in designing the current system of General Supervision and Focused Monitoring. The group continues to meet on a regular basis to review the results of general supervision and monitoring activities, advise the Department on improvement activities, analyze statewide data, develop strategies for public dissemination of data, determine the key performance indicators for the upcoming year and advise on implementation of the SPP.

Due to the treatment of the 2003-04 school year as a planning year, there were a limited number of findings of noncompliance in that year. The baseline data is significantly impacted by the ongoing issues of noncompliance with one district currently in level four of sanctions.

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

| |
|--|
| Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision |
|--|

Indicator 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

| |
|---------------------|
| Measurement: |
|---------------------|

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and enforcement actions that the State has taken.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Department has multiple methods of oversight to ensure compliance with IDEA. These methods together make up the system of general supervision. A description of the system is available on the Department website at www.sde.ct.gov in a manual titled: *Connecticut's System*

of General Supervision and Focused Monitoring for Continuous Improvement for Students with Disabilities. A copy of the manual is also included with this SPP packet. The range of supervision and monitoring activities includes:

- ongoing meetings of the Focused Monitoring Steering Committee;
- the annual review and dissemination of data for LEAs through the Special Education Strategic School Profiles;
- the annual training of data submission and verification of data through preliminary profiles and focused monitoring data reports;
- ongoing analysis of trends in complaints, mediations and due process hearings;
- self-assessments conducted by LEAs on identified areas of concern;
- a desk audit of LEA IDEA applications for funding;
- an attestation by each district of their adoption and use of the Department issued Policy and Procedure Manual and IEP form;
- training and technical assistance on guidelines and publications created by the Department and supported through training and technical assistance from SERC;
- monitoring of corrective actions issued through complaints or due process hearings, and focused monitoring; and
- focused monitoring of key performance indicators.

The Department spent the 2003-04 school year as a transition from our program review process of monitoring LEAs on a cyclical basis to the current system of focused monitoring. The new system of focused monitoring incorporates the information gleaned from all existing data sources including complaints, mediations and due process hearings, as well as the other methods of general supervision described above.

The data from the above resources is used by the steering committee to determine key performance indicators (KPIs) for focused monitoring on an annual basis. Three data probes are identified for each key performance indicator. Criteria is established for each data point and district data are displayed on data maps in one of three categories: 1) an area of significant concern requiring data verification, data analysis and potential need for monitoring and improvement planning; 2) an area of concern requiring data verification and analysis; and 3) an area of strength indicating strong performance in the area identified. A copy of the data maps for 2005-06 is included in this SPP packet and available on the Department website at www.sde.ct.gov.

The data maps are disseminated to superintendents, special education directors and parent organizations. The data maps are used to determine which districts will receive specific communications regarding their performance and requests for a self-assessment to analyze data and indicate improvement activities. This information is reviewed and used to determine which districts will subsequently receive a focused monitoring site visit.

Site visits were conducted for 10 districts in the 2004-05 school year and will be conducted for 10 districts in the 2005-06 school year. Site visits include a review of district policies, practices and procedures, a record review, observation of students, interviews with staff and administration and a public forum for parents. The site visit team includes representatives from

the Department's Bureau of Special Education and Bureau of School and District Improvement, training and technical assistance providers from SERC, parents, Department data managers and special education directors from districts not being monitored.

The site visits in the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years focused on two key performance indicators. The key performance indicators for both years are: (1) monitor any overrepresentation of students with disabilities, in specific disability categories, for all racial and ethnic groups, in comparison to the population of the district's general education enrollment; and (2) decrease the number of students in all disability categories who spend time in segregated settings as defined by 0-40 percent of their day with nondisabled peers.

Within six weeks of the conclusion of a site visit, a preliminary report is issued by the Department with findings that identify strengths, recommendations for improved performance, and areas of noncompliance. Any findings of noncompliance are coupled with corrective actions for addressing the noncompliance, including timelines within one year of date of issue of the report, and requirements for reporting to the Department regarding implementation of the required corrective actions. Upon completion of the corrective actions, a final letter indicating compliance is issued by the Department. In addition, all districts that are reviewed for each key performance indicator convene a district team of general and special education representatives to attend a day-long improvement planning session with the Department to address the recommendations for improved performance. These plans are reviewed prior to approval by the Department and incorporated into any existing NCLB improvement plan or district strategic plan.

Districts are offered training, technical assistance and the opportunity for grant funds to assist with implementing the plans. Districts report on implementation of the improvement plans every six months. The plans are designed to be implemented over the course of 18 months. The improvement plans contain activities to address improved performance, not issues of noncompliance. At the end of the 18 months, upon review of data in the key performance area, districts will be issued a letter indicating they met the requirements as identified in the improvement plan or indicating the need for continued planning and improvement.

The Department has designed a series of sanctions that may be used to facilitate change in district performance or compliance as required. These include: a review of progress on plans on a quarterly basis, notification to superintendent and board of education regarding lack of progress and redesign of plan, release of IDEA funds on a conditional basis, and appointing a consultant at district expense to ensure correction of findings of noncompliance.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

- A) Ninety-five percent of findings of noncompliance from 2003-04 school year were completed within the one year timeline (2004-05) or the findings were issued less than one year ago. The 5 percent represents one district with ongoing issues of noncompliance. This district is on level four of graduated sanctions by the Department.
 - a. 20 findings of noncompliance
 - b. 19 findings of noncompliance from 19 districts have been corrected.

19 / 20 = 95% of noncompliance corrections completed within one year.

- B) Zero percent of findings of noncompliance from 2003-04 school year were completed within the one year time line. This percentage represents three findings of noncompliance for the same district indicated in A. There were no findings of noncompliance for other districts.
- a. 3 findings of noncompliance
 - b. 0 findings of noncompliance have been corrected.
3 / 0 = 0% of noncompliance corrections completed within one year.
- C) One hundred percent of findings of noncompliance from 2003-04 school year were completed within the one year time line.
- a. 39 agencies with findings of noncompliance
 - b. 99 findings of noncompliance
 - c. 99 findings of noncompliance have been corrected
99 / 99 = 100% of noncompliance corrections completed within one year.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

- A) As reported in the 2005 APR, one urban school district remains with ongoing issues of noncompliance identified in the 1999-2003 cycle of review, in spite of the continued efforts of the Department to facilitate resolution of these issues. These issues include: ensuring that IEPs are implemented and that each student's IEP is available at the school that he/she is attending, placement decisions for children with disabilities are made on an individual basis, all students have access to the general education curriculum with corresponding materials and all services identified on IEPs are delivered.

