State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:
Part B

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

For reporting on
FFY18

Connecticut

PART B DUE February 3, 2020

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

170

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

The General Supervision System

The following CSDE activities comprise the compliance monitoring prong of the GSS:

Data Collections:

The CSDE Performance Office conducts the data collections required under the IDEA. All data regarding children with disabilities are collected via multiple unique but "linked" data collection systems. Part of the state's responsibility for ensuring the accuracy of the federally reported data includes auditing the data reported by districts on students with disabilities. Districts are monitored according to a three-year monitoring cycle for the Parent Survey, Child Count/Individual Education Program (IEP) Desk Audit, Assessment Modifications/Accommodations Audit, and a General Supervision IDEA Compliance Review (File Review). All districts participate in the Desk Audit and File Review Process.

Dispute Resolution Processes:

Complaint Resolution Process
The complaint resolution process identifies and timely corrects noncompliance in an LEA's implementation of federal and state special education requirements and identifies components of an LEA's special education programming that need improvement (e.g., policies, procedures). The CSDE publication, Complaint Resolution Process, describes the complaint resolution process in detail. This publication can be found at the CSDE's web site.

Mediation
Mediation is a voluntary process offered to a parent and an LEA as a means to reach an agreement with respect to any matter relating to the proposal or refusal to initiate or change the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of the child, or the provision of a free appropriate public education.

Advisory Opinions
Connecticut provides that any party that requests a due process hearing, may also request an advisory opinion. The advisory opinion regulations require the agreement of both parties to participate in the process. The process, which is completed in one day, allows the parties to state their positions to a hearing officer with limits on the number of witnesses the parties may present and the amount of time each party has to present their positions.

Due Process Hearings
The CSDE operates a single-tiered hearing system. That is, special education due process hearings are conducted at the state level; there is no local hearing. CGS Section 10-76h and its corresponding regulations establish the due process hearing system, which is managed by the CSDE. Hearing officers are appointed by the CSDE and approved by the State Board of Education. They may not be an employee of a public agency involved in the education or care of the child and may not have a personal or professional interest which would conflict with his or her objectivity in the hearing.

Fiscal Management
Mechanisms are in place to provide oversight in the distribution and use of IDEA Part B funds at the state and local level. In particular, the BSE collaborates with the Bureau of Fiscal Services (BFS) to ensure proper methods of administration are in place, such as: monitoring and enforcement of obligations imposed; technical assistance, as needed; adoption of promising educational techniques; sharing of successful practices; and correction of deficiencies through monitoring or evaluation. The CSDE ensures that audits of LEAs are conducted annually in accordance with the Single Audit Act. Regular review and follow up is completed to verify the LEA's correction of noncompliance and the Fiscal Review Team determines if further action is required. If a concern is identified and rises to the point of review, the BSE utilizes the IDEA Program/Fiscal Compliance Review Process to review Corrective Action plans to verify proper use of IDEA Part B funds as related to the fiscal requirements of the IDEA.

IDEA Compliance File Reviews
For this monitoring activity, CSDE staff annually review a random sample of special education documentation (including student IEPs) from approximately 60 Connecticut LEAs using a standardized rubric to verify compliance with IDEA requirements. All 170 Connecticut LEAs have been assigned to one of three cohorts and each cohort participates in this prescribed process on a 3-year rotating cycle that is aligned with other state monitoring activities.

Significant Disproportionality
The IDEA requires states to collect and examine data on an annual basis to determine whether significant disproportionality based on race or ethnicity is occurring in a district with respect to (1) the identification of children for special education and related services; (2) identification in six specific disability categories; (3) educational settings of less than 40 percent time with nondisabled peers and separate schools/residential facilities; and (4) discipline including in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions/expulsions, and total disciplinary removals. In Connecticut, the criteria used to determine those districts that demonstrate significant disproportionality in the four areas listed above includes: a relative risk index (RRI) equal to 3.0 and above for 3 consecutive years; a minimum cell size of 10; a minimum n-size of 30; and a reasonable progress standard of a 0.2 RRI reduction in both the second and third year of the analysis. A district that demonstrates significant disproportionality must review and revise, as necessary, its policies, procedure and practices under in the area(s) of significant disproportionality and publicly report on the revision of policies, practices, and procedures. Additionally, the district must set-aside 15 percent of its total IDEA Part B funds for Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS).

The following CSDE activities comprise the program improvement prong of the GSS:

Approval Process for Private Special Education Programs (APSEP)
Connecticut Regulations and Statutes grant the State Board of Education (SBOE) the authority to regulate and supervise the education of all children requiring special education who are residing in or attending any facility, private or public, receiving money from the state. In light of these statutory powers, the Commissioner of Education evaluates the suitability and efficacy of such private facilities prior to the disbursement of state funds and grants to local educational agencies utilizing such facilities for special education purposes. Principles adopted by the SBOE, which include specific standards, serve as the basis on which special education programs in private facilities (private programs) in Connecticut shall be approved. The principles are applicable to private programs in Connecticut-based private day and residential schools, hospitals, rehabilitation centers and treatment centers.

LRE Initiative
The CSDE gathers current data relative to disability category, time with nondisabled peers, race, age, gender, geographic region, prevalence rate and achievement scores data for students in the continuum of settings to examine trends and variables to understand causal factors. These data are reviewed to determine specific action steps and intervention levels for districts with data of concern.

State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)
Connecticut's SSIP is focused on early literacy instruction and is based on a 3-tiered framework of support. BSE staff review multiple data points, including State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) data, for approximately 60 LEAs. The CSDE uses specific selection criteria to identify a subset LEAs to receive Tier II support. Those LEAs complete and submit the District Literacy Evaluation Tool (DLET), a self-assessment fidelity instrument established to help LEA personnel target, prioritize and act on literacy efforts across their elementary schools. Based on DLET results, a smaller subset of LEAs receive more intensive in-district support and technical assistance to address the LEAs' data of concern.

At the time of the February 2020 submission, the CSDE was engaged in reviewing and revising its SSIP effort.

Technical Assistance System

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Technical Assistance (TA)
Technical assistance activities are critical for ensuring the implementation of IDEA requirements and distributing best practices to LEA personnel and families. The BSE conducts a number of technical assistance activities to help promote compliance and best practices in the provision of special education services across Connecticut.

For example, the BSE regularly publishes its Bureau Bulletin, which provides updates to LEA personnel and families regarding special education policy and practice, upcoming BSE activities and professional development and/or technical assistance opportunities. In another example, the Bureau Chief of Special Education issues memoranda to special education directors regarding guidance about the provision of special education services or new/revised BSE practices. In a final example, the Commissioner of Education issues "C-Letters" to superintendents regarding guidance about education policy or new/revised CSDE practices.

The BSE also provides a great deal of technical assistance to LEA personnel and families regarding the provision of special education services through telephone and e-mail contacts. The BSE has developed an organization system to manage the voluminous number of contacts received each week through a "BSE Contact List". Each BSE consultant accepts contacts from a group of LEAs in order to ensure the timely response to inquiries and establish a regular contact between the BSE and LEA personnel and families from a particular district. These communications serve as an opportunity to provide technical assistance, establish a collaborative relationship between the CSDE and its constituents and promote both compliance and best practices regarding special education services. Finally, as needed, BSE consultants conduct trainings for LEA administrators and personnel on specific topics related to special education.

Professional Development System

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

Professional Development (PD)
The CSDE recognizes the importance of high quality professional development offerings for district personnel. The CSDE also recognizes the importance of parent/family training to empower parents and families in their role in the special education process. Therefore, the CSDE partners with the State Education Resource Center (SERC), the Regional Educational Service Center (RESC) Alliance, the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) and other organizations to ensure that regularly scheduled, relevant professional development offerings and parent/family trainings are available to the public to address various topics (both compliance-focused and results-focused) related to special education. The CSDE's Differentiated Monitoring and Support Team looks regularly at the patterns and trends across monitoring activities and uses the information to plan appropriate future offerings with the SERC, the RESC Alliance, and other service delivery providers.

Stakeholder Involvement

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

Stakeholder input regarding the setting of targets through FFY 2019 was obtained through three separate in-person presentations/discussions conducted by the BSE Division Director and/or CSDE staff. In each instance, the history of the SPP/APR and its associated targets were reviewed with participants, trend data was shared and targets were proposed and discussed. For multiple indicators, those discussions resulted in consensus around the setting of more rigorous targets.

The stakeholder groups included:

The State Advisory Council for Special Education, which includes parents; students; LEA personnel; representatives of other state agencies, advocacy groups, and Approved Private Special Education Programs; Charter Schools; as well as Members of the CT General Assembly.

The LEA Advisory Committee, developed to inform the BSE's General Monitoring and Supervision efforts by providing participants opportunities to:

increase their knowledge and understanding of the current General Monitoring and Supervision System in Connecticut; provide feedback on the current system and share their own related experiences; advise the BSE on improvements to the system and to suggest areas of focus that would have the greatest impact on student outcomes; and provide feedback on any proposed changes to our system prior to statewide implementation.

The Early Childhood Large City and Severe Needs Forum is attended by early childhood special education administrators from LEAs throughout CT. The forum convenes five times per year and offers both a learning opportunity and discussion forum on topics of interests by the attendees. Each meeting incudes a guest speaker and topics have included assessment practice, early learning and development standards, family engagement, evaluation timelines, and APR data/data collection.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)
YES
Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

The updated SPP/APR will be posted in the Special Education section of the CSDE Web site at:

http://portal.ct.gov/SDE/Special-Education/State-Performance-Plan-SPP-and-Annual-Performance-Report-APR/Documents

in May 2020. Written communication bringing attention to the revised SPP/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 Reports, which will be posted on the CSDE's Web site:

http://edsight.ct.gov/SASPortal/main.do

From the top navigation menu:

(Select > Overview - Select > Special Education Annual Performance Reports)

no later than June 1, 2020, and announced in the Bureau of Special Education's Bureau Bulletin.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

Intro - OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III, Year Four, of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator B-17, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information. The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the target

Intro - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2011	62.40%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target >=	65.00%	67.60%	70.30%	72.90%	75.60%
Data	64.72%	65.16%	65.56%	65.21%	66.71%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	78.20%	78.20%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input regarding the setting of targets through FFY 2019 was obtained through three separate in-person presentations/discussions conducted by the BSE Division Director and/or CSDE staff. In each instance, the history of the SPP/APR and its associated targets were reviewed with participants, trend data was shared and targets were proposed and discussed. For multiple indicators, those discussions resulted in consensus around the setting of more rigorous targets.

The stakeholder groups included:

The State Advisory Council for Special Education, which includes parents; students; LEA personnel; representatives of other state agencies, advocacy groups, and Approved Private Special Education Programs; Charter Schools; as well as Members of the CT General Assembly.

The LEA Advisory Committee, developed to inform the BSE's General Monitoring and Supervision efforts by providing participants opportunities to: increase their knowledge and understanding of the current General Monitoring and Supervision System in Connecticut; provide feedback on the current system and share their own related experiences; advise the BSE on improvements to the system and to suggest areas of focus that would have the greatest impact on student outcomes; and provide feedback on any proposed changes to our system prior to statewide implementation.

The Early Childhood Large City and Severe Needs Forum is attended by early childhood special education administrators from LEAs throughout CT. The forum convenes five times per year and offers both a learning opportunity and discussion forum on topics of interests by the attendees. Each meeting incudes a guest speaker and topics have included assessment practice, early learning and development standards, family engagement, evaluation timelines, and APR data/data collection.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	3,747

Source	Date	Description	Data
(EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)			
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	5,769
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	64.95%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
3,747	5,769	66.71%	78.20%	64.95%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

FFY 2018 ESEA 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate data reported here represent the "on-time" graduation rate of students who were first time 9th graders in the fall of 2014. The 2017-18 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for students with disabilities (SWD) was 64.95 percent. Under Connecticut's Approved Accountability Flexibility, new annual targets were established for all subgroups under the cohort graduation rate. These targets reflect incremental growth. The Approved Flexibility target for students with disabilities for Connecticut for the 2017-18 Cohort is 78.2 percent. Target not met.
[3,747 graduates / 5,769 students with disabilities in the 2017-18 cohort] × 100 = 64.95%

There were significantly fewer Student with Disabilities in the 2017-18 cohort for students eligible for graduation (nearly 1000 fewer swd; a 12.7% reduction in the cohort). In addition, many more SWD in this cohort remained enrolled beyond four years in order to access transition services. This increase in students remaining enrolled accounts for the slight drop (1.7% slippage) from the previous year of graduation data.

Data are the same data used for reporting under Title 1 of the ESEA through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Data are not obtained from sampling. Data are valid and reliable as verified by the series of validation checks built into the collection system and a randomized statewide verification process.

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

If extended, provide the number of years

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

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 11 Assessment. 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.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indictor, and OSEP accepts that target.

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2011	15.70%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target <=	14.80%	14.50%	14.00%	13.60%	13.30%
Data	14.75%	12.25%	15.52%	12.85%	12.50%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	13.00%	12.70%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input regarding the setting of targets through FFY 2019 was obtained through three separate in-person presentations/discussions conducted by the BSE Division Director and/or CSDE staff. In each instance, the history of the SPP/APR and its associated targets were reviewed with participants, trend data was shared and targets were proposed and discussed. For multiple indicators, those discussions resulted in consensus around the setting of more rigorous targets.

The stakeholder groups included:

The State Advisory Council for Special Education, which includes parents; students; LEA personnel; representatives of other state agencies, advocacy groups, and Approved Private Special Education Programs; Charter Schools; as well as Members of the CT General Assembly.

The LEA Advisory Committee, developed to inform the BSE's General Monitoring and Supervision efforts by providing participants opportunities to: increase their knowledge and understanding of the current General Monitoring and Supervision System in Connecticut; provide feedback on the current system and share their own related experiences; advise the BSE on improvements to the system and to suggest areas of focus that would have the greatest impact on student outcomes; and provide feedback on any proposed changes to our system prior to statewide implementation.

The Early Childhood Large City and Severe Needs Forum is attended by early childhood special education administrators from LEAs throughout CT. The forum convenes five times per year and offers both a learning opportunity and discussion forum on topics of interests by the attendees. Each meeting incudes a guest speaker and topics have included assessment practice, early learning and development standards, family engagement, evaluation timelines, and APR data/data collection.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	4,501
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	40
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	52
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	635
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	19

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, provide justification for the changes below.

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

In accordance with option 2 of the Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) Part B Indicator Measurement Table, Connecticut is reporting using the ESEA 4-year adjusted cohort dropout rate. This represents the same data source and measurement that was used to report in Connecticut's FFY 2010 APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012. While option 2 (above) indicates a requirement to report an annual dropout rate, the SPP/APR Measurement table clearly states under the data sources section to report the same data used in FFY 2010 APR. Connecticut has been reporting the 4-year cohort dropout rate for multiple years as allowed by OSEP.
FFY 2018 data reported here represent students with disabilities who were first time 9th graders in the fall of 2014 but who were no longer enrolled in public education at the end of the 2017-18 reporting year.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
732	5,769	12.50%	13.00%	12.69%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

FFY 2018 data reported here represent students with disabilities who were first time 9th graders in the fall of 2014 but who were no longer enrolled in public education at the end of the 2017-18 reporting year. The 2017-18 cohort dropout rate for students with disabilities was 12.7 percent. Target met.

[732 dropouts / 5,769 students with disabilities in the 2017-18 cohort] × 100 = 12.69%

The dropout rate calculation for students with disabilities is consistent with the formula used for all Connecticut students. 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.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate 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.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	SB	X	X	X	X	X	X					
B	SAT											X
C												
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	SB	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	SB	98.40%	Actual	88.26%	96.66%	97.07%	97.26%	97.27%
B	SAT	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
B	SAT	95.00%	Actual	76.23%	80.32%	83.45%	88.77%	87.20%
C			Target >=					

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	SB	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	SB	98.70%	Actual	88.19%	96.34%	96.44%	96.63%	96.85%
B	SAT	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
B	SAT	94.50%	Actual	76.06%	79.05%	83.37%	88.67%	87.07%
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target ≥					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					

			Target >=				
L			Actual				

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	SB	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	SAT	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=			
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	SB	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	SAT	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=			
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input regarding the setting of targets through FFY 2019 was obtained through three separate in-person presentations/discussions conducted by the BSE Division Director and/or CSDE staff. In each instance, the history of the SPP/APR and its associated targets were reviewed with participants, trend data was shared and targets were proposed and discussed. For multiple indicators, those discussions resulted in consensus around the setting of more rigorous targets.

The stakeholder groups included:

The State Advisory Council for Special Education, which includes parents; students; LEA personnel; representatives of other state agencies, advocacy groups, and Approved Private Special Education Programs; Charter Schools; as well as Members of the CT General Assembly.

The LEA Advisory Committee, developed to inform the BSE's General Monitoring and Supervision efforts by providing participants opportunities to: increase their knowledge and understanding of the current General Monitoring and Supervision System in Connecticut; provide feedback on the current system and share their own related experiences; advise the BSE on improvements to the system and to suggest areas of focus that would have the greatest impact on student outcomes; and provide feedback on any proposed changes to our system prior to statewide implementation.