A staff member from the Bureau of Special Education was assigned to work with a staff member from the Equity Unit of the Department to ensure that students are receiving a free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. Since the last report in the 2005 APR, the Department has maintained an ongoing presence in the district through the following activities:

- May 2005: Department audit of students' IEPs to monitor delivery of services – six schools were chosen for the review, four were visited. Ten of 16 files continued to demonstrate noncompliance;
- June and October 2005: Meeting of superintendent, assistant superintendent, chief of staff and director of special education with the Department associate commissioner and Department district monitors to discuss issues of noncompliance;
- Fall 2005: Meeting of Department district monitors with the administration of the teacher's union and district administration to discuss issues relating to noncompliance;
- Fall 2005: Provision of technical assistance to district through Department funded intervention teams in 15 schools (\$30,000);
- Fall 2005: Planning for district Coaches Academy in Spring 2006;
- Fall 2005: Implementation of Level Four of Sanctions; and
- December 2005: Focused Monitoring site visit scheduled.

The Department has a menu of four levels of graduated sanctions that may be employed in response to district noncompliance. As indicated through the 2005 APR and the list of Department interventions, three of these sanctions had been employed. On November 1, 2005, Department communicated to the district movement to level four of sanctions which includes appointing a special education consultant at district expense to assist with implementation of corrective actions. The Department required the district to redirect part of their 2006 IDEA appropriations to ensure that students were receiving their mandated IEP services. The mandated consultant will be required to conduct school and classroom visits, prepare and write monthly reports on district progress in implementing its special education policies and procedures and in demonstrating compliance with state and federal mandates. The reports will be submitted to the superintendent, Chair of the board of education, and the Department associate commissioner of the Division of Family and Student Support Services.

As described above, the Department had minimal findings of noncompliance in 2003-04 outside of those identified through dispute resolution. This data are presented in the attached data template and used to establish the required baselines. In an effort to more accurately communicate the current system of general supervision and monitoring, findings for the 2004-05 year are included in this report. The Department conducted 10 focused monitoring site visits in the 2004-05 year. No findings of noncompliance have exceeded the one year time line. The following chart summarizes findings of noncompliance and timelines for completion of corrective actions:

| District | Issue(s) | One year timeline | Status |
|----------|--|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| 064 | Provision of IEP services General education teacher access to IEP Access to general education curriculum Placement decisions made on individual basis | February 2002 | Open Level Four of sanctions |
| 163 | Evaluation practices Provision of IEP services | December 17, 2005 | Open |
| 077 | Evaluation practices Provision of IEP services | December 7, 2005 | Closed |
| 103 | Evaluation practices Length of instructional day | December 22, 2005 | Closed |
| 164 | IEP goals and services individualized for student need | January 21, 2006 | Closed |
| 147 | Notice of planning and placement team meeting Out-of-district IEP implementation and notice of placement | March 28, 2006 | Closed |

SPP Template – Part B

Connecticut
State

| District | Issue(s) | One year timeline | Status |
|----------|--|-------------------|--------|
| 111 | Data collection for time with nondisabled peers Evaluation practices Procedural violations Eligibility for speech/language services | March 29, 2006 | Closed |
| 069 | Functional behavioral assessment and behavioral support plans Involvement of parents in PPT meetings Evaluation practices Documentation of service delivery | April 25, 2006 | Closed |
| 132 | No findings of noncompliance | NA | NA |
| 043 | IEP link to general education curriculum Service delivery on IEP Transition planning Eligibility for speech/language services Regular education teacher present at PPT | May 11, 2006 | Open |
| 136 | Completeness of IEP document | May 11, 2006 | Closed |

- A) An analysis of data for 2004-05, demonstrates that the Department will be at 100 percent for that year pending resolution of the issues in the same district that impacted the 2003-04 school year.
- B) The three findings all relate to the same district described in section A.
- C) Target met.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% |

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 100% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| 15.1 Implementation of NCSEAM State Partner Work Plan. | 2005-06 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) |
| 15.2 Addition of student interview into FM process. | 2005-06 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students attending CT Youth Leadership Forum |
| 15.3 Disseminate state color-coded maps representing key performance indicators. | 2005-06 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department personnel to design and disseminate the maps Department website |
| 15.4 Arrange for Focused Monitoring Steering Committee to meet three times on an annual basis to review data, determine key performance indicators and advise on implementation of SPP. | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stipends for parents NCSEAM |
| 15.6 Complete annual revision of focused monitoring self assessments and site visit protocols. | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focused Monitoring Coordinator Lead consultants for FM |
| 15.7 Conduct focused monitoring to ensure compliance with IDEA. The monitoring tools will be utilized to review student records; interview with administrators, teachers (general and special education), related service professionals; solicit input from | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fourteen consultants from the Department to conduct focused monitoring site visits, including focused monitoring coordinator |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|------------------------------------|--|
| parent through forums; and conduct observations of implementation of student IEPs. | | |
| 15.8 Distribute district grant funds to implement improvement plans. | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$10,000 per district – IDEA discretionary funds |
| 15.9 Conduct external evaluation of focused monitoring system. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External evaluator • NCSEAM technical assistance |
| 15.10 Revise state IEP form and manual – training in new form. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Printing costs |
| 15.11 Update Department’s Policy and Procedure Manual for districts. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 15.12 Provide oversight by Department consultants to districts with ongoing noncompliance and district consultant to provide monitoring and technical assistance in district and report to the Department on correction of noncompliance. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District IDEA funds |
| 15.13 Review of system of sanctions for districts with ongoing noncompliance. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 15.14 Provide training and technical assistance tied to district improvement plans. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SERC personnel |
| 15.15 Implement new Department data collection system to assist with tracking noncompliance identified through complaints, mediations and due process hearings. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office of Information Systems database development |
| 15.16 Meet with SERC to discuss statewide and district specific activities and training to address general supervision and monitoring. | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • CSPD Council |
| 15.17 Develop and implement GSS Manual and GSS Internal Evaluation Protocol. | 2007-08 school year until complete | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel |
| 15.18 Conduct alignment and coordinate activities such as notification methods, data collection and methods, database infrastructure among all components of general supervision and state accountability measures to ensure an integrated | 2007-08 school year through 2010 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel • Other state agency personnel as needed |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|---|---|
| system. | | |
| <p>15.19 Coordinate compliance planning and revision of procedures for timelines and findings, develop a glossary to ensure common use of terms. Enhance methods of disseminating data to stakeholders, districts, and families through use of visual depictions.</p> | <p>2007-08 school year through 2010</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel |
| <p>15.20 (Revised) Hire FTE consultant to oversee development and implementation of the Department’s system of general supervision within available IDEA appropriations.</p> | <p>2007-08 school year, maintain indefinitely</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| <p>15.21 (Revised) Develop and implement a comprehensive general supervision electronic information system within available IDEA appropriations.</p> | <p>2008-09 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel to design and implement • Independent contractors to develop • Training to use the system • Fiscal support for resources to build and maintain system |
| <p>15.23 Re-examination of current enforcement procedures with emphasis on (1) including parents in the state monitoring process, (2) focusing monitoring efforts on the issues that are most critical to ensuring appropriate education to children with disabilities , and (3) timely follow-up to ensure that appropriate actions to demonstrate compliance with the law are taken across all monitoring areas.</p> | <p>2008-09 school year through 2010</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Electronic data and tracking system • SERC personnel |
| <p>15.24 Fully incorporate other monitoring activities into a comprehensive system of general supervision with common protocol and practices regarding oversight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>P.J. et al .v. State of Connecticut, State Board of Education et al.</i>; • grant application submissions; • approved private special education program reviews; | <p>2008-09 school year through 2010</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Electronic data and tracking system • Staff development • Revised General Supervision manual, guidelines, and protocol. |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEIS; • parentally placed private school students; and • fiscal verification. | | |
| <p>15.25 Review and revise GSS policies and procedures that address instances of longstanding noncompliance and the implementation of enforcement actions and sanctions.</p> | <p>2010-11 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • SERC personnel |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:
Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Department assigns a Bureau of Special Education consultant to coordinate the signed written complaint system. Signed written complaints are logged in and assigned to a Department consultant. The staff member completes the review of the complaint and issues a written final decision within 60 days of receipt of the complaint. The 60 day time limit for the review and resolution of a complaint may be extended if the parties agree to engage in mediation or alternative means of dispute resolution, or if exceptional circumstances exist with respect to the particular complaint in which case all parties will be informed in writing of the specific length of the extension and the circumstances required the extension.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

$(63 + 13) / 76 \times 100 = 100\%$

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Target met. This data and analysis demonstrate full compliance in this indicator as required in the FFY 2003 Annual Performance Report letter dated October 18, 2005.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% |

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 100% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|-------------------------|---|
| 16.1 Develop brochure for LEAs and families on alternatives to dispute resolution. | 2005-06 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Education Resource Center (SERC) |
| 16.2 Continue development of new data system to track complaints by district, issue, findings and timelines. Data system to have “tickler” system for corrective action timelines. Implement data system and identify training needs of bureau staff. | 2006-07 until completed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office of Information Systems database development Due Process Unit of Bureau of Special Education |
| 16.3 Simplify the process for filing a complaint through explanation and sample request form in updated Parent’s Guide to Special Education in Connecticut. | 2006-2007 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CSDE Parent Workgroup |
| 16.4 Complete an assessment of the Dispute Resolution System and alignment to general supervision of compliance indicators. <i>Action Step:</i> Review practices and tools used for assigning and verifying corrective actions. <i>Action Step:</i> Revise procedures to include | 2008-09 through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department personnel Due Process Unit of Bureau of Special Education CADRE assessment tools Storage system to maintain results of Dispute Resolution System assessment |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|---|---|
| <p>appropriate guidelines for applying sanctions for noncompliance. <i>Action Step:</i> Pursue development of a management table to track the various aspects of compliance and performance through the general supervision system. <i>Action Step:</i> Develop criteria to determine if district is in need of assistance, needs intervention, or needs substantial intervention consistent with Section 616 of IDEA 2004.</p> | | |
| <p>16.5 Provide training for new consultants who work on complaints.</p> | <p>2005-06 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complaint Resolution Manual • Guidelines for granting extensions |
| <p>16.6 Monitor timelines for completion of complaints or documentation of extensions for each consultant.</p> | <p>2005-06 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data System |
| <p>16.7 Assign sufficient staff to Due Process Unit to assure timely completion of work.</p> | <p>2005-06 school year through 2011</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.7 FTE staff added 2004-05 school year • .5 FTE BSE staff to be reassigned to this work for 2011-12 school year |
| <p>16.8 Review data on annual basis to determine if there are trends in not meeting timelines with specific districts, consultants, across indicators, and specificities related to General Supervision expectations.</p> | <p>2005-06 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data System • Due Process Unit of Bureau of Special Education • Bureau of Special Education personnel |
| <p>16.9 Provide complaint data reports to consultants for districts undergoing focused monitoring visits.</p> | <p>2005-06 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office of Information Systems database development |
| <p>16.10 Staff will participate in relevant professional development activities concerning complaint resolution as State travel restrictions allow. <i>Action Step:</i> Staff will continue to participate in professional development in effective complaint resolution with additional emphasis on timelines. <i>Action Step:</i> Train monitoring staff on what needs to be evident for one year closeouts.</p> | <p>2008-09 through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Due Process Unit of Bureau of Special Education • CADRE assessment tools |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|-----------------------------|---|
| <p>16.11 Include information on the dispute resolution process during parent and school district personnel professional development activities.</p> | <p>2010-11 through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Process Unit of Bureau of Special Education • State Education Resource Center (SERC) |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

| |
|--|
| Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision |
|--|

Indicator 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.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

| |
|---------------------|
| Measurement: |
|---------------------|

| |
|---|
| Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100. |
|---|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The due process hearing system is overseen by the Department's Bureau of Special Education, which appoints contracted hearing officers. All 12 hearing officers are attorneys in good standing with their respective state bar associations and have experience in education.

Within 45 calendar days after receipt of a request for a hearing a final decision is rendered. Hearing officers may grant a specific extension of time beyond the 45 calendar day time line for certain reasons at the request of either party.

Prior to a due process hearing, mediation and advisory opinion are available through the state. Department consultants are assigned for mediations and hearing officers are assigned for advisory opinions.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

$$3 + 24 (27) / 29 \times 100 = 93\%$$

Discussion of Baseline Data:

For the 2004-05 school year, 291 hearing requests were received by the Department. Of this total number of requests, 29 resulted in fully adjudicated hearing decisions. Twenty-seven of these were completed within required timelines. This represents a timely completion rate of 93 percent. This is an increase over the rate reported in 2005 APR (89.5 percent). The 7 percent of due process hearings not completed in a timely manner represent two hearing decisions. The Department continues to work diligently with hearing officers regarding adherence to timelines.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 100% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|---------------------|--|
| 17.1 Development of data collection system that tracks timelines and provides “tickler” system to distribute reminders to hearing officers. | 2006-07 school year | • Office of Information Systems database development |
| 17.2 Development of data collection system that integrates management of mediations, complaints and due process hearings. | 2006-07 school year | • Office of Information Systems database development |
| 17.3 Training to hearing officers in new timelines required by IDEA 2004 and system for tracking timelines. | 2006-07 school year | • Due Process Unit |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|---|---|
| <p>17.4 Provide training and technical assistance to mediators, LEAs and families on alternatives to dispute resolution including IEP facilitation.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year through 2008</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Education Resource Center (SERC) • Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE) • Parent Training and Information Center (PTI)- The Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) |
| <p>17.5 Develop a brochure on use of LEA and state alternatives to dispute resolution.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SERC personnel • CADRE |
| <p>17.6 Implement a supplemental tracking activity to ensure timely rendering of decisions.</p> | <p>2007-08 school year</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hearing officer training • Department personnel |
| <p>17.7 Continue to work with the Bureau of Data Collection, Research and Evaluation to improve the due process database by designing report query tools that will assist the due process unit in ensuring that all required timelines are met, assist in hearing officer evaluation, and information can be provided to Department personnel, hearing officers and school districts regarding due process data and trends.</p> <p><i>Action Step:</i> Continue to review practices and revise procedures for documenting and justifying extensions of hearing timelines.</p> <p><i>Action Step:</i> Identify procedures for decreasing resources used for data entry and handling information requests.</p> <p><i>Action Step:</i> Develop specific procedures for evaluation of hearing officers.</p> | <p>2010-11 through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|---|---|
| <p>17.8 Sustain and improve existing professional development practices. <i>Action Step:</i> Review number and nature of professional development activities occurring. <i>Action Step:</i> Professional development for due process hearing officers, eight days per year. <i>Action Step:</i> Individualized professional development for due process hearing officers.</p> | <p>2008-09 through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Process Unit of Bureau of Special Education • CADRE assessment tools • SERC • \$400 per year per hearing officer |
| <p>17.9 Individualized professional development for due process hearing officers.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$400 per hearing officer per year |
| <p>17.10 Provide a summary of due process hearing data and timely completions data to hearing officers on an annual basis.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Process Unit |
| <p>17.11 Annual review of data on due process hearing timelines to determine if trends exist with specific hearing officers.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Process Unit |
| <p>17.12 Include timely hearing completions as a performance measure for annual hearing officer appraisal.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Process Unit |
| <p>17.13 Provide frequent and regular reminders to hearing officer of required timelines.</p> | <p>2006-07 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Process Database |
| <p>17.14 Use established contracting processes to add new hearing officers to serve as independent contractors.</p> | <p>2010-11 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Special Education (BSE) Consultants • Stakeholders • CPAC • Department Staff |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|---|---|
| <p>17.15 Design and provide training to new hearing officers. <i>Action Step:</i> Working with current hearing officers, SERC and Bureau of Special Education employees, develop and provide training and educational materials to newly contracted hearing officers. <i>Action Step:</i> Make such training and materials available to current hearing officers to ensure that consistent procedures and information is shared by all hearing officers.</p> | <p>2010-11 school year through 2013</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BSE Consultants • SERC • Department Personnel |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

| |
|--|
| Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision |
|--|

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

| |
|--|
| Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100. |
|--|

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Department required data submission by each LEA for the 2005-06 school year. Data was collected beginning July 1, 2006 – August 15, 2006. The data collection included:

- the number of hearing requests submitted to the Department by parent(s) in the district;
- the number of hearing requests by parent(s) that went through a resolution session and were resolved as a result;
- the number of hearing requests by parent(s) that went through a resolution session and were not resolved; and
- the number of hearing requests by parent(s) in which the resolution session was waived.

For the 2006-07 school year, data will be collected from every district each time a hearing is requested. The data will include: whether a resolution session was convened; waived; and the outcome of the session, if convened.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

For the baseline year of 2005-06, the percent of resolution sessions successfully resolving disputes was 67.2 percent.

(41/61 x 100 = 67.2%)

Discussion of Baseline Data:

This was the first year districts were required to offer resolution sessions. A total of 41 resolution sessions were successful in resolving disputes. Data are valid and reliable. Although other methods of alternate dispute resolution have been available in the past, it appears that the addition of the resolution sessions has afforded parents an additional successful option in resolving disputes.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | Not applicable/baseline year data |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 67.3% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 67.4% |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 67.5% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 67.6% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 67.7% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 67.8% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 67.9% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|---------------------|--|
| 18.1 Development of data collection system that integrates management of mediations, complaints, resolution sessions and due process hearings. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Office of Information Systems database development • Outside consultant |
| 18.2 Develop a brochure on the use of alternatives to dispute resolution. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SERC personnel • Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE) |
| 18.3 Provide training to hearing officers in new timelines required by IDEA 2004 and system for tracking timelines. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Process Unit |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------------------|---|
| 18.4 Provide training to LEA attorneys on the requirements and effectiveness of resolution sessions. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Process Unit |
| 18.5 Include in the revision of the “Parent’s Guide to Special Education in Connecticut” information regarding the use of resolution sessions. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSDE Parent Workgroup |
| 18.6 Complete an assessment of the Dispute Resolution System and alignment to general supervision of compliance indicators | 2007-08 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Process Unit • CADRE assessment tools • Storage system to maintain results of Dispute Resolution System assessment |
| 18.7 Notification to school districts of each hearing request will contain a form to be filled out and returned to the Department indicating whether a resolution session was convened or waived and the outcome of the session if convened. | 2006-07 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Process Unit |
| 18.8 Provide training and technical assistance to mediators, LEAs and families on alternatives to dispute resolution including IEP facilitation and resolution sessions. | 2006-07 school year through 2008 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SERC personnel • CADRE • Parent Training and Information Center (PTI)- Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) |
| 18.9 Provide training to hearing officers on the requirements for use of resolution sessions. | 2006-07 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Process Unit |
| 18.10 Provide data on the success of resolution sessions to hearing officers and LEAs on an annual basis. | 2006-07 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Process Unit |
| 18.11 Update the Due Process Resolution Meetings reporting section of the Special Education Data Application and Collection (SEDAC) system and require districts to do real-time reporting of resolution sessions and their outcomes for individual students. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Education Data Application and Collection (SEDAC) System • Due Process Unit • Bureau of Data Collection Research and Evaluation |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Connecticut General Statutes Section 10-76h(f)(1)(a) provides that “the mediator shall attempt to resolve the issues in a manner which is acceptable to the parties within 30 days from the request of the mediation.”