The Early Childhood Large City and Severe Needs Forum is attended by early childhood special education administrators from LEAs throughout CT. The forum convenes five times per year and offers both a learning opportunity and discussion forum on topics of interests by the attendees. Each meeting incudes a guest speaker and topics have included assessment practice, early learning and development standards, family engagement, evaluation timelines, and APR data/data collection.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts
Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES
Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)
Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	5,755	6,154	6,383	6,524	6,908	6,620					5,569
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	3,978	4,340	4,504	4,793	5,108	4,944					1,337
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	1,139	1,155	1,162	982	1,012	827					3,050
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	517	513	561	558	562	540					558

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)
Date:

04/08/2020

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	5,805	6,206	6,446	6,568	6,936	6,653					5,587
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	4,896	3,437	3,106	3,195	3,529	3,646					1,345
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	245	2,089	2,601	2,581	2,557	2,083					3,054
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	521	517	559	563	567	542					559

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	SB	38,344	37,195	97.27%	95.00%	97.00%	Met Target	No Slippage
B	SAT	5,569	4,945	87.20%	95.00%	88.80%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	SB	XXX
B	SAT	XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	SB	38,614	37,234	96.85%	95.00%	96.43%	Met Target	No Slippage
B	SAT	5,587	4,958	87.07%	95.00%	88.74%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	SB	XXX
B	SAT	XXX

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Interactive reports containing performance information (both participation and achievement) at the district and school levels for all students and subgroups (including students with disabilities) can be found at:

http://edsight.ct.gov/SASPortal/main.do

From the top navigation menu: (select > Performance and the appropriate assessment (e.g., Smarter Balanced, SAT).
All data is downloadable in EXCEL format.

An excel spreadsheet detailing information regarding the number and percent of children with disabilities who were provided accommodations in order to participate on regular statewide assessments at both the district and school levels is also available at the above link.

From the top navigation menu: (select > Students Select > Students with Disabilities)

On the left hand panel, under Related Links: (select: Accommodations Report)

This report has been updated with both the count and percentage of students provided accommodations. Data regarding the participation and performance of children with disabilities on Alternate Assessments based on Alternate Academic Achievement Standards can be found at the same location as the Accommodations data.

From the top navigation menu: (select > Students Select > Students with Disabilities) On the left hand panel, under Related Links: (Select > Alternate Assessment Data)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3B - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

    A.   Indicator 3A – Reserved
    B.   Participation rate for children with IEPs
    C.   Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	SB	X	X	X	X	X	X					
B	SAT											X
C												
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	SB	2014	Target >=		16.98%	17.50%	18.00%	18.50%
A	SB	16.98%	Actual	33.82%	16.98%	18.18%	17.91%	18.25%
B	SAT	2014	Target >=		19.81%	20.00%	20.50%	21.00%
B	SAT	19.81%	Actual	33.96%	19.81%	25.30%	26.44%	23.54%
C			Target >=					

C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	SB	2014	Target >=		11.88%	12.00%	12.50%	13.00%
A	SB	11.88%	Actual	41.35%	11.88%	13.43%	14.67%	14.57%
B	SAT	2014	Target >=		8.65%	9.00%	9.50%	10.00%
B	SAT	8.65%	Actual	24.71%	8.65%	11.18%	12.39%	11.83%
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					

H			Actual						
I			Target >=						
I			Actual						
J			Target >=						
J			Actual						
K			Target >=						
K			Actual						
L			Target >=						
L			Actual						

Targets

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	SB	19.00%	19.50%
Reading	B >=	SAT	21.50%	22.00%
Reading	C >=			
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	SB	13.50%	14.00%
Math	B >=	SAT	10.50%	11.00%
Math	C >=			
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input regarding the setting of targets through FFY 2019 was obtained through three separate in-person presentations/discussions conducted by the BSE Division Director and/or CSDE staff. In each instance, the history of the SPP/APR and its associated targets were reviewed with participants, trend data was shared and targets were proposed and discussed. For multiple indicators, those discussions resulted in consensus around the setting of more rigorous targets.

The stakeholder groups included:

The State Advisory Council for Special Education, which includes parents; students; LEA personnel; representatives of other state agencies, advocacy groups, and Approved Private Special Education Programs; Charter Schools; as well as Members of the CT General Assembly.

The LEA Advisory Committee, developed to inform the BSE's General Monitoring and Supervision efforts by providing participants opportunities to: increase their knowledge and understanding of the current General Monitoring and Supervision System in Connecticut; provide feedback on the current system and share their own related experiences; advise the BSE on improvements to the system and to suggest areas of focus that would have the greatest impact on student outcomes; and provide feedback on any proposed changes to our system prior to statewide implementation.

The Early Childhood Large City and Severe Needs Forum is attended by early childhood special education administrators from LEAs throughout CT. The forum convenes five times per year and offers both a learning opportunity and discussion forum on topics of interests by the attendees. Each meeting incudes a guest speaker and topics have included assessment practice, early learning and development standards, family engagement, evaluation timelines, and APR data/data collection.

FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/08/2020

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	5,634	6,008	6,227	6,333	6,682	6,311					4,945
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	813	822	887	804	945	854					210
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	128	142	127	91	99	52					674
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	190	198	202	133	188	152					233

Data Source:

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/08/2020

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	5,662	6,043	6,266	6,339	6,653	6,271					4,958
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	918	816	600	505	598	453					87
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above	40	118	76	51	64	24					252

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	211	186	213	140	181	263					203

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	SB	37,195	6,827	18.25%	19.00%	18.35%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B	SAT	4,945	1,117	23.54%	21.50%	22.59%	Met Target	No Slippage
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	SB	XXX
B	SAT	XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	SB	37,234	5,457	14.57%	13.50%	14.66%	Met Target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B	SAT	4,958	542	11.83%	10.50%	10.93%	Met Target	No Slippage
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	SB	XXX
B	SAT	XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Interactive reports containing performance information (both participation and achievement) at the district and school levels for all students and subgroups (including students with disabilities) can be found at:

http://edsight.ct.gov/SASPortal/main.do

From the top navigation menu: (select > Performance and the appropriate assessment (e.g., Smarter Balanced, SAT).
All data is downloadable in EXCEL format.

An excel spreadsheet detailing information regarding the number and percent of children with disabilities who were provided accommodations in order to participate on regular statewide assessments at both the district and school levels is also available at the above link.

From the top navigation menu: (select > Students Select > Students with Disabilities)

On the left hand panel, under Related Links: (select: Accommodations Report)

This report has been updated with both the count and percentage of students provided accommodations. Data regarding the participation and performance of children with disabilities on Alternate Assessments based on Alternate Academic Achievement Standards can be found at the same location as the Accommodations data.

From the top navigation menu: (select > Students Select > Students with Disabilities) On the left hand panel, under Related Links: (Select > Alternate Assessment Data)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3C - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

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

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

*   The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
*   The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency 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 such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	21.30%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target <=	10.00%	10.00%	9.50%	9.50%	9.00%
Data	9.41%	9.41%	6.47%	6.47%	7.65%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	9.00%	9.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input regarding the setting of targets through FFY 2019 was obtained through three separate in-person presentations/discussions conducted by the BSE Division Director and/or CSDE staff. In each instance, the history of the SPP/APR and its associated targets were reviewed with participants, trend data was shared and targets were proposed and discussed. For multiple indicators, those discussions resulted in consensus around the setting of more rigorous targets.

The stakeholder groups included:

The State Advisory Council for Special Education, which includes parents; students; LEA personnel; representatives of other state agencies, advocacy groups, and Approved Private Special Education Programs; Charter Schools; as well as Members of the CT General Assembly.

The LEA Advisory Committee, developed to inform the BSE's General Monitoring and Supervision efforts by providing participants opportunities to: increase their knowledge and understanding of the current General Monitoring and Supervision System in Connecticut; provide feedback on the current system and share their own related experiences; advise the BSE on improvements to the system and to suggest areas of focus that would have the greatest impact on student outcomes; and provide feedback on any proposed changes to our system prior to statewide implementation.

The Early Childhood Large City and Severe Needs Forum is attended by early childhood special education administrators from LEAs throughout CT. The forum convenes five times per year and offers both a learning opportunity and discussion forum on topics of interests by the attendees. Each meeting incudes a guest speaker and topics have included assessment practice, early learning and development standards, family engagement, evaluation timelines, and APR data/data collection.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
16	170	7.65%	9.00%	9.41%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The count of Districts with a significant discrepancy grew in 2017-18 from 13 districts to 16 districts. Five of the districts from 2016-17 were no longer identified with a significant discrepancy. Of the 16 identified districts, eight were newly identified and eight were districts previously identified in 2016-17. For the eight newly identified districts, six were just over the target of less than 2.0% of students with disabilities suspended or expelled for more than 10 days (2.1%) and the remaining two had rates of 2.2 and 2.3 percent. For the eight repeater districts, five demonstrated a reduction in their rate of students with disabilities suspended or expelled for more than 10 days and three had rates increases.