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Sixty-six percent of mediations resulted in agreements.

$$35 + 64 = 99 / 150 = 66\%$$

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The Department’s 2004-05 school year data shows a slight increase in the percent of mediations (66 percent) that resulted in agreements in comparison to the 2003-04 year (64 percent). The Department does not believe that tracking the number of agreements is an effective means of assessing the effectiveness of the mediation process. Fifty-one mediations did not result in agreements. Of these 51 non-agreements, only eight went on to hearing with four pending. Of the 150 mediations held, 142 did not result in an adjudicated hearing decision. In 95 percent of the cases (with four pending) a hearing was not pursued after mediation. The goal of mediation is to maximize the opportunity for the parties to reach a settlement. The effectiveness of mediation should not be rated on a percentage of written agreements.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 67% |

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 68% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 69% |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 70% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 71% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 72% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 72% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 72% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| 19.1 Develop a brochure for LEAs and families on alternatives to dispute resolution. | 2005-06 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SERC personnel |
| 19.2 Conduct mediator meetings and provide on-going functional supervision. | 2010-11 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Process Unit |
| 19.3 Promote the use of mediation for families through updated Parent’s Guide to Special Education in Connecticut. | 2005-06 school year through 2007 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSDE Parent Workgroup • Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) - Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) • State Education Resource Center (SERC) personnel |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------------------|---|
| 19.4 Provide training and technical assistance to mediators, LEAs and families on alternatives to dispute resolution. | 2005-06 school year through 2007 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SERC personnel • Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution (CADRE) • CPAC |
| 19.5 Develop and implement evaluation checklist and procedures for mediator selection. | 2007-08 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 19.6 Monitor data on mediation agreements and track future use of due process system for non-agreements on an annual basis. Measure progress using both indicators. | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office of Information Systems database development |
| 19.7 Provide training and a mentorship program for new mediators. | 2008-09 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Process Unit • Department personnel • SERC |

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2012

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

See Overview, page i

(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)

| |
|--|
| Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision |
|--|

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

| |
|---------------------|
| Measurement: |
|---------------------|

State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Components of Department procedures utilized to ensure collection and reporting of accurate and timely data have been maintained (PC-ISSIS data collection software, data cleaning by data managers, production of special education profiles, and individual student file verification). Additionally, in the 2003-04 school year, the Department added a Focused Monitoring Data Verification report to provide for ease of identification of major data shifts in multiple areas of special education data used in state and federal reporting, as well as monitoring activities. The Department also added an additional data analyst to the staff for increased reporting, data cleaning and responsiveness to LEA data needs.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

The Department has 100 percent rate of timely and accurate submittal of state reports.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Regarding timely submittal of state reports (federal tables and APR), the Department submitted the 2004 Annual Performance Report (2002-03 reporting period) on time, March 31. Preliminary federal tables for child count, race and ethnicity, and educational placement were submitted on or before the February 1 due date. The preliminary federal personnel and suspension and expulsion tables were submitted on or before the November 1 due date. The preliminary federal exiting table was submitted on or before February 1 as outlined in the Department's request for reporting timeline extension, rather than the November 1 due date outlined in regulations. This is 100 percent timely submittal of state reports therefore target met.

| FFY | Measurable and Rigorous Target |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 2005 (2005-2006) | 100% |
| 2006 (2006-2007) | 100% |
| 2007 (2007-2008) | 100% |
| 2008 (2008-2009) | 100% |
| 2009 (2009-2010) | 100% |
| 2010 (2010-2011) | 100% |
| 2011 (2011-2012) | 100% |
| 2012 (2012-2013) | 100% |

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| 20.1 Continue all data collection, cleaning and reporting activities currently in place. | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 20.2 Publish state data maps for all focused monitoring indicators. | 2005-06 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Personnel • Focused Monitoring Steering Committee |
| 20.3 Publicly disseminate district data on Department Web site. | 2005-06 school year through 2013 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Personnel • Department Web site |

| Improvement Activities | Timelines | Resources |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| 20.4 Implementation of mandatory PSIS registration system. | July 2006 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 20.5 Change the Connecticut OSEP child count data collection from December 1 to October 1. | October 2006 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 20.6 Implementation of the Special Education Data Application and Collection (SEDAC). | November 2006 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel • Outside contractors to write program |
| 20.7 Convene meetings across multiple bureaus to address timely data collection and reporting. | 2006-07 school year through 2011 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |
| 20.8 Convene meetings across multiple bureaus to address collection procedures and timelines for discipline data. | 2006-07 school year | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department personnel |



2005 – 2006 CT Special Education Parent Survey

Please share your thoughts and experiences regarding your child’s special education program. Information from this survey will be used to monitor progress in improving special education services in Connecticut.

Please mark the circles below to describe your child. If you have more than one child who receives special education services or who has an IEP, please complete the survey according to your experiences with the child identified on the front of your survey envelope. Please return the completed survey in the stamped envelope provided to:

SERC, 25 Industrial Park Road, Middletown, CT 06457-1520.

This information will help determine, as mandated by the U.S. Department of Education, whether the Parent Survey response properly represents the state as a whole. It will not be used to identify you, your child or your family in any way. All of your responses will be confidential. Only an independent evaluator will have direct access to this information.



| Age | Gender | Race/Ethnicity [Choose One Only] | Grade Level |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| 3 – 5 <input type="radio"/> | Male <input type="radio"/> | American Indian or Alaskan Native <input type="radio"/> | Pre-school <input type="radio"/> |
| 6 – 12 <input type="radio"/> | Female <input type="radio"/> | Asian or Pacific Islander <input type="radio"/> | Elementary (includes Kindergarten) <input type="radio"/> |
| 13 – 14 <input type="radio"/> | | Black not Hispanic <input type="radio"/> | Middle <input type="radio"/> |
| 15 – 17 <input type="radio"/> | | Hispanic <input type="radio"/> | High <input type="radio"/> |
| 18 – 21 <input type="radio"/> | | White not Hispanic <input type="radio"/> | Transition/18-21 yrs. <input type="radio"/> |

| Primary Eligibility for Services [Choose One Only; Eligibility is listed on Page 1 of your child’s IEP.] | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|
| Autism | <input type="radio"/> | Orthopedic Impairment | <input type="radio"/> |
| Deaf-Blindness | <input type="radio"/> | Other Health Impairment (OHI) ADD/ADHD? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No | <input type="radio"/> |
| Developmental Delay (ages 3-5 only) | <input type="radio"/> | Speech or Language Impaired | <input type="radio"/> |
| Emotional Disturbance | <input type="radio"/> | Traumatic Brain Injury | <input type="radio"/> |
| Hearing Impairment | <input type="radio"/> | Visual Impairment | <input type="radio"/> |
| Intellectual Disability/Mental Retardation | <input type="radio"/> | To Be Determined | <input type="radio"/> |
| Specific Learning Disabilities | <input type="radio"/> | Other _____ | <input type="radio"/> |
| Multiple Disabilities | <input type="radio"/> | Don’t Know | <input type="radio"/> |

| Type of Placement [Choose One Only] | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Public School | <input type="radio"/> | Out-of-State | <input type="radio"/> |
| Out-of-District Special Education School | <input type="radio"/> | Hospital/Homebound | <input type="radio"/> |
| Residential School | <input type="radio"/> | Other _____ | <input type="radio"/> |
| Private/Parochial | <input type="radio"/> | | |