Districts describe increased challenges in supporting the social, emotional and behavioral needs of students with disabilities, as well as those students with disabilities who have been impacted by trauma. A review of the districts identified revealed variability in districts' effectiveness in identifying the need for and then supporting the appropriate interventions for students, beginning at the Tier I level of support. As Tier I serves as the foundation upon which all other tiers are built, Tier II and III supports become consequently compromised. Additionally, districts struggle with the efficacy of the systems they have in place to identify students in need of support. The state will continue to work with districts to support team structures, data analysis, application of consistent interventions/supports and program evaluation as well as the delivery of meaningful professional development.

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

For Indicator 4A, the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) determined that a district had a significant discrepancy by comparing the suspension/expulsion rates for children with individualized education programs (IEPs) among districts in the state. The state calculated the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs for each district within the state.

Connecticut has defined "significant discrepancy" as a district suspending or expelling greater than 2 percent (2.0%) of its children with disabilities for more than 10 days in a school year.

Connecticut does not use a minimum "n" size for this analysis, and no districts were excluded from the calculation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using FFY17- FFY18 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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 Office of Student Support Services met to review district suspension and expulsion data and the process for addressing districts with a significant discrepancy. The CSDE contacted the 16 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. 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.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.
XXX

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.
XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4A - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups 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 that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices 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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

Historical Data

Baseline	2016	0.00%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

24

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
14	0	146	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Connecticut's 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. In Connecticut, significant discrepancy for Indicator 4B is 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 by race in each district for students with disabilities and compared those rates to the students with disabilities that had suspensions and expulsions greater than a cumulative total of 10 days by race in each district.

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)

In the 2017-18 school year, 14 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity in the suspension/expulsion rate of children with disabilities of greater than 10 days in a school year. The districts' policies, procedures or practices were reviewed to ensure compliance with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.
Zero districts were found to have non-compliant policies, procedures or practices. Target met.

Connecticut's minimum 'n' size requirement excluded 27 districts from the calculation of rates.
Districts in Connecticut 170
Districts excluded under minimum "n" Rule A = 22
Districts excluded under minimum "n" Rule B = 2
Districts assessed for Significant Discrepancy = 146
Districts with rates > 2.0% = 14

The Connecticut State Department of Education (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.
Data for Indicator 4B are not taken from sampling. Data collected are valid and reliable, as ensured through a series of verification checks after the electronic submission of the data.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The CSDE contacted the 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.

Upon completion of the desk audit, the CSDE determined that each of the 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. Therefore, the CSDE did not require any of the districts to revise its policies, procedures or 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.

The CSDE completed the review of the 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.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

If YES, select one of the following:

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.
XXX

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.
XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): 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))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 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.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 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.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%
A	65.20%	Data	68.07%	68.67%	67.74%	67.33%	67.69%
B	2005	Target <=	6.10%	6.10%	6.10%	6.10%	6.10%
B	7.70%	Data	5.91%	5.20%	5.21%	5.50%	5.67%
C	2014	Target <=	7.40%	8.40%	8.40%	8.40%	8.40%
C	8.40%	Data	7.40%	8.40%	8.35%	8.03%	7.88%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	68.10%	68.20%
Target B <=	6.00%	6.00%
Target C <=	8.30%	8.30%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input regarding the setting of targets through FFY 2019 was obtained through three separate in-person presentations/discussions conducted by the BSE Division Director and/or CSDE staff. In each instance, the history of the SPP/APR and its associated targets were reviewed with participants, trend data was shared and targets were proposed and discussed. For multiple indicators, those discussions resulted in consensus around the setting of more rigorous targets.

The stakeholder groups included:

The State Advisory Council for Special Education, which includes parents; students; LEA personnel; representatives of other state agencies, advocacy groups, and Approved Private Special Education Programs; Charter Schools; as well as Members of the CT General Assembly.

The LEA Advisory Committee, developed to inform the BSE's General Monitoring and Supervision efforts by providing participants opportunities to: increase their knowledge and understanding of the current General Monitoring and Supervision System in Connecticut; provide feedback on the current system and share their own related experiences; advise the BSE on improvements to the system and to suggest areas of focus that would have the greatest impact on student outcomes; and provide feedback on any proposed changes to our system prior to statewide implementation.

The Early Childhood Large City and Severe Needs Forum is attended by early childhood special education administrators from LEAs throughout CT. The forum convenes five times per year and offers both a learning opportunity and discussion forum on topics of interests by the attendees. Each meeting incudes a guest speaker and topics have included assessment practice, early learning and development standards, family engagement, evaluation timelines, and APR data/data collection.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	72,551
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	48,430
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	4,436
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	5,178
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	209
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	191

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.
NO
Provide an explanation below

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	48,430	72,551	67.69%	68.10%	66.75%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	4,436	72,551	5.67%	6.00%	6.11%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	5,578	72,551	7.88%	8.30%	7.69%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
inside the regular class 80% or more of the day							
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements *[c1+c2+c3]*	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)
NO

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	As districts work diligently to bring students back from out of district placements into separate schools, they transition students into the public school by first including students in special education classrooms where students are inside the regular class for less than 40% of the day. The movement of students from 5C into 5B is a less restrictive environment.
C	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	76.61%	76.75%	77.25%	77.50%	77.75%
A	71.60%	Data	76.61%	74.17%	72.62%	72.64%	71.18%
B	2011	Target <=	11.80%	11.50%	11.25%	11.00%	10.75%
B	15.50%	Data	11.80%	14.41%	15.07%	16.43%	18.28%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	78.00%	78.00%
Target B <=	10.50%	10.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input regarding the setting of targets through FFY 2019 was obtained through three separate in-person presentations/discussions conducted by the BSE Division Director and/or CSDE staff. In each instance, the history of the SPP/APR and its associated targets were reviewed with participants, trend data was shared and targets were proposed and discussed. For multiple indicators, those discussions resulted in consensus around the setting of more rigorous targets.

The stakeholder groups included:

The State Advisory Council for Special Education, which includes parents; students; LEA personnel; representatives of other state agencies, advocacy groups, and Approved Private Special Education Programs; Charter Schools; as well as Members of the CT General Assembly.

The LEA Advisory Committee, developed to inform the BSE's General Monitoring and Supervision efforts by providing participants opportunities to: increase their knowledge and understanding of the current General Monitoring and Supervision System in Connecticut; provide feedback on the current system and share their own related experiences; advise the BSE on improvements to the system and to suggest areas of focus that would have the greatest impact on student outcomes; and provide feedback on any proposed changes to our system prior to statewide implementation.

The Early Childhood Large City and Severe Needs Forum is attended by early childhood special education administrators from LEAs throughout CT. The forum convenes five times per year and offers both a learning opportunity and discussion forum on topics of interests by the attendees. Each meeting incudes a guest speaker and topics have included assessment practice, early learning and development standards, family engagement, evaluation timelines, and APR data/data collection.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	9,785
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	6,815
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	1,759
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	99
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	6,815	9,785	71.18%	78.00%	69.65%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	1,859	9,785	18.28%	10.50%	19.00%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Provide reasons for slippage for A

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	CT has seen decreases in the area of early childhood environments for the last several years. Last year the department improvement plan in this area included direct contact with the lowest quantile of districts regarding their data and opportunities for professional development. After a number of interactions with districts with rapidly declining data, it was noted that the significant turnover in preschool early childhood staff and lack of requisite training for new hires had resulted in districts not properly collecting and reporting the total hours of early childhood programming provided to children outside of the IEP. Districts that were providing integrated services for 1-3 days per week while the children they served also received regular early childhood programming in non-public settings were not recording the hours of programming outside of the IEP and therefore were not able to include those hours of regular early childhood programming in the determination of the total/holistic educational environment for receiving special education and related services. Intensive technical assistance is on-going throughout our state to address this omission of critical data in the reporting of early childhood programming and environments for children with disabilities in Connecticut.
B	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

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:

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.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2008	Target >=	55.50%	55.50%	54.00%	55.50%	57.00%
A1	58.30%	Data	55.97%	59.24%	46.05%	73.25%	88.80%
A2	2008	Target >=	51.50%	51.50%	50.00%	51.50%	53.00%
A2	54.20%	Data	51.89%	53.59%	43.04%	68.66%	71.99%
B1	2008	Target >=	65.50%	65.50%	64.00%	64.50%	65.00%
B1	61.70%	Data	65.56%	67.35%	70.17%	85.77%	91.61%
B2	2008	Target >=	32.50%	32.50%	31.00%	31.50%	32.00%
B2	33.00%	Data	32.65%	34.51%	47.96%	68.97%	74.25%
C1	2008	Target >=	52.00%	52.00%	51.00%	51.00%	51.00%
C1	50.50%	Data	52.19%	54.52%	59.42%	80.00%	95.96%
C2	2008	Target >=	25.00%	25.00%	24.00%	25.00%	26.00%
C2	26.50%	Data	25.19%	25.75%	33.59%	57.50%	68.79%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	58.50%	85.00%
Target A2 >=	54.50%	68.00%
Target B1 >=	65.50%	85.00%
Target B2 >=	33.50%	68.00%
Target C1 >=	51.00%	90.00%
Target C2 >=	27.00%	65.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input regarding the setting of targets through FFY 2019 was obtained through three separate in-person presentations/discussions conducted by the BSE Division Director and/or CSDE staff. In each instance, the history of the SPP/APR and its associated targets were reviewed with participants, trend data was shared and targets were proposed and discussed. For multiple indicators, those discussions resulted in consensus around the setting of more rigorous targets.