Please report your experience with your child's special education program over the past 12 months.

| CT Special Education Parent Survey | STRONGLY Agree | MODERATELY Agree | SLIGHTLY Agree | SLIGHTLY Disagree | MODERATELY Disagree | STRONGLY Disagree | DON'T KNOW | NOT APPLICABLE |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Satisfaction with My Child's Program | | | | | | | | |
| 1. I am satisfied with my child's overall special education program. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | <input type="radio"/> |
| 2. I have the opportunity to talk to my child's teachers on a regular basis to discuss my questions and concerns. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | <input type="radio"/> |
| 3. My child's school day has been shortened to accommodate his/her transportation needs. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | <input type="radio"/> |
| 4. My child has been sent home from school due to behavioral difficulties (not considered suspension). | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | <input type="radio"/> |
| 5. My child is accepted within the school community. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | <input type="radio"/> |
| 6. My child's IEP is meeting his or her educational needs. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 7. All special education services identified in my child's IEP have been provided. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 8. Staff is appropriately trained and able to provide my child's specific program and services. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9. Special education teachers make accommodations and modifications as indicated on my child's IEP. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 10. General education teachers make accommodations and modifications as indicated on my child's IEP. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 11. General education and special education teachers work together to assure that my child's IEP is being implemented. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Participation in Developing and Implementing My Child's Program | | | | | | | | |
| 12. In my child's school, administrators and teachers encourage parent involvement in order to improve services and results for children with disabilities. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | <input type="radio"/> |
| 13. At meetings to develop my child's Individualized Education Plan (IEP), I feel encouraged to give input and express my concerns. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | <input type="radio"/> |
| 14. I understand what is discussed at meetings to develop my child's IEP. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | <input type="radio"/> |
| 15. My concerns and recommendations are documented in the development of my child's IEP. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | <input type="radio"/> |
| 16. My child's evaluation report is written in terms I understand. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | <input type="radio"/> |
| 17. PPT meetings for my child have been scheduled at times and places that met my needs. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | | <input type="radio"/> |

Please continue →

| CT Special Education Parent Survey | STRONGLY Agree | MODERATELY Agree | SLIGHTLY Agree | SLIGHTLY Disagree | MODERATELY Disagree | STRONGLY Disagree | DON'T KNOW | NOT APPLICABLE |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 18. At my child's PPT, the school district proposed programs and services to meet my child's <u>individual</u> needs. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |
| 19. When we implement my child's IEP, I am encouraged to be an equal partner with my child's teachers and other service providers. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |
| 20. I have received a copy of my child's IEP within 5 school days after the PPT. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |
| 21. If necessary, a translator was provided at the PPT meetings. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |
| 22. The translation services provided at the PPT meetings were useful and accurate. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |
| 23. The school district proposed the regular classroom for my child as the first placement option. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| My Child's Participation | | | | | | | | |
| 24. My child has the opportunity to participate in school-sponsored activities such as field trips, assemblies and social events (dances, sports events). | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |
| 25. My child has the opportunity to participate in extracurricular school activities such as sports or clubs with children without disabilities. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |
| 26. My child has been denied access to non-school sponsored community activities due to his/her disability. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |
| 27. My child's school provides supports, such as extra staff, that are necessary for my child to participate in extracurricular school activities (for example, clubs and sports). | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Transition Planning for Preschoolers | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Answer <u>only</u> if your child has transitioned from early intervention (Birth to Three System) to Preschool in the past 3 years.</i> | | | | | | | | |
| 28. I am satisfied with the school district's transition activities that took place when my child left Birth to Three. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |
| Transition Planning for Secondary Students | | | | | | | | |
| 29. I am satisfied with the way <u>secondary</u> transition services were implemented for my child. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |
| 30. When appropriate, outside agencies have been invited to participate in <u>secondary</u> transition planning. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| <i>Answer <u>only</u> if your child was age 13 at his/her last PPT meeting.</i> | | | | | | | | |
| 31. My child is age 13 and the PPT introduced planning for his/her transition to adulthood. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |

| CT Special Education Parent Survey | STRONGLY Agree | MODERATELY Agree | SLIGHTLY Agree | SLIGHTLY Disagree | MODERATELY Disagree | STRONGLY Disagree | DON'T KNOW | NOT APPLICABLE |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Answer <u>only</u> if your child is age 13 or older.</i> | | | | | | | | |
| 32. The school district actively encourages my child to attend and participate in PPT meetings. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |
| <i>Answer <u>only</u> if your child was age 13 or 14 at his/her last PPT meeting.</i> | | | | | | | | |
| 33. My child is age 13 or 14 and the PPT discussed an appropriate course of study at the high school. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |
| <i>Answer <u>only</u> if your child is age 15 or older.</i> | | | | | | | | |
| 34. My child is age 15 or older and the PPT developed individualized goals related to employment/postsecondary education, independent living and community participation, if appropriate. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |
| Parent Training and Support | | | | | | | | |
| 35. In the past year, I have attended parent training or information sessions (provided by my district, other districts or agencies) that addressed the needs of parents and of children with disabilities. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |
| 36. I am involved in a support network for parents of students with disabilities available through my school district or other sources. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |
| 37. There are opportunities for parent training or information sessions regarding special education provided by my child's school district. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| 38. A support network for parents of students with disabilities is available to me through my school district or other sources. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| My Child's Skills | | | | | | | | |
| 39. My child is learning skills that will enable him/her to be as independent as possible. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |
| 40. My child is learning skills that will lead to a high school diploma, further education, or a job. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | | ○ |

COMMENTS: Please use this space to comment on your experience with your child's special education program. These comments may refer to your experiences overall and are not limited to the past 12 months.

Thank you for your valuable response!

2005-2006 CT Special Education Parent Survey
Selecting LEAs into the First Year Group

Steps Taken:

- 1) All 169 LEAs are sorted according to the number of special education students served. The LEAs are divided into four strata, large to x-small. The four strata are further categorized into two reference groups: (1) ERGs A, B, C, D or (2) E, F, G, H, I.

| State wide Size Strata | N | State wide ERG Strata | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| | | A,B,C,D | | E,F,G,H,I | |
| | | N | % | N | % |
| Large (LEA size > 899) | 16 | 3 | 1.8% | 13 | 7.7% |
| Medium (399 < LEA size < 900) | 38 | 22 | 13.0% | 16 | 9.5% |
| Small (99 < LEA size < 400) | 70 | 43 | 25.4% | 27 | 16.0% |
| X-Small (LEA < 100) | 45 | 23 | 13.6% | 22 | 13.0% |
| Totals | 169 | 91 | 53.8% | 78 | 46.2% |

- 2) Proportional allocation is used to determine the number of LEAs to be drawn from each stratum. The target LEA sample size for the first year was set at 20¹.
- 3) The target *n* for each stratum is calculated by taking the percentage of LEAs in each stratum and multiplying this number by the target sample of 20.

| Sample Size Strata | Sample ERG Strata | | | | actual sample size |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| | A,B,C,D | | E,F,G,H,I | | |
| | target n | actual n | target n | actual n | |
| Large (LEA size > 899) | 0.36 | 0 | 1.5 | 2 | |
| Medium (399 < LEA size < 900) | 2.60 | 3 | 1.9 | 2 | |
| Small (99 < LEA size < 400) | 5.09 | 5 | 3.2 | 3 | |
| X-Small (LEA < 100) | 2.72 | 3 | 2.6 | 3 | |
| Totals | 10.8 | 11 | 9.2 | 10 | |

- 4) The first year sample of LEAs can now be selected. The selection is done by taking a simple random sample within each stratum.