The stakeholder groups included:

The State Advisory Council for Special Education, which includes parents; students; LEA personnel; representatives of other state agencies, advocacy groups, and Approved Private Special Education Programs; Charter Schools; as well as Members of the CT General Assembly.

The LEA Advisory Committee, developed to inform the BSE's General Monitoring and Supervision efforts by providing participants opportunities to: increase their knowledge and understanding of the current General Monitoring and Supervision System in Connecticut; provide feedback on the current system and share their own related experiences; advise the BSE on improvements to the system and to suggest areas of focus that would have the greatest impact on student outcomes; and provide feedback on any proposed changes to our system prior to statewide implementation.

The Early Childhood Large City and Severe Needs Forum is attended by early childhood special education administrators from LEAs throughout CT. The forum convenes five times per year and offers both a learning opportunity and discussion forum on topics of interests by the attendees. Each meeting incudes a guest speaker and topics have included assessment practice, early learning and development standards, family engagement, evaluation timelines, and APR data/data collection.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

3,188

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	73	2.29%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	60	1.88%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	785	24.62%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	380	11.92%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,890	59.28%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited 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. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	1,165	1,298	88.80%	58.50%	89.75%	Met Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*	2,270	3,188	71.99%	54.50%	71.20%	Met Target	No Slippage

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	258	8.09%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	6	0.19%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	589	18.48%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,030	63.68%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	305	9.57%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited 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. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)*	2,619	2,883	91.61%	65.50%	90.84%	Met Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the	2,335	3,188	74.25%	33.50%	73.24%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
program.*Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)*							

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	57	1.79%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	26	0.82%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	904	28.36%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,204	37.77%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	997	31.27%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited 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.	2,108	2,191	95.96%	51.00%	96.21%	Met Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	2,201	3,188	68.79%	27.00%	69.04%	Met Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	XXX
A2	XXX
B1	XXX
B2	XXX
C1	XXX
C2	XXX

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Please explain why the State did not include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

NO

If no, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

The CSDE's decisions regarding data analysis and reporting are 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-III 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-III to serve as age-specific benchmarks of skill acquisition. In conjunction with information gathered from validation and standardization studies, the Brigance IED–III 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-III 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-III 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.

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) established a statewide data 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. The CSDE selected a single statewide assessment instrument, the Brigance Diagnostic
Inventory of Early Development III© (Brigance), a criterion-referenced assessment instrument, for the collection and reporting of early childhood outcome data.

The CSDE 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-III test developer and
publisher for review and approval. Feedback from both the developer and publisher of the Brigance IED-III 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, are
used to collect data at a child's entry to and exit from special education at the preschool grade level.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: 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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

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.

Instructions

Sampling **of parents from whom response is requested** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO
If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately?	XXX

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input regarding the setting of targets through FFY 2019 was obtained through three separate in-person presentations/discussions conducted by the BSE Division Director and/or CSDE staff. In each instance, the history of the SPP/APR and its associated targets were reviewed with participants, trend data was shared and targets were proposed and discussed. For multiple indicators, those discussions resulted in consensus around the setting of more rigorous targets.

The stakeholder groups included:

The State Advisory Council for Special Education, which includes parents; students; LEA personnel; representatives of other state agencies, advocacy groups, and Approved Private Special Education Programs; Charter Schools; as well as Members of the CT General Assembly.

The LEA Advisory Committee, developed to inform the BSE's General Monitoring and Supervision efforts by providing participants opportunities to: increase their knowledge and understanding of the current General Monitoring and Supervision System in Connecticut; provide feedback on the current system and share their own related experiences; advise the BSE on improvements to the system and to suggest areas of focus that would have the greatest impact on student outcomes; and provide feedback on any proposed changes to our system prior to statewide implementation.

The Early Childhood Large City and Severe Needs Forum is attended by early childhood special education administrators from LEAs throughout CT. The forum convenes five times per year and offers both a learning opportunity and discussion forum on topics of interests by the attendees. Each meeting incudes a guest speaker and topics have included assessment practice, early learning and development standards, family engagement, evaluation timelines, and APR data/data collection.

Historical Data

Baseline	2018	83.62%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target >=	87.50%	87.50%	87.50%	87.75%	88.00%
Data	87.73%	88.07%	81.28%	87.55%	85.92%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	88.25%	85.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2,353	2,814	85.92%	88.25%	83.62%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

20,633

Percentage of respondent parents

13.64%

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The state of CT adopted a new survey. Previously Connecticut used a CT designed survey created in collaboration with the University of Connecticut. Recently under the advice and guidance of our Parent Work Group (PWG) and State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the department shifted gears and utilized a new survey and external evaluator for the administration of the new survey. The department used, with approval from OSEP, a modified version of the NCSEAM Survey. Twenty-five items from the NCSEAM survey were used to create the Connecticut Special Education Parent Involvement Survey.

A factor analysis of the survey data was conducted and determined that only seventeen items would be used for the final survey analysis. This factor, Parent Involvement, explained 58.2% of the variance in parent responses. Eight items were dropped because of weak item loadings and four items specifically loaded as two separate factors: post-secondary transition and parent training (extraction method: principal component analysis with oblimin rotation). The reliability of the included seventeen items in the 'parent involvement' factor was very strong (a = 0.971). All validity and reliability statistics support the use of only seventeen items from the survey to answer the question of whether the district facilitated parent involvement.

The use of an entirely new survey makes the comparison of any previous survey results to the current year survey data inappropriate. The data obtained from the 2018-19 survey serves as a new BASELINE reset for Connecticut.

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

Connecticut does not use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children. All parents of students ages 3-21 are included in the survey. All surveys were collected in the same manner from all parents regardless of the age/grade of the student with disabilities. There are no issues with the combination of data because the surveys are identical, and all procedures for distribution and collection were also identical. No data were combined because all data were obtained from
 one survey, one administration and one database.

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Preschool	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
Preschool	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	XXX	XXX

Target B >=		XXX	XXX	

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately

	Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
Preschool	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	**XXX**	**XXX**	**XXX**	**XXX**	**XXX**	**XXX**	**XXX**

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

The number of School-Age parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

XXX

Percentage of respondent School-Age parents

XXX

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO
If yes, provide sampling plan.	XXX

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

For FFY 2018, 51 districts were included in the survey. CT's approved sampling plan calls for the census of most districts in the cohort and a sample of the larger urban districts. In FFY2018, a survey was mailed to every parent of students with disabilities ages 3-21 in 40 of the 51 districts in the cohort. Surveys were sent to a sample of parents (in accordance with Connecticut's approved sampling design) in the 11 largest participating districts. Please see Connecticut's approved Special Education Parent Survey Sampling Plan for details.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	YES
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	XXX
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Connecticut will work with the vendor and local school districts to increase the participation and outreach for the parent survey from our urban school districts. Our parent survey data indicate positive and encouraging outcomes but fail to reach a proportionate share of Black and Latino families in CT.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Parent responses were analyzed to determine state performance on Indicator 8. The 83.62 percent agreement reported above represents the percent of parents who responsed Very Strongly Agree, Strongly Agree or Agree to at least half of the seventeen survey items. The responses collected from 51 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).

Age: $X2(4) = 124.38$; effect size = 0.20 ~ Weak Association
Gender: $X2(1) = 3.09$; effect size = 0.05 ~ Negligible Association
Race/Ethnicity: $X2(6) = 592.43$; effect size = 0.45 ~ Moderate Association
Grade: $X2(3) = 129.81$; effect size = 0.20 ~ Weak Association
Disability: $X2(6) = 99.44$; effect size = 0.18 ~ Weak Association

These results indicate that the parent survey respondents were representative of the total 3-21 population of student with disabilities in CT for Age, Gender, Grade and Disability. However, there was an significant chi-square and moderate association for Race/Ethnicity. Standardized residuals were considered when interpreting the race/ethnicity representativeness of the sample. It was concluded that categories "Asian", "Black," "White," and "Hispanic/Latino of any race" had a major influence on the significant chi-square test statistic, with large standardized residuals. "Black" and "Hispanic/Latino of any race" were underrepresented in the final respondent sample. Whereas "Asian" and "White" were overrepresented in the final respondent sample.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The state of CT adopted a new survey. Previously Connecticut used a CT designed survey created in collaboration with the University of Connecticut. Recently under the advice and guidance of our Parent Work Group (PWG) and State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the department shifted gears and utilized a new survey and external evaluator for the administration of the new survey. The department used, with approval from OSEP, a modified version of the NCSEAM Survey. Twenty-five items from the NCSEAM survey were used to create the Connecticut Special Education Parent Involvement Survey.

The use of an entirely new survey makes the comparison of any previous survey results to the current year survey data inappropriate. The data obtained from the 2018-19 survey serves as a new BASELINE reset for Connecticut.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2018 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2019 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: 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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, 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 that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§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 and/or cell 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 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2018	0.00%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

0

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2	0	170	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The state of Connecticut adopted the same formula for assessing significant disproportionality to this indicator. We are calculating a risk ratio and applying a minimum cell size of 10 and a minimum N-size of 30. These minimum's do not exclude a district from the calculation, they simply trigger the required use of the alternate risk ratio when the cell or N-size is violated for the comparison group. Upon violation, the district-level data are compared to the state-level data.
The threshold for the identification of disproportionate representation is an risk ratio greater than or equal to 3.0. We are only using one year of data for the assessment of disproportionate representation.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Each year, the CSDE requires districts with identified disproportionate representation (i.e., RR's greater than or equal to 3.0) to conduct an analysis of their policies, procedures and practices using a state-designed self-assessment based upon compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. Sections 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. Upon a desk audit review of each district's responses to the 52 indicators of the self-assessment by CSDE staff, it is determined if each of the districts is correctly implementing the related regulatory requirements and has appropriate identification policies, procedures and practices. If the CSDE finds that the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, the CSDE would report the finding in its SPP/APR and assign corrective actions accordingly.

For FFY 2018, two districts were initially contacted regarding disproportionate representation using the CSDE's definition.
The CSDE required the two districts to conduct an analysis of their policies, procedures and practices using the state-designed self-assessment based upon compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. Sections 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. Upon review of the self-assessment by CSDE staff via desk audit, it was verified that each of the two districts was correctly implementing the related regulatory requirements and had appropriate identification policies, procedures and practices; and that the disproportionate representation was not due to inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Both areas of identified disproportionate representation were in the area of Black Special Education.

As the state has adopted a new methodology for the assessment of disproportionate representation, FFY 2018 data serves as a new BASELINE reset for Connecticut.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

9 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: 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))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, 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 that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§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 and/or cell 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 2018 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2019).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

Historical Data

Baseline	2018	0.00%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	**2018**	**2019**
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

0

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
17	0	170	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The state of Connecticut adopted the same formula for assessing significant disproportionality to this indicator. We are calculating a risk ratio and applying a minimum cell size of 10 and a minimum N-size of 30. These minimum's do not exclude a district from the calculation, they simply trigger the required use of the alternate risk ratio when the cell or N-size is violated for the comparison group. Upon violation, the district-level data are compared to the state-level data.
The threshold for the identification of disproportionate representation is an risk ratio greater than or equal to 3.0. We are only using one year of data for the assessment of disproportionate representation.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Each year, the CSDE requires districts with identified disproportionate representation (i.e., RR's greater than or equal to 3.0) to conduct an analysis of their policies, procedures and practices using a state-designed self-assessment based upon compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. Sections 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. Upon a desk audit review of each district's responses to the 52 indicators of the self-assessment by CSDE staff, it is determined if each of the districts is correctly implementing the related regulatory requirements and has appropriate identification policies, procedures and practices. If the CSDE finds that the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, the CSDE would report the finding in its SPP/APR and assign corrective actions accordingly.

For FFY 2018, 17 districts were initially contacted regarding disproportionate representation using the CSDE's definition in 18 identified areas.

The CSDE required the 17 districts to conduct an analysis of their policies, procedures and practices using the state-designed self-assessment based upon compliance with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. Sections 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311. Upon review of the self-assessment by CSDE staff via desk audit, it was verified that each of the districts was correctly implementing the related regulatory requirements and had appropriate identification policies, procedures and practices; and that the disproportionate representation was not due to inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 of the 18 areas of disproportionate representation were in the racial category of american Indian.
12 of the 18 areas of disproportionate representation were in the racial category of black.
4 of the 18 areas of disproportionate representation were in the racial category of Hispanic.
1 of the 18 areas of disproportionate representation were in the racial category of white.

9 of the 18 areas of disproportionate representation were in the disability category of Learning Disabled.
3 of the 18 areas of disproportionate representation were in the disability category of Speech/Language Impairment.
2 of the 18 areas of disproportionate representation were in the disability category of Other Health Impairment.
2 of the 18 areas of disproportionate representation were in the disability category of Intellectual Disabilities.
2 of the 18 areas of disproportionate representation were in the disability category of Emotional Disturbance.

As the state has adopted a new methodology for the assessment of disproportionate representation, FFY 2018 data serves as a new BASELINE reset for Connecticut.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions
None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

10 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: 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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

    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).
    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.

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

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2018	93.48%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.21%	99.33%	99.27%	99.11%	99.58%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
17,004	15,896	99.58%	100%	93.48%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

After submission of the FFY 2017 Initial Evaluation Timeline data, OSEP instructed the CSDE to halt monitoring of the Federal 60-calendar day timeline and begin using the state established timeline (45-school days). The transition from using the federal timeline to the state timeline resulted in a decrease in the total number of timely initial evaluations.

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

1,108

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.

Evaluations for a total of 1,108 children did not meet the state 45-school day timeline. The range of days beyond were from 1 to 316.
There were several reasons for evaluations to not be completed within the timeline.

First, 99 students were reported as failing to meet the state timeline without a justifiable reason for being delayed. This is similar to previous years of reporting.

Second, 151 students were recoded to Beyond the Timeline because OSEP directed the CSDE to count any student immediately re-referred as not timely. Previous CSDE guidance regarding immediate re-referral was determined to not meet the requirement of a "comprehensive evaluation" under 34 C.F.R. § 300.304(c)(6). The reason for delay in this group of 151 students was due to the OSEP definition of comprehensive evaluation resulting in the evaluations being recoded to beyond the timeline.

Lastly, the CSDE conducted follow-up on all new initial evaluations reported within the state's database to determine if the evaluation met the State's 45-school day timeline. This follow-up was extensive and is explained in detail below (see method used to collect these data). The outcome of the follow-up resulted in the CSDE identifying an additional 858 records that did not meet the State's timeline.

The most common reasons for delay in the first and third groups were due to: independent evaluations not being completed on time; inability to access multi-lingual evaluators or assessment instruments for non-native English speakers; and scheduling conflicts.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).

Pursuant to Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (RCSA) §10-76d-13, once a district receives a written referral for special education evaluation, it has 45 school days to complete an initial evaluation, exclusive of the time required to obtain parental consent. The State timeline encompasses the entire eligibility determination process including reviewing the referral, obtaining written parental consent for evaluation, conducting a comprehensive evaluation, determining eligibility, obtaining written parental consent for the provision of special education services and implementing an individualized education program (IEP) if the student is found eligible.

Exceptions for going beyond the timeline include the following:
- Documented request by parent to reschedule or delay the eligibility determination PPT meeting after agreeing to attend at a particular time and date.
- Parent repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for evaluation.
- Student hospitalized/extended absence with medical documentation that student was not available for evaluation.
- Student placed in diagnostic placement for the purpose of determining eligibility.
- Eligibility Determination PPT cancelled due to inclement weather/emergency closing.
- Child referred from the Birth to Three system, had a 90-day transition conference, and either had an IEP in place by their 3rd birthday or was found not eligible.
- Documented agreement to extend the evaluation timeline for the purpose of determining a Specific Learning Disability (ED637 form).

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The data used to report Indicator 11 are statewide data that are inclusive of every school district in the state that is responsible for the provision of special education and related services. Data are not obtained from sampling. Data reported for this indicator are valid and reliable.

Evaluation Timelines data are collected annually from all districts via a web-based data collection tool. Data are collected for all children for whom consent to evaluate was received, including children placed by parents in private, non-public, and religiously affiliated schools, between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019.

In a phone conference following the OSEP memorandum (received 11/4/19), OSEP directed the CSDE to switch the reporting of the evaluation timeline data from the federal timeline (calculated within the State's data system) to the state established timeline. This switch required a comprehensive process of investigation and review by the CSDE.

All of the 17,155 records reported by districts in the State's data collection were reviewed. There were 302 records where the student was initially referred and then immediately re-referred. These 302 records reflect 151 unique students. The first record for each of these students was deleted and the second record for each of the 151 students was retained in the database and recoded to "Beyond the Timeline" as directed by OSEP. This resulted in a total count of 17,004 unique initial evaluation records in the database.