¹ In the 2005 SPP, Connecticut submitted a sampling plan for the dissemination of the CT Special Education Parent Survey for the years 2005-2010. In this plan, we presented an example of a sampling procedure in which each of the 169 LEAs in Connecticut would be sampled once over the course of six years. This was to be accomplished by drawing a sample of 29 districts in the first year, and 28 in each of the next five years. Since this is the first year that the Department is engaging in such a sophisticated sampling design, we revised the number of districts targeted for the sample pool in the first year. In this way, should we encounter any unforeseen problems with the sampling protocol in this first year, a smaller number of districts will be affected. We will adjust the sample size in future years to ensure that every district sampled by 2010.

| Sample Size Strata | Sample ERG Strata | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| | A,B,C,D | E,F,G,H,I |
| | Selected LEAs | Selected LEAs |
| Large (LEA size > 899) | - | Waterbury, New Britain |
| Medium (399 < LEA size < 900) | Wilton, Madison, Windsor | Killingly, New London |
| Small (99 < LEA size < 400) | Orange, Canton, Preston, East Lyme, Shelton | Lebanon, North Stonington, Derby |
| X-Small (LEA < 100) | Easton, Andover, Westbrook | Ashford, Chester, Sharon |
| Totals | 11 | 10 |

Selecting Students into the First Year Sample

Steps Taken:

- 1) The number of students to be taken from each district is calculated by the sample size needed to have a 95% confidence interval, +-5% ME and a 40% response rate (assuming a population proportion of 50%).
- 2) As a result, all students in the following districts will be included in the survey.

| Year 1 District Group | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| District # | District | Schools | | | | Special Ed. Students | | | |
| | | Elem. | Middle | High | Total | Elem. | Middle | High | Total |
| 1 | Andover | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | - | - | 25 |
| 3 | Ashford | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 66 | - | - | 66 |
| 23 | Canton | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 55 | 38 | 59 | 152 |
| 26 | Chester | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 46 | - | - | 46 |
| 37 | Derby | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 72 | - | 77 | 149 |
| 45 | Easton | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 57 | - | 57 |
| 46 | East Lyme | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 110 | 89 | 148 | 347 |
| 69 | Killingly | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 193 | 110 | 105 | 408 |
| 71 | Lebanon | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 57 | 56 | 79 | 192 |
| 76 | Madison | 4 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 229 | 82 | 152 | 463 |
| 95 | New London | 6 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 210 | 135 | 119 | 464 |
| 102 | North Stonington | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 49 | 19 | 32 | 100 |
| 107 | Orange | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 134 | - | - | 134 |
| 114 | Preston | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 67 | 33 | - | 100 |
| 125 | Sharon | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 53 | - | - | 53 |
| 126 | Shelton | 6 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 206 | 62 | 131 | 399 |
| 154 | Westbrook | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 31 | 23 | 27 | 81 |
| 161 | Wilton | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 253 | 129 | 127 | 509 |
| 164 | Windsor | 5 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 194 | 158 | 190 | 542 |
| Totals | 21 | 47 | 14 | 13 | 74 | 2050 | 991 | 1246 | 4287 |

Special Education numbers represent 2004-2005 data received from the CT Dept. of Special Ed. on 11/8/05

- 3) A sample of students will be taken from the New Britain and the Waterbury School Districts. Using the same guidelines as above, a sample of 793 students will be needed from New Britain and a sample of 843 students will be needed from Waterbury, for a final sample size of approximately 5923.
- 4) This final sample size should result in a state-representative sample of 95% confidence, +-2% ME, and a 40% response rate (assuming a population proportion of 50%).

Selecting Students into the First Year Sample

- 5) Students from New Britain and Waterbury are chosen by disproportionate allocation to account for a higher response rate for parents of elementary school students, followed by parents of middle school students, followed by parents of high schools students.

| School Type | Total Special Ed | Prop. Allocation | n1 | Disprop. Allocation | n2 |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|------------|
| Waterbury | | | | | |
| Elementary | 1448 | 53.1% | 448 | 38.1% | 321 |
| Middle | 650 | 23.8% | 201 | 28.8% | 243 |
| High | 628 | 23.0% | 194 | 33.0% | 279 |
| Totals | 2726 | | 843 | 100.0% | 843 |
| New Britain | | | | | |
| Elementary | 753 | 42.1% | 334 | 27.1% | 215 |
| Middle | 504 | 28.2% | 223 | 33.2% | 263 |
| High | 533 | 29.8% | 236 | 39.8% | 315 |
| Totals | 1790 | | 793 | 100.0% | 793 |

- 6) (If we have demographic information by school, we will also over-sample to account for differences in response rate by race.)
- 7) A process called the cumulative-size method will be used to determine the number of students taken from each school. Once the number of students is determined, students will be chosen by a random sample of student ID numbers.

First Year LEA Group Compared to State

2004-2005 Special Education Students

| Disability | Statewide | | Year 1 District Group | |
|-------------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Learning Disability | 25919 | 35.5% | 3290 | 36.7% |
| Intellectual Disability | 3191 | 4.4% | 463 | 5.2% |
| Emotional Disturbance | 6957 | 9.5% | 914 | 10.2% |
| Speech Impairment | 15727 | 21.5% | 1878 | 21.0% |
| Other Health Impairment | 10443 | 14.3% | 1359 | 15.2% |
| Other Disability | 8044 | 11.0% | 715 | 8.0% |
| Autism | 2747 | 3.8% | 341 | 3.8% |
| Total | 73028 | 100.0% | 8960 | 100.0% |

Statewide data is from the Dept. of Special Ed. District information is from on-line district profiles and does not include Pre-K students.