Of the 17,004 total initial evaluation records in the State's database, 250 records were "Beyond the Timeline" (151 records recoded from immediate re-referrals and 99 records that did not meet the state timeline). The remaining 16,754 unique student records in the State's database were analyzed to assess compliance with the state initial evaluation timeline. This process first required reviewing each district's data submission in the evaluation timeline database and then merging the evaluation timeline database with the State's Public School Information System (PSIS) and the State's Special Education data system (SEDAC) using the State's unique student identifier (SASID).

The State established timeline requires no more than 45-school days between the receipt of referral date and the IEP implementation date. Using the three merged data systems, the CSDE was able to determine the implementation of the IEP from the special education entry date for receipt of services (from PSIS) and the start date of services from the IEP (reported in SEDAC). These two dates were used to compare to the referral date for initial evaluation reported in the evaluation timeline database. Through the triangulation of these data systems, the CSDE was able to verify that 13,496 of the 16,754 records met the State established timeline.

Follow-up review was conducted for the remaining 3,258 records that could not be verified via the merge of the three data systems. Of these records,

879 met the State timeline through a verification of district level records; 1,521 met the State's timeline due to an exception in State regulation or policy (e.g., 49.8 percent were IDEA Part C referrals for children whose IEPs were implemented before their third birthday); and 858 of the records failed to meet the State's timeline.

In summary, the CSDE was able to verify that 15,896 of the 17,004 total initial evaluations conducted in FFY 2018 met the State established timeline (93.48 percent). A total of 1,108 records failed to meet the State established timeline.

These data are valid and reliable as evidenced by 1) the triangulation of data systems to ensure compliance with the State established timeline, 2) intensive follow-up with districts to verify compliance with the State established timeline, and 3) documentation of reasons for delay

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Consistent with Connecticut's exclusive use of the state established timeline (45-school days), FFY 2018 data serve as a new BASELINE reset for Connecticut.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
30	30	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

There were 30 districts determined to be out of compliance with Indicator 11 based on FFY 2017 (2017-18) evaluation timelines data.

All 30 districts were required to submit statements of assurance that each had reviewed its policies, procedures and practices specific to conducting and completing initial evaluations for any factors that may have contributed to untimely completion of initial evaluation and submit any revisions for review by BSE staff via desk audit.

The 30 districts were also required to provide monitored submissions of subsequent evaluation timelines data during 2018-19 for review by CSDE staff. During the monitored submission process, all 30 districts reached the 100% target for timely initial evaluations and were found to be implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 C.F.R. Section 300.301, which the CSDE verified using the special education SIS database.

Through the actions detailed above, the CSDE was able to verify within one year that each of the 30 districts is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for initial evaluations, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

There were 30 districts determined to be out of compliance with Indicator 11 based on FFY 2017 (2017-18) evaluation timelines data.

All 30 districts were required to submit statements of assurance that each had reviewed its policies, procedures and practices specific to conducting and completing initial evaluations for any factors that may have contributed to untimely completion of initial evaluation and submit any revisions for review by BSE staff via desk audit.

The 30 districts were also required to submit to the CSDE the following information for each child determined eligible beyond the timeline during FFY 2017:
-the student's State Assigned Student Identifier (SASID);
-dates of referral, written parental consent for evaluation, and review of evaluation results;
-the reason for the delay;
-the extent to which the delay may have resulted in the denial of a free and appropriate public education (FAPE), if any; and
-any action items taken to address the late evaluation and IEP implementation.

The CSDE used the special education SIS database to verify that the initial evaluation was completed and an IEP implemented for each of the 69 students whose evaluations exceeded the state timelines. BSE staff also reviewed any actions taken by the district to address the late evaluation and IEP implementation such as compensatory education or services, staff training, or revisions to clerical procedures.

Through the actions detailed above, the CSDE was able to verify within one year that each of the 69 initial evaluations was completed, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

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 to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

     e.   # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

     f.   # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. 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 - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	91.90%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	3,048
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	576
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	1,842

d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.							395
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.							235
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.							0

	Numerator *(c)*	Denominator *(a-b-d-e-f)*	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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.	1,842	1,842	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e,or f

0

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

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The data used to report on this indicator represent the statewide data collected from every school district in the state that provides special education and related services to the population of eligible students beginning at age 3. No sampling was utilized for reporting on this indicator. Data are valid and reliable as verified by a series of validation checks built into the statewide data collection system.

The statewide special education data collection system is called the Special Education Data Application and Collection (SEDAC). Data utilized were obtained by the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) through the electronic submission of special education data by each school district in the state. Data submitted are child-specific with each child having a unique student identification number called a State Assigned Student Identification Number (SASID). The CSDE began assigning a SASID number to all children in the state's Part C program in the school year 2006-07. By the school year 2007-08, all infants and toddlers receiving Part C services had a SASID assigned by the CSDE. That student identification number assigned by the CSDE stays with the child during the receipt of their early intervention services and is reassigned to the child by the CSDE at age 3 or at whatever age and point in time the child becomes enrolled and begins receiving a public education.

Data used in the analysis reflect the Section 618 data that identifies the number of 3-year-old children receiving special education and related services. The CSDE's data system also captures the date of the child's individualized education program (IEP) team meeting that is held to develop the child's initial IEP along with the start date of a child's special education and related services. The Part C lead agency's data are used as data verification to ensure that the data analysis and reporting is fully inclusive of all students who exit Part C to Part B.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions
None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline	2009	77.80%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.71%	99.92%	99.93%	99.87%	99.92%

Targets

FFY	**2018**	**2019**
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
15,564	15,568	99.92%	100%	99.97%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these 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. These data are collected annually through Connecticut's Special Education Data Application and Collection (SEDAC). SEDAC collects multiple variables that allow the state to monitor IEP compliance with postsecondary goals and objectives, including: use of age appropriate transition assessments; postsecondary goals related to individualized student transition service needs; evidence that the student was invited to the IEP team meeting; and evidence that participating agencies were invited where appropriate. Data were not obtained from sampling, secondary transition data are collected for every child with an IEP who is 15 years of age or older. All data reported here are valid and reliable.

Detailed information regarding the SEDAC data collection can be found at the following location:
http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/help/sedac/default.aspx.

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	

If no, please explain

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
8	8	0	0

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
For the eight districts identified with noncompliance under Indicator 13 in FFY 2017, the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) verified within the one-year timeline that all districts are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (34 C.F.R. Sections 300.320(b) and 300.321(b)) through a review of subsequent data in the state's special education data system, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The eight districts were required to
review student files to determine the underlying cause(s) of noncompliance and submit a brief summary of the findings of this investigation, as well as a plan for addressing the cause(s) of noncompliance, for review by CSDE staff. Additionally, each district was also required to submit a statement of assurance that it had reviewed its policies, procedures, and practices specific to providing measurable postsecondary goals and annual goals and objectives, including inviting the student to the PPT meeting where transition services were being discussed, and if appropriate, inviting a representative from an outside/participating agency to the PPT meeting, for any factors that may have contributed to inappropriate transition services and submit any changes or revisions for review by CSDE staff. Each district was also required to provide evidence of training for all staff members who were responsible for the oversight, development, or implementation of IEPs that include appropriate post-secondary transition goals and annual goals which address the accurate and thorough completion of IEPs with particular attention to the secondary transition sections of the IEP - pages 4, 5, 6, and 7 – specifically information on pages 9 – 16 of the revised IEP Manual and page 6 of the special education database handbook and record layout. In addition, each district was required to participate in a CSDE technical assistance (TA) session, differentiated and tailored to each district, based on their area(s) of noncompliance, which included training on the use of following CSDE Indicator 13 resources and tools: Secondary Transition Planning IEP Checklist, Secondary Transition Planning IEP Checklist - District Summary, and IEP Rubric for Scoring Secondary Transition Planning.

The CSDE used the special education database to verify that the eight districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (34 C.F.R. Sections 300.320(b) and 300.321(b)), consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02. CSDE staff also reviewed any actions taken by the district to address the development of an IEP with coordinated, measurable, post-secondary and annual goals and transition services, including inviting the student to the PPT meeting where transition services are discussed and if appropriate, inviting a representative from an outside/participating agency, such as staff training, the development of a "checks and balance" review system of secondary IEPs, or revisions of clerical or data collection procedures.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
For the eight districts identified with noncompliance under Indicator 13 in FFY 2017, CSDE personnel worked closely with local education agency (LEA) personnel to immediately correct individual cases of noncompliance. In all cases, individual correction occurred within 4 months of the finding being issued and was verified through a review of student IEPs.