2004-2005 Special Education Students

| Race/Ethnicity | Statewide | | Year 1 District Group | |
|-------------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Native American/Alaskan | 271 | 0.4% | 37 | 0.4% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 1000 | 1.4% | 102 | 1.1% |
| Black | 11650 | 16.0% | 1768 | 18.3% |
| White | 47555 | 65.1% | 5001 | 52.0% |
| Hispanic | 12552 | 17.2% | 2772 | 28.6% |
| Total | 73028 | 100.0% | 9680 | 100.0% |

Statewide data is from the Dept. of Special Ed. District information is from on-line district profiles.

| Year 1 District Group | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| School Type | Statewide | | Year 1 | |
| | N | % | n | % |
| Elementary School | 685 | 64.5% | 79 | 66.4% |
| Middle School | 176 | 16.6% | 21 | 17.6% |
| High School | 201 | 18.9% | 19 | 16.0% |
| Totals | 1062 | 100.0% | 119 | 100.0% |
| Special Education Students | | | | |
| Special Education Students | Statewide | | Year 1 | |
| | N | % | n | % |
| Elementary | 30,643 | 47.5% | 4,251 | 48.3% |
| Middle | 13,873 | 21.5% | 2,145 | 24.4% |
| High | 20,045 | 31.0% | 2,406 | 27.3% |
| Totals | 64,561 | 100.0% | 8,802 | 100.0% |
| Special Education numbers represent 2004-2005 data received from the CT Dept. of Special Ed. on 11/8/05 | | | | |

First Year LEA Group Compared to State

| Year 1 District Group | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|----------|---------------|----------|
| ERG | All LEAs | | Year 1 | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| A | 12 | 7.1% | 2 | 9.5% |
| B | 19 | 11.2% | 2 | 9.5% |
| C | 38 | 22.5% | 4 | 19.0% |
| D | 21 | 12.4% | 3 | 14.3% |
| E | 26 | 15.4% | 5 | 23.8% |
| F | 16 | 9.5% | 0 | 0.0% |
| G | 15 | 8.9% | 0 | 0.0% |
| H | 13 | 7.7% | 2 | 9.5% |
| I | 6 | 3.6% | 3 | 14.3% |
| - | 3 | 1.8% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total | 169 | 100.0% | 21 | 100.0% |

The "-" represents the Unified School Districts #1, #2, and CT Technical High School System.

| Year 1 District Group | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|----------|---------------|----------|
| RESC | All LEAs | | Year 1 | |
| | # | % | # | % |
| CREC | 36 | 21.3% | 3 | 14.3% |
| CES | 14 | 8.3% | 2 | 9.5% |
| ACES | 27 | 16.0% | 4 | 19.0% |
| ED.C | 30 | 17.8% | 1 | 4.8% |
| LEARN | 24 | 14.2% | 7 | 33.3% |
| EASTCONN | 35 | 20.7% | 4 | 19.0% |
| - | 3 | 1.8% | - | - |
| Total | 169 | 100.0% | 21 | 100.0% |

The "-" represents the Unified School Districts #1, #2, and CT Technical High School System.

Responses will NOT be linked to your name.
This is just so we don't send you another survey in the mail this year.

2011 Survey of Graduates or Exiters of Connecticut High Schools

This survey asks questions about what you have been doing since you left high school. Your former school will NOT know the names of the students who respond. We will combine your answers with the answers from your classmates to let your school know how well they prepared you for your future. Your school will use this as a way to grade themselves on how well they are preparing students for life after high school.

Please complete the survey and return to us in the enclosed, pre-paid envelope. Someone who knows you well can help you complete it. Fill in the circle next to your answer.

1. Since leaving high school, have you enrolled in any type of school for at least one term (including a quarter, semester, inter-session, summer or online)?

- No. **[Go to next page]**
- No, I enrolled but I did not complete one full term. **[Go to next page]**
- Yes, part-time student (less than 12 credits per semester)
- Yes, full-time student (12 or more credits per semester)

2. What type of school did you attend?

- 4-year college or university (for credit, non-credit, or remedial classes)
- 2-year community college (for credit, non-credit, or remedial classes)
- Vocational, Technical, or Trade School (less than a two-year program)
- Adult Education (e.g., GED, High School Completion Program)
- Postgraduate or College Prep Program
- Short-term education or job training program (e.g. Job Corps, Workforce Board Program)
- Other – Please specify: _____

3. Since leaving high school, have you been employed for at least 3 months?

(it does not have to be in a row)

- No, I have not been employed. **[Go to next page]**
- No. I have been employed, but for less than 3 months. **[Go to next page]**
- Yes, Part-time (less than an average of 20 hours per week)
- Yes, Part-time (average 20 - 34 hours per week)
- Yes, Full-time (average 35 hours or more, per week)

4. How much did you earn at your most recent job?

- Below minimum wage (less than \$8.25/hr.)
- Minimum wage (\$8.25/hr.)
- Above minimum wage (greater than \$8.25/hr.)

5. Please select the best description of your most recent job.

- For an employer (in a company with people with and without disabilities)
- In the military (e.g., Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Coast Guard)
- Self-employed
- In your family's business (e.g., a farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering)
- In supported employment (paid work with wage support to the employer)
- In sheltered employment (where most workers have disabilities)
- Employed while in jail or prison
- Other – Please specify: _____

6. Have you used any of these agencies since leaving high school?

- Yes (*Please check all services that apply below*)
 - Board of Education/Services for the Blind (BESB)
 - Bureau of Rehabilitation Services (BRS)
 - Department of Developmental Services (DDS)
 - Department of Mental Health & Addiction Services (DMHAS)
 - Department of Labor One-Stop Centers (DOL)
 - Department of Public Health (DPH)
 - Department of Social Services (DSS)
 - Social Security Administration (SSA)
 - Services at my college or university for students with disabilities
 - Other: _____
- No; Services were not necessary
- No; Did not want to use any services
- No; Did not know any services were available

7. Are you taking part in any of the following?

- Adult day service programs
- Adult day vocational programs
- Independent living skills programs
- Volunteer work or community service
- Other: _____

8. How much do you agree with this: *“I am satisfied with my life since leaving high school”*

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Why? _____

9. What skills did your high school teach you? (Check all that apply)

- Social Skills (getting along with others)
- Self-Advocacy (ability to know what you need and ask for it)
- Independent Living Skills (running a household, using transportation, taking care of your health and hygiene, managing your money)
- Technology Skills (ability to use computers or other assistive tools)
- Time Management/Organizational Skills
- Money Management Skills
- Study Skills/Learning Strategies
- Work Experience
- None
- Other: _____

10. What part of your high school education was most helpful in getting you ready for life after you left high school?

11. What services, assistance, or activities would you recommend for high school students working on transition plans now?

12. Was there anything confusing or unclear about this survey?

**Thank you very much for completing this survey!
Please return in the enclosed, pre-paid reply envelope**