For each individual case of noncompliance, districts were required to:
1. Convene a PPT meeting for the purpose of reviewing and revising the student's individualized education program (IEP) as well as for transition planning and correcting the area of noncompliance. In some cases the correction required a revision to the required elements of the student's IEP and in other cases it required an action to be taken by the district and then appropriately documenting that action on the IEP. The areas of secondary transition addressed through required corrective actions for individual cases were:
a. the inclusion of appropriate, measurable postsecondary goals based upon age appropriate transition assessments,
b. evidence that the student's preferences and interests were considered in transition planning,
c. evidence that the student was invited to the PPT meeting, and
d. evidence that the district invited a representative of any outside agency that is likely to be responsible for providing transition services for the student.
2. Update the special education data base for every student with a noncompliant IEP under this indicator; and
3. Submit the updated IEP pages to the CSDE to verify the correction of noncompliance.

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions
None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response
Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Post-school outcomes: Percent 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.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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.

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.

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.

Instructions

*Sampling **of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See* General Instructions *on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. *Definitions*

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under "competitive employment" in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., 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.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 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, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C 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.).

II. *Data Reporting*

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of "leavers" who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

"Leavers" should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, "leavers" who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, "leavers" who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators*

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	49.00%	49.00%	49.00%	49.00%	49.00%
A	46.30%	Data	49.12%	49.73%	46.66%	51.34%	86.40%
B	2009	Target >=	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%	63.00%
B	61.20%	Data	63.27%	73.57%	65.24%	66.62%	91.60%
C	2009	Target >=	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%	77.00%
C	78.70%	Data	77.69%	86.51%	78.74%	79.23%	95.32%

FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	49.10%	80.00%
Target B >=	63.10%	85.00%
Target C >=	78.75%	90.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input regarding the setting of targets through FFY 2019 was obtained through three separate in-person presentations/discussions conducted by the BSE Division Director and/or CSDE staff. In each instance, the history of the SPP/APR and its associated targets were reviewed with participants, trend data was shared and targets were proposed and discussed. For multiple indicators, those discussions resulted in consensus around the setting of more rigorous targets.

The stakeholder groups included:

The State Advisory Council for Special Education, which includes parents; students; LEA personnel; representatives of other state agencies, advocacy groups, and Approved Private Special Education Programs; Charter Schools; as well as Members of the CT General Assembly.

The LEA Advisory Committee, developed to inform the BSE's General Monitoring and Supervision efforts by providing participants opportunities to: increase their knowledge and understanding of the current General Monitoring and Supervision System in Connecticut; provide feedback on the current system and share their own related experiences; advise the BSE on improvements to the system and to suggest areas of focus that would have the greatest impact on student outcomes; and provide feedback on any proposed changes to our system prior to statewide implementation.

The Early Childhood Large City and Severe Needs Forum is attended by early childhood special education administrators from LEAs throughout CT. The forum convenes five times per year and offers both a learning opportunity and discussion forum on topics of interests by the attendees. Each meeting incudes a guest speaker and topics have included assessment practice, early learning and development standards, family engagement, evaluation timelines, and APR data/data collection.

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	1,991
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,796
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	91
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	10
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	16

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,796	1,991	86.40%	49.10%	90.21%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	1,887	1,991	91.60%	63.10%	94.78%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	1,913	1,991	95.32%	78.75%	96.08%	Met Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX
C	XXX

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., 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.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES

	Yes / No
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	XXX

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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 exiting 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.
Gender: $X2(1) = 34.2$; effect size = 0.13 ~ Weak Association
Race/Ethnicity: $X2(6) = 99.1$; effect size = 0.20 ~ Weak Association
Exit Type: $X2(3) = 272.3$; effect size = 0.36 ~ Moderate Association
Disability: $X2(6) = 87.2$; effect size = 0.20 ~ Weak Association

There was statistical support for differences between the respondents and the statewide population of exiters across one of the four areas assessed – Exit Reason. For this one area where differences were supported, the effect size or practical significance level did warrant consideration. 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.

For Exit Reason, it was concluded that category dropout had a significant influence on the significant chi-square test statistic. Dropouts were underrepresented in the final respondent sample.

While one would like to have a more proportionate number of dropouts respond to the survey, the likelihood of locating students that have dropped out is small. Particularly in a very small state where moving out of state is actually quite easy and the prospect of a job is better in other areas of the Northeast than in Connecticut where most jobs require college degrees. The addition of the National Student Clearinghouse Data regarding enrolled students in higher education had a significant impact on our response rates and likewise directly influenced the smaller proportion of students dropping out compared to the graduates. The data that so many students with disabilities were enrolled in higher education was enormously encouraging, however, students who have dropped out are not likely to have enrolled or been accepted to an institute of higher education.

	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Connecticut will work with the Department of Labor next year in an effort to track down and obtain employment information on students with disabilities who exited in 2018-19 and may have been employed since exiting school.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2018 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

14 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2019 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: 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))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	108
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	65

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.
NO
Provide an explanation below.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input regarding the setting of targets through FFY 2019 was obtained through three separate in-person presentations/discussions conducted by the BSE Division Director and/or CSDE staff. In each instance, the history of the SPP/APR and its associated targets were reviewed with participants, trend data was shared and targets were proposed and discussed. For multiple indicators, those discussions resulted in consensus around the setting of more rigorous targets.

The stakeholder groups included:

The State Advisory Council for Special Education, which includes parents; students; LEA personnel; representatives of other state agencies, advocacy groups, and Approved Private Special Education Programs; Charter Schools; as well as Members of the CT General Assembly.

The LEA Advisory Committee, developed to inform the BSE's General Monitoring and Supervision efforts by providing participants opportunities to: increase their knowledge and understanding of the current General Monitoring and Supervision System in Connecticut; provide feedback on the current system and share their own related experiences; advise the BSE on improvements to the system and to suggest areas of focus that would have the greatest impact on student outcomes; and provide feedback on any proposed changes to our system prior to statewide implementation.

The Early Childhood Large City and Severe Needs Forum is attended by early childhood special education administrators from LEAs throughout CT. The forum convenes five times per year and offers both a learning opportunity and discussion forum on topics of interests by the attendees. Each meeting incudes a guest speaker and topics have included assessment practice, early learning and development standards, family engagement, evaluation timelines, and APR data/data collection.

Historical Data

Baseline	2013	45.07%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target >=	45.00%	45.00%	45.00%	45.00%	45.00%
Data	45.07%	50.00%	30.43%	55.29%	57.14%

Targets

FFY	**2018**	**2019**
Target >=	45.10%	52.00%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
65	108	57.14%	45.10%	60.19%	Met Target	No Slippage

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable
XXX
Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions
None
Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

15 - OSEP Response
The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	224
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	54
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	96

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Provide an explanation below

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input regarding the setting of targets through FFY 2019 was obtained through three separate in-person presentations/discussions conducted by the BSE Division Director and/or CSDE staff. In each instance, the history of the SPP/APR and its associated targets were reviewed with participants, trend data was shared and targets were proposed and discussed. For multiple indicators, those discussions resulted in consensus around the setting of more rigorous targets.

The stakeholder groups included:

The State Advisory Council for Special Education, which includes parents; students; LEA personnel; representatives of other state agencies, advocacy groups, and Approved Private Special Education Programs; Charter Schools; as well as Members of the CT General Assembly.

The LEA Advisory Committee, developed to inform the BSE's General Monitoring and Supervision efforts by providing participants opportunities to: increase their knowledge and understanding of the current General Monitoring and Supervision System in Connecticut; provide feedback on the current system and share their own related experiences; advise the BSE on improvements to the system and to suggest areas of focus that would have the greatest impact on student outcomes; and provide feedback on any proposed changes to our system prior to statewide implementation.

The Early Childhood Large City and Severe Needs Forum is attended by early childhood special education administrators from LEAs throughout CT. The forum convenes five times per year and offers both a learning opportunity and discussion forum on topics of interests by the attendees. Each meeting incudes a guest speaker and topics have included assessment practice, early learning and development standards, family engagement, evaluation timelines, and APR data/data collection.

Historical Data

Baseline	2005	68.60%			
FFY	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Target >=	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%	68.00%
Data	68.63%	68.68%	68.77%	63.33%	61.88%

Targets

FFY	**2018**	**2019**
Target >=	68.70%	68.70%

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	**FFY 2017 Data**	**FFY 2018 Target**	**FFY 2018 Data**	**Status**	**Slippage**
54	96	224	61.88%	68.70%	66.96%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Targets

FFY	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	**FFY 2017 Data**	**FFY 2018 Target (low)**	**FFY 2018 Target (high)**	**FFY 2018 Data**	**Status**	**Slippage**
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

16 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Chief State School Officer

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Bryan Klimkiewicz

Title:

Special Education Division Director

Email:

Bryan.Klimkiewicz@ct.gov

Phone:

860-713-6911

Submitted on: