

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2022**

Connecticut



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

**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

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

170

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

Connecticut's General Supervision System (GSS) is comprised of two focus areas:

1. Compliance monitoring
2. Program improvement

While each focus area has its components described separately below, it is the integration of the various components that is the basis for an effective GSS that supports continuous improvement.

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, Assessment Modifications/Accommodations Audit, and as needed, a focused IDEA compliance review (File Review). During FFY 2022, the CSDE continued to engage with its data system vendor to plan, develop, review, and test the monitoring and reporting functionality in its new Connecticut Special Education Data System (CT-SEDS). As those features are finalized, the CSDE's processes for collecting and verifying the accuracy of data will be updated and revised.

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 was updated in 2022 and describes the complaint resolution process in detail. This publication can be found at the CSDE's website.

-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.

-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. Connecticut provides that any party that requests a due process hearing, may also request an Advisory Opinion.

Fiscal Management

Mechanisms are in place to provide oversight in the distribution and use of IDEA Part B and other federal funds to support students with disabilities, at the state and local level. The BSE collaborates with the Bureau of Fiscal Services (BFS) and electronic Grant Management System (eGMS) to ensure proper methods of administration are in place, such as: distribution and compliance with allocations; monitoring and enforcement of obligations imposed; systems to monitor risk with examination of deficiencies; and as needed technical assistance. Annual audits of LEAs are conducted in accordance with the Single Audit Act, as risk factors are examined through a fiscal risk rubric. If a concern is identified and rises to the point of review, the Fiscal Review Team determines if further action(s) is required. The IDEA Program/Fiscal Compliance Review Process examines evidence and Corrective Action(s) plans to verify proper use of IDEA Part B/federal funds as related to the fiscal requirements of the IDEA.

IDEA Compliance File Reviews

For this monitoring activity, CSDE staff annually reviews special education documentation (including student IEPs) from a subset of Connecticut LEAs using standardized rubrics 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 survey and monitoring activities. In FFY 2022, the focus of this monitoring activity was on verifying compliance with: timely annual reviews of IEPs, conducting timely reevaluations, IEP present levels of performance and annual goals, and prior written notice. With the implementation of CT-SEDS, procedures for this activity were revised in FFY 2022 as

the CSDE team conducting the reviews were able to access the child-level documentation directly through the data system.

Significant Disproportionality

In Connecticut, the criteria used to determine those districts that demonstrate significant disproportionality in the four areas required for review include: 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, procedures, and practices under in the area(s) of significant disproportionality and publicly report on any revisions. Additionally, the district must set-aside 15 percent of its total IDEA Part B funds for Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CCEIS).

SPP/APR Compliance Indicators

The six SPP Part B compliance indicators (4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13) are included in the compliance monitoring prong of the CSDE's GSS. Each of the indicators has been assigned a lead staff members to oversee LEA performance, provide technical assistance, and verify the correction of noncompliance associated with each indicator as needed. The Performance Office works closely with the Bureau of Special Education to complete the data collection, analysis, and reporting aspects of the work.

LEA Annual Determinations

The CSDE uses the required categories (Meets Requirements, Needs Assistance, Needs Intervention, and Needs Substantial Intervention) when assessing the performance of each LEA with the SPP compliance indicators, an additional state indicator (chronic absenteeism rate), the completion of corrective actions ordered to address the timely correction of noncompliance, and timely and accurate data submission. Based on an LEA's determination level, the CSDE may order enforcement actions and/or impose sanctions on the LEA to support IDEA compliance.

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

SPP/APR Results Indicators

The eleven SPP Part B results indicators (1-4A, 5-8 and 15-17) are included in the performance improvement prong of the CSDE's GSS. Each of the indicators has been assigned a lead staff members to oversee LEA performance and support improvement in the area. The Performance Office works closely with the Bureau of Special Education to complete the data collection, analysis, and reporting aspects of the work.

-State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) - SPP Indicator 17

Connecticut's SSIP is focused on early literacy instruction and reading achievement. The foundation of the State's theory of action is the evidence-based practice of Data-based Individualization (DBI).

See the Indicator 17 section of this report for more information.

Approval Process for Private Special Education Programs

The State Board of Education has the authority to regulate and supervise the education of all children requiring special education who are attending any facility receiving money from the state, including private facilities that LEAs are utilizing for special education purposes. Specific standards are used for the evaluation/approval process.

Technical Assistance System:

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

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. Additionally, the Special Education Division Director 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 works closely with the state's parent training and information (PTI) center which is currently administered by the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC). Weekly meetings between BSE and CPAC leadership allow for the regular exchange of information and ideas on how to best support LEAs and families by providing timely and meaningful TA. Furthermore, data on direct TA to families provided by CPAC staff is collected by the PTI Center and reviewed monthly during the school year by the entire BSE staff as a means to identify trend issues and develop appropriate supports.

The BSE also provides a great deal of technical assistance directly 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. 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 processes and services. The BSE enhanced its technical assistance to Connecticut families in FFY 2022 by launching the BSE Call Center. This component of the CSDE's technical assistance activities is responsible for responding to telephone and email inquiries regarding special education laws and practices. Finally, as needed, BSE consultants conduct trainings for LEA administrators and personnel on specific topics related to special education

During the 2022-23 school year, CSDE staff provided a tremendous amount of technical assistance related to its new special education and IEP data system (CT-SEDS). Priority was given to questions/issues involving IDEA compliance and/or with associated timelines. There were 5,661 Help Desk tickets submitted by district staff with questions/issues on using the system that were resolved the past year. This direct support was complemented by the continued development of user manuals, quick guides, and other resources such as flowcharts to support district staff as they were becoming acclimated with navigating the system.

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 children with disabilities.

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 (RESA) 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.

During FFY 2020, a comprehensive professional learning opportunity titled "Connecticut IEP Quality Training" was developed and piloted. After some minor revisions, this professional learning series was offered to districts in FFY 2021. This series of trainings continued to be offered in FFY 2022 and includes both synchronous and asynchronous modules that cover topics such as Quality IEP Development, Secondary Transition, Progress Monitoring, Prior Written Notice, and Parent Training. During FFY 2022, 68 training courses were offered and 3,312 participants attended. Evaluation data solicited from participants indicate a very high level of satisfaction with the content and usefulness of the training.

Complementing the technical assistance provided to districts regarding the special education IEP and data system (CT-SEDS), professional learning opportunities were also offered during FFY 2022. The CSDE provided three full days of in-person training for up to 800 "districts experts" to support the train the trainer model established during the system roll-out. Additionally, the CSDE hosted 19 "Office Hours" sessions designed for district system administrators and data managers regarding technical updates and system functionality. The CSDE's system vendor and regional partners also provided webinars and targeted sessions to approximately 2,300 school district staff, as well as full day, in district training in 13 school districts.

Additionally, multiple professional learning activities focusing on supporting students in the LRE, statewide assessment and alternate assessment administration, eligibility for the alternate statewide assessments, discipline and restorative practices, reducing chronic absenteeism, and structured literacy among others were offered during FFY 2022.

Finally, the CSDE's Differentiated Monitoring and Support Team looks regularly at the patterns and trends across monitoring activities and uses the information to determine the need for the development of specific professional opportunities to be provided by the CSDE as well as SERC, the RESA Alliance, and other service delivery providers.

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut's Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner's Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

In FFY 2022, the CSDE determined that there was not currently a need to revise any of the indicator targets. The CSDE will continue to evaluate its progress on the SPP indicators during FFY 2023 and solicit stakeholder input on the current results indicator targets as needed to ensure that they remain measurable and rigorous.

Throughout FFY 2022, the CSDE Special Education Division Director participated in meetings focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities with the following groups: Center for Children's Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website that was created in FFY 2020 continued to be a mechanism to collect broad stakeholder input in FFY 2022. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also continued to build the capacity of stakeholders, including a diverse group of parents, by reviewing and presenting information, sharing resources and reviewing data related to the SPP Indicators and associated activities. The CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the SPP-APR through the existing structures of the LEA Advisory group, the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state's PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14

Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17

Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6

Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16

Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12

Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets are being made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

Apply stakeholder engagement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

39

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including 39 parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut's Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner's Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also solicited input on the SPP-APR from parent center staff and a diverse group of parents who are members of the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as the state's PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14

Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17

Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6

Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16

Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12

Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets were made during FFY 2022, the CSDE is considering the parent input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning.

The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

The Bureau of Special Education (BSE) has always made an effort to engage with and increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to inform BSE policy and guidance as well as to support the Part B SPP implementation. In the previous year the focus on how to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents was mostly related to the State's new IEP document and understanding changes in practices related to the implementation of CT-SEDS. This foundational knowledge was deemed essential for parents to understand if they were asked to participate in the development of improvement activities. This work continued in FFY 2022.

Additionally, during FFY 2022, the BSE determined that it would be beneficial to pause and assess its current efforts to increase the number of diverse parents and develop their capacity in a broader way and beyond the new IEP, so that they could be in an even better position to meaningfully contribute to conversations focused on improvement activities related to the SPP indicators. The BSE also sought input from various stakeholders representing different perspectives and including the Special Populations group, the State Advisory Council (SAC) for special education, and the CPAC Parent groups (English and Spanish). After the BSE provided an overview of current professional learning offerings, the BSE collected feedback from parents on what they considered as successful activities to continue, suggestions for revisions to existing activities, as well as suggestions for new activities.

The group members were also asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience. The BSE is currently in the process of reviewing feedback received from the various groups to determine what ideas could be used and put into practice quickly versus those that will take some time to develop before utilization.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website (<https://portal.ct.gov/SDE/Special-Education/State-Performance-Plan-SPP-and-Annual-Performance-Report-APR>) has been updated to include the results of SPP/APR stakeholder process on target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for the public to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

Each year the CSDE Special Education Division Director participates in meetings with the following groups: Center for Children's Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input on improving outcomes for students with disabilities is accepted through these forums.

Initially when setting targets and developing indicator improvement strategies in FFY 2020, a broad/representative group of 66 stakeholders was assembled to participate in live, virtual sessions with the goal of building their capacity and soliciting feedback. Input was received in the form of live comments, instant polls, small group discussions, and surveys. One hundred Youth Advisory Council students from 10 school districts participate in virtual session designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Additionally, virtual sessions were held with the State Advisory Council (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Virtual meetings were also held with the Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC) Parent Leadership group. The sessions were designed to build capacity and solicit participant feedback. Input was received in the form of live questions/comments, and small group discussions. Sessions were held in English and Spanish.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE continued to solicit public input by accessing the existing structures of the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state's PTI center parent meetings. While no revisions to targets are going to be made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. Further discussion was also held regarding parent engagement and strategies the CSDE could employ to continue increasing the accessibility as well as the capacity and participation of diverse stakeholders in work of the SPP-APR indicator improvement planning process.

The Connecticut State Board of Education was provided with updates and had the opportunity to ask questions.

The CSDE Newsletter, Superintendent Updates, LEA Email Notifications, and the Special Education Bureau Bulletin were also utilized to share/disseminate information.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website (<https://portal.ct.gov/SDE/Special-Education/State-Performance-Plan-SPP-and-Annual-Performance-Report-APR>) is regularly reviewed and updated if needed to include the results of SPP/APR stakeholder process on target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation.

The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback and recommendations that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 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/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

The CSDE reports to the public on the FFY 2021 performance of each local education agency (LEA) located in the state on the targets in the SPP/APR through the District Annual Performance Reports. The FFY 2021 District APR reports are posted on the CSDE's website at: (<http://edsight.ct.gov/SASPortal/main.do>) From the top navigation menu: (Select > Overview; Select > Special Education Annual Performance Reports).

In June 2023, the State's updated SPP/APR was posted in the Special Education section of the CSDE Web site at: (<https://portal.ct.gov/SDE/Special-Education/State-Performance-Plan-SPP-and-Annual-Performance-Report-APR/Documents>).

Information regarding the FFY 2021 District Annual Performance Reports and revised SPP/APR is provided to each LEA, the state's parent training and information (PTI) center, and various parent/advocacy organizations throughout the state.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating 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 under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS009.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	85.74%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	75.60%	78.20%	78.20%	87.65%	85.00%
Data	66.71%	64.95%	67.80%	87.65%	87.53%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	85.00%	85.50%	85.50%	86.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut’s Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner’s Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

In FFY 2022, the CSDE determined that there was not currently a need to revise any of the indicator targets. The CSDE will continue to evaluate its progress on the SPP indicators during FFY 2023 and solicit stakeholder input on the current results indicator targets as needed to ensure that they remain measurable and rigorous.

Throughout FFY 2022, the CSDE Special Education Division Director participated in meetings focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities with the following groups: Center for Children’s Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website that was created in FFY 2020 continued to be a mechanism to collect broad stakeholder input in FFY 2022. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also continued to build the capacity of stakeholders, including a diverse group of parents, by reviewing and presenting information, sharing resources and reviewing data related to the SPP Indicators and associated activities. The CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the SPP-APR through the existing structures of the LEA Advisory group, the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state's PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14

Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17

Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6

Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16

Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12

Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets are being made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,121
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	73
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	29
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	840

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
5,121	6,063	87.53%	85.00%	84.46%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Connecticut continues to see the impact of COVID on our exit data, in that our exiting population of students with disabilities continues to grow. In SY 2020-21, CT only exited 5,149 total students with disabilities, while in the current data for SY 2021-22, CT has 5,121 students with disabilities exit with a regular high school diploma.

We had nearly as many students with disabilities exit with a diploma this year, as total exiting students in the previous year. Therefore, while there appears to be slippage in CT's graduation rate data, this is actually a reflection of a return to a typical number of students exiting from public education; fewer students are remaining enrolled because jobs are more available and post-secondary institutions have re-opened to normal operations.

During COVID, many students with disabilities did not exit because of lack of options after high school due to the impact of COVID on our entire society. Now we are seeing students exit that were remaining enrolled because there were limited alternative options. The total number of exiting students increased over 16% from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022. The percentage of students exiting with a regular high school diploma increased from 4,507 to 5,121. Therefore, the calculation of a decrease in our graduation rate is actually a reflection of an increase in students dropping out during FFY 2022, who might have exited in earlier years if more post-high school opportunities were readily available.

This increase in students exiting is a reflection of COVID and disproportionately impacts the graduation rate because of the APR requirement to use an annual exiting statistic rather than a cohort statistic for graduation rate. Connecticut expects the Graduation rate to moderate as students who are part of older cohorts are no longer remaining enrolled for longer periods of time than typical. One additional contributor to the increase in students exiting from

public education in 2021-22 is due to the changes in CT requirements to earn a regular high school diploma. Any student exiting starting in 2023, is required to have five additional credits to graduate with a regular diploma. Therefore, many students who may have previously needed 20 credits to graduate, would need nearly an additional year of credits to exit with a regular high school diploma. This new requirement has resulted in additional considerations for students, families, and educators.

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

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. For the classes graduating from 2004-2022, 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. For the class of 2023 and each graduating class thereafter, a minimum of twenty-five credits is required for graduation with a regular high school diploma, including not fewer than nine credits in the humanities, including civics and the arts, not fewer than nine credits in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, not fewer than one credit in physical education and wellness, not fewer than one credit in health and safety education, not fewer than one credit in world languages, and a one credit mastery-based diploma assessment.

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

It is important that the reader not compare the current data reported for FFY 2020 through 2022 to the presented historic data (FFY 2019 and earlier) in the prepopulated chart. The prepopulated historic data are based upon the 4-year cohort rate graduation calculation that is no longer used to measure this indicator. With the new requirements in the OSEP APR Measurement Table, the historic data do not reflect the graduation rate definition now required in this indicator.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS009.

Measurement

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 exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	12.02%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	13.30%	13.00%	12.70%	11.18%	12.00%
Data	12.50%	12.69%	13.11%	11.18%	11.52%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	12.00%	12.00%	12.00%	12.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut's Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner's Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

In FFY 2022, the CSDE determined that there was not currently a need to revise any of the indicator targets. The CSDE will continue to evaluate its progress on the SPP indicators during FFY 2023 and solicit stakeholder input on the current results indicator targets as needed to ensure that they remain measurable and rigorous.

Throughout FFY 2022, the CSDE Special Education Division Director participated in meetings focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities with the following groups: Center for Children's Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website that was created in FFY 2020 continued to be a mechanism to collect broad stakeholder input in FFY 2022. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also continued to build the capacity of stakeholders, including a diverse group of parents, by reviewing and presenting

information, sharing resources and reviewing data related to the SPP Indicators and associated activities. The CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the SPP-APR through the existing structures of the LEA Advisory group, the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state's PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14

Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17

Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6

Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16

Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12

Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets are being made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,121
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	73
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	29
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	840

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
840	6,063	11.52%	12.00%	13.85%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Connecticut continues to see the impact of COVID on our exit data, in that our exiting population of students with disabilities continues to grow. In SY 2020-21, CT only exited 5,149 total students with disabilities, while in the data for SY 2021-22, CT has 6,063 students with disabilities exiting. Therefore, while there is slippage in CT's dropout rate data, this is a reflection of a return to a typical number of students exiting from public education. Fewer students are remaining enrolled because jobs are more readily available and post-secondary institutions have re-opened to normal operations. During COVID, many students with disabilities did not exit because of lack of options after high school due to the impact of COVID on our entire society. Now we are seeing students exit that were remaining enrolled because there were no other options. The total number of exiting students increased over 16% from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022. Therefore, the calculation of a decrease in our dropout rate is representative of students dropping out during FFY 2022, who might have exited in earlier years if more post-high school opportunities were readily available. This increase in students exiting is a reflection of COVID and disproportionately impacts the dropout rate because of the APR requirement to use an annual exiting statistic rather than a cohort statistic for graduation rate. Connecticut expects the dropout rate to moderate as students who are part of older cohorts are no longer remaining enrolled for longer periods of time than typical.

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

The dropout definition for students with disabilities is consistent with the rules 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.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

It is important that the reader not compare the current data reported for FFY 2020 through 2022 to the presented historic data (FFY 2019 and earlier) in the prepopulated chart. The prepopulated historic data are based upon the 4-year cohort rate calculation that is no longer used to measure this indicator. With the new requirements in the OSEP APR Measurement Table, the historic data do not reflect the dropout rate definition now required in this indicator.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

A. 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. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, 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.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	92.70%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	86.10%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	68.72%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	92.78%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	83.63%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	70.16%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut's Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner's Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

In FFY 2022, the CSDE determined that there was not currently a need to revise any of the indicator targets. The CSDE will continue to evaluate its progress on the SPP indicators during FFY 2023 and solicit stakeholder input on the current results indicator targets as needed to ensure that they remain measurable and rigorous.

Throughout FFY 2022, the CSDE Special Education Division Director participated in meetings focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities with the following groups: Center for Children's Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website that was created in FFY 2020 continued to be a mechanism to collect broad stakeholder input in FFY 2022. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also continued to build the capacity of stakeholders, including a diverse group of parents, by reviewing and presenting information, sharing resources and reviewing data related to the SPP Indicators and associated activities. The CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the SPP-APR through the existing structures of the LEA Advisory group, the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state's PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14

Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17

Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6

Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16

Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12

Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets are being made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	6,457	6,966	6,402
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	3,679	4,801	2,266
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	2,095	1,367	2,746
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	505	424	427

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	6,469	6,980	6,403
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	2,252	2,890	2,266
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	3,511	3,163	2,746
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	500	422	422

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	6,279	6,457	97.25%	95.00%	97.24%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	6,592	6,966	94.66%	95.00%	94.63%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5,439	6,402	84.38%	95.00%	84.96%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	6,263	6,469	96.82%	95.00%	96.82%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	6,475	6,980	93.12%	95.00%	92.77%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	5,434	6,403	84.41%	95.00%	84.87%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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.

https://public-edsight.ct.gov/performance/smarter-balanced-achievement-participation?language=en_US

https://public-edsight.ct.gov/performance/connecticut-school-day-sat?language=en_US

https://public-edsight.ct.gov/performance/ngss-assessment?language=en_US

https://public-edsight.ct.gov/performance/alternate-assessments?language=en_US

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	15.28%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	13.90%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	19.86%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	12.91%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	6.55%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	7.48%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	16.00%	16.50%	17.00%	17.50%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	14.50%	15.25%	16.00%	16.75%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	20.50%	21.00%	21.50%	22.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	14.00%	15.00%	16.00%	17.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	7.50%	8.25%	9.00%	9.75%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	8.00%	8.50%	9.00%	9.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut's Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner's Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

In FFY 2022, the CSDE determined that there was not currently a need to revise any of the indicator targets. The CSDE will continue to evaluate its progress on the SPP indicators during FFY 2023 and solicit stakeholder input on the current results indicator targets as needed to ensure that they remain measurable and rigorous.

Throughout FFY 2022, the CSDE Special Education Division Director participated in meetings focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities with the following groups: Center for Children’s Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website that was created in FFY 2020 continued to be a mechanism to collect broad stakeholder input in FFY 2022. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also continued to build the capacity of stakeholders, including a diverse group of parents, by reviewing and presenting information, sharing resources and reviewing data related to the SPP Indicators and associated activities. The CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the SPP-APR through the existing structures of the LEA Advisory group, the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state’s PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14

Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17

Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6

Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16

Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12

Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets are being made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	5,774	6,168	5,012
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	764	756	319
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	234	122	560

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a	5,763	6,053	5,012

proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment			
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	766	395	101
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	234	64	242

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	998	5,774	17.72%	16.00%	17.28%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	878	6,168	13.31%	14.50%	14.23%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	879	5,012	17.78%	20.50%	17.54%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,000	5,763	14.75%	14.00%	17.35%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	459	6,053	6.31%	7.50%	7.58%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	343	5,012	7.09%	8.00%	6.84%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

Qualitative data suggest that there may be a connection between the number of students with disabilities reaching proficiency on the Grade 11 mathematics assessment and the lower student attendance rates that many districts have been experiencing. The CSDE has undertaken efforts to support districts with addressing chronic absenteeism as well as emphasizing the importance of mathematics literacy across all grades and has identified a goal within the newly awarded State Personnel and Development grant to address math proficiency.

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.

https://public-edsight.ct.gov/performance/smarter-balanced-achievement-participation?language=en_US

https://public-edsight.ct.gov/performance/connecticut-school-day-sat?language=en_US

https://public-edsight.ct.gov/performance/ngss-assessment?language=en_US

https://public-edsight.ct.gov/performance/alternate-assessments?language=en_US

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against 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 for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	27.39%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	19.13%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	37.76%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	28.09%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	42.39%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	36.47%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	30.50%	33.00%	35.50%	38.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	22.50%	25.00%	27.50%	30.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	39.00%	40.00%	41.00%	42.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	31.00%	33.00%	35.50%	38.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	44.00%	45.50%	47.00%	48.50%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	36.00%	36.50%	37.00%	38.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut's Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner's Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

In FFY 2022, the CSDE determined that there was not currently a need to revise any of the indicator targets. The CSDE will continue to evaluate its progress on the SPP indicators during FFY 2023 and solicit stakeholder input on the current results indicator targets as needed to ensure that they remain measurable and rigorous.

Throughout FFY 2022, the CSDE Special Education Division Director participated in meetings focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities with the following groups: Center for Children's Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website that was created in FFY 2020 continued to be a mechanism to collect broad stakeholder input in FFY 2022. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also continued to build the capacity of stakeholders, including a diverse group of parents, by reviewing and presenting information, sharing resources and reviewing data related to the SPP Indicators and associated activities. The CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the SPP-APR through the existing structures of the LEA Advisory group, the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state's PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14

Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17

Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6

Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16

Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12

Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets are being made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	505	424	427
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	150	93	152

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	500	422	422
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	149	193	157

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	150	505	29.98%	30.50%	29.70%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	93	424	21.69%	22.50%	21.93%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	152	427	32.98%	39.00%	35.60%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	149	500	30.18%	31.00%	29.80%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	193	422	45.01%	44.00%	45.73%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	157	422	34.47%	36.00%	37.20%	Met target	No Slippage

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.

https://public-edsight.ct.gov/performance/smarter-balanced-achievement-participation?language=en_US

https://public-edsight.ct.gov/performance/connecticut-school-day-sat?language=en_US

https://public-edsight.ct.gov/performance/ngss-assessment?language=en_US

https://public-edsight.ct.gov/performance/alternate-assessments?language=en_US

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children 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 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children 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.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	31.84
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	37.46
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	39.51
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	27.37
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	28.20
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	29.63

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	42.00	41.50	41.00	31.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	46.00	45.25	44.50	37.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	46.00	45.25	44.50	39.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	40.00	39.50	39.00	27.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	40.00	39.50	39.00	28.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	36.00	35.50	35.00	29.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut's Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education

(State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner’s Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

In FFY 2022, the CSDE determined that there was not currently a need to revise any of the indicator targets. The CSDE will continue to evaluate its progress on the SPP indicators during FFY 2023 and solicit stakeholder input on the current results indicator targets as needed to ensure that they remain measurable and rigorous.

Throughout FFY 2022, the CSDE Special Education Division Director participated in meetings focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities with the following groups: Center for Children’s Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website that was created in FFY 2020 continued to be a mechanism to collect broad stakeholder input in FFY 2022. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also continued to build the capacity of stakeholders, including a diverse group of parents, by reviewing and presenting information, sharing resources and reviewing data related to the SPP Indicators and associated activities. The CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the SPP-APR through the existing structures of the LEA Advisory group, the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state’s PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

- Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14
- Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17
- Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6
- Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16
- Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12
- Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets are being made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	35,269	37,527	35,816
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	5,774	6,168	5,012
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	17,278	18,316	18,298
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	234	122	560
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	764	756	319
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	234	122	560

Data Source:

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	35,859	37,756	36,190
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	5,763	6,053	5,012
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	17,075	13,600	12,040
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	234	64	242
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	766	395	101
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	234	64	242

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the pre-filled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	17.28%	49.65%	32.26	42.00	32.37	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	14.23%	49.13%	36.65	46.00	34.90	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	17.54%	52.65%	38.46	46.00	35.11	Met target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	17.35%	48.27%	31.28	40.00	30.92	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	7.58%	36.19%	28.50	40.00	28.61	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	6.84%	33.94%	27.99	36.00	27.09	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - 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 local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs totally 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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 rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs that met the minimum n and/or cell 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2005	21.30%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	5.00%	5.00%
Data	7.65%	9.41%	8.24%	2.35%	0.59%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	20.00%	15.00%	12.50%	10.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut's Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner's Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

In FFY 2022, the CSDE determined that there was not currently a need to revise any of the indicator targets. The CSDE will continue to evaluate its progress on the SPP indicators during FFY 2023 and solicit stakeholder input on the current results indicator targets as needed to ensure that they remain measurable and rigorous.

Throughout FFY 2022, the CSDE Special Education Division Director participated in meetings focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities with the following groups: Center for Children's Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website that was created in FFY 2020 continued to be a mechanism to collect broad stakeholder input in FFY 2022. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also continued to build the capacity of stakeholders, including a diverse group of parents, by reviewing and presenting information, sharing resources and reviewing data related to the SPP Indicators and associated activities. The CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the SPP-APR through the existing structures of the LEA Advisory group, the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state's PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

- Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14
- Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17
- Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6
- Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16
- Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12
- Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets are being made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

NO

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs in the State	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
21	170	0.59%	20.00%	12.35%	Met target	No Slippage

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.

Connecticut established a state bar of 2.0 % to compare suspension/expulsion rates among districts; this was established in FFY 2011. The CSDE derived the 2.0 % threshold by calculating the suspension and expulsion rates of each district and ranking all districts in the state using the 2010-11 discipline data, and then convened the Indicator 4 stakeholder group to discuss options. The advisory group reviewed the historic discipline data and recommended applying 1.75 standard deviations above the mean, which the CSDE accepted and used to set the 2.0 % bar when comparing the ranked district suspension/expulsion rates for students with disabilities. The advisory group further recommended that the same bar be used for both indicators 4A and 4B. This state bar was reviewed with the Indicator 4 stakeholder group in the fall of 2021 and no changes were recommended.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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 21 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 identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

The State DID 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 did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year’s SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

As a result of the increase in disciplinary actions statewide, the CSDE implemented additional extensive data review and verification for all districts to ensure data accuracy. This process delayed the analysis used for the SPP indicators and resulted in later than typical notification to districts of the significant discrepancy. While, the State has contacted the three LEAs identified with having have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements, the CSDE is still in the process of verifying the correction of the noncompliance. The State is confident that the verification of correction of the noncompliance will be completed within the one-year timeframe.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

The State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2022 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (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 district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs 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 "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs totally 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 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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 the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

25

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
27	4	145	0.00%	0%	2.76%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable

During FFY 2021 (discipline data from 2020-21) most Connecticut districts were using a hybrid (in-person/remote) mode of instruction therefore the opportunities for students to receive disciplinary action were minimized. In fact, during FFY 2021 no LEAs were identified as having 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.

During FFY 2022 (discipline data from 2021-22), districts across the state, upon returning to full in-person instruction, experienced a marked increase in the intensity and frequency of significant student behaviors resulting in an increase in disciplinary actions including suspension/expulsion. This increase has been the catalyst for more districts being identified as having significant discrepancy by race or ethnicity, and upon the required review of policies, procedures, and practices related to development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, or procedural safeguards, revealed that there were policies, procedure, or practices contributing to the significant discrepancy and not complying with requirements.

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

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 disaggregated by race/ethnicity among LEAs in the State.

In Connecticut, significant discrepancy for Indicator 4B is defined as follows: Greater than 2.0% of students with disabilities in any racial/ethnic group 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.

Connecticut established a state bar of 2.0% to compare suspension/expulsion rates among districts; this was established in FFY 2011. The CSDE derived the 2.0% threshold by calculating the suspension and expulsion rates of each district and ranking all districts in the state using the 2010-11 discipline data, and then convened the Indicator 4 stakeholder group to discuss options. The advisory group reviewed the historic discipline data disaggregated by race/ethnicity for all SWDs in the state and recommended applying 1.75 standard deviations above the mean, which the CSDE accepted and used to set the 2.0% bar when comparing the ranked district suspension/expulsion rates for students with disabilities. The advisory group further recommended that the same bar be used for both indicators 4A and 4B, as there should be no difference in the rates of suspension/expulsion by race. This state bar was reviewed with the Indicator 4 stakeholder group in the fall of 2021 and no changes were recommended.

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 2021-22 school year, 27 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.

Connecticut's minimum ‘n’ size requirement excluded 25 districts from the calculation of rates. Districts excluded under minimum “n” Rule A = 25. Districts excluded under minimum “n” Rule B = 0 Districts. Therefore, the number of districts assessed for Significant Discrepancy = 145 Districts. The number of districts with rates > 2.0% = 27 Districts. 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.

Four districts were found to have non-compliant policies, procedures, or practices. Target not met.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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 27 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 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 did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.

As a result of the increase in disciplinary actions statewide, the CSDE implemented additional extensive data review and verification for all districts to ensure data accuracy. This process delayed the analysis used for the SPP indicators and resulted in later than typical notification to districts of the significant discrepancy. While, the State has contacted the four LEAs identified with having have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements, the CSDE is still in the process of verifying the correction of the noncompliance. The State is confident that the verification of correction of the noncompliance will be completed within the one-year timeframe.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Because the State reported greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2022 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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 ED*Facts* file specification FS002.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

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

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2019	Target >=	68.00%	68.10%	68.20%	67.00%	67.25%
A	67.50%	Data	67.69%	66.75%	67.50%	67.64%	68.01%
B	2019	Target <=	6.10%	6.00%	6.00%	7.20%	7.20%
B	6.64%	Data	5.67%	6.11%	6.64%	7.10%	7.42%
C	2019	Target <=	8.40%	8.30%	8.30%	7.30%	7.25%
C	7.34%	Data	7.88%	7.69%	7.34%	7.26%	6.71%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	67.50%	68.00%	68.50%	69.00%
Target B <=	7.20%	7.20%	7.20%	7.20%
Target C <=	7.20%	7.15%	7.10%	7.05%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut's Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner's Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

In FFY 2022, the CSDE determined that there was not currently a need to revise any of the indicator targets. The CSDE will continue to evaluate its progress on the SPP indicators during FFY 2023 and solicit stakeholder input on the current results indicator targets as needed to ensure that they remain measurable and rigorous.

Throughout FFY 2022, the CSDE Special Education Division Director participated in meetings focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities with the following groups: Center for Children's Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website that was created in FFY 2020 continued to be a mechanism to collect broad stakeholder input in FFY 2022. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also continued to build the capacity of stakeholders, including a diverse group of parents, by reviewing and presenting information, sharing resources and reviewing data related to the SPP Indicators and associated activities. The CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the SPP-APR through the existing structures of the LEA Advisory group, the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state's PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14

Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17

Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6

Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16

Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12

Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets are being made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	81,926
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	55,689
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6,794
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	5,093
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	105
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	48

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	55,689	81,926	68.01%	67.50%	67.97%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	6,794	81,926	7.42%	7.20%	8.29%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	5,246	81,926	6.71%	7.20%	6.40%	Met target	No Slippage
Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable						
B	5B is a very difficult indicator to plan for around a target consideration. Naturally, as in reducing placements in segregated setting under indicator 5C occurs, many students transition from separate and residential settings back to public schools in the 0-40% regular class (5B) Environments category as recommended by IEP Teams. CT demonstrated a significant drop in the percentage of students in 5C (more than 0.3%). In fact, CT has noted a drop in 5C for each of the last 2 years. In an effort to return students to the public school setting, in many cases, students were transitioned into separate class settings and therefore the 5B percentage increased. Additionally, CT saw an overall increase in the school age child count of 2.2% (1174 students), of which over 66% were immediately served in inclusive environments of 80% or more time in the regular class.						

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(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 ED*Facts* file specification FS089.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 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 ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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 IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	77.75%	78.00%	78.00%	65.00%	60.00%
A	Data	71.18%	69.65%	64.49%	65.36%	66.71%
B	Target <=	10.75%	10.50%	10.50%	22.20%	25.00%
B	Data	18.28%	19.00%	22.51%	22.15%	20.94%
C	Target <=				2.50%	2.50%
C	Data				0.54%	0.44%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut's Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner's Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

In FFY 2022, the CSDE determined that there was not currently a need to revise any of the indicator targets. The CSDE will continue to evaluate its progress on the SPP indicators during FFY 2023 and solicit stakeholder input on the current results indicator targets as needed to ensure that they remain measurable and rigorous.

Throughout FFY 2022, the CSDE Special Education Division Director participated in meetings focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities with the following groups: Center for Children’s Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website that was created in FFY 2020 continued to be a mechanism to collect broad stakeholder input in FFY 2022. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also continued to build the capacity of stakeholders, including a diverse group of parents, by reviewing and presenting information, sharing resources and reviewing data related to the SPP Indicators and associated activities. The CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the SPP-APR through the existing structures of the LEA Advisory group, the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state’s PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14

Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17

Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6

Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16

Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12

Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets are being made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2019	64.49%
B	2019	22.51%
C	2020	0.54%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	61.50%	63.00%	64.50%	66.00%
Target B <=	24.50%	24.00%	23.50%	22.50%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	3,039	3,592	78	6,709
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	1,905	2,459	56	4,420
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	543	611	7	1,161
b2. Number of children attending separate school	13	25	6	44
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	0	0	0
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	7	13	1	21

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

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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	4,420	6,709	66.71%	61.50%	65.88%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	1,205	6,709	20.94%	24.50%	17.96%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Home	21	6,709	0.44%	2.50%	0.31%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response**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 3 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

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2008	Target >=	57.00%	58.50%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
A1	58.30%	Data	88.80%	89.75%	89.68%	87.30%	88.10%

A2	2008	Target >=	53.00%	54.50%	68.00%	63.00%	64.00%
A2	54.20%	Data	71.99%	71.20%	65.76%	66.03%	64.90%
B1	2008	Target >=	65.00%	65.50%	85.00%	85.00%	86.00%
B1	61.70%	Data	91.61%	90.84%	90.58%	88.80%	87.35%
B2	2008	Target >=	32.00%	33.50%	68.00%	66.00%	67.00%
B2	33.00%	Data	74.25%	73.24%	70.21%	68.00%	67.03%
C1	2008	Target >=	51.00%	51.00%	90.00%	93.50%	94.00%
C1	50.50%	Data	95.96%	96.21%	96.73%	96.09%	95.78%
C2	2008	Target >=	26.00%	27.00%	65.00%	60.00%	61.00%
C2	26.50%	Data	68.79%	69.04%	62.99%	61.42%	60.11%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	86.00%	87.00%	88.00%	89.00%
Target A2 >=	65.00%	66.00%	67.00%	68.00%
Target B1 >=	87.00%	88.00%	89.00%	90.00%
Target B2 >=	68.00%	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%
Target C1 >=	94.50%	95.00%	95.50%	96.00%
Target C2 >=	62.00%	63.00%	64.00%	65.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut's Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner's Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

In FFY 2022, the CSDE determined that there was not currently a need to revise any of the indicator targets. The CSDE will continue to evaluate its progress on the SPP indicators during FFY 2023 and solicit stakeholder input on the current results indicator targets as needed to ensure that they remain measurable and rigorous.

Throughout FFY 2022, the CSDE Special Education Division Director participated in meetings focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities with the following groups: Center for Children's Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website that was created in FFY 2020 continued to be a mechanism to collect broad stakeholder input in FFY 2022. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also continued to build the capacity of stakeholders, including a diverse group of parents, by reviewing and presenting information, sharing resources and reviewing data related to the SPP Indicators and associated activities. The CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the SPP-APR through the existing structures of the LEA Advisory group, the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state's PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

- Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14
- Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17
- Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6
- Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16
- Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12

Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets are being made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

3,305

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

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	108	3.27%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	97	2.93%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,067	32.28%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	405	12.25%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,628	49.26%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	1,472	1,677	88.10%	86.00%	87.78%	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,033	3,305	64.90%	65.00%	61.51%	Did not meet target	Slippage

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

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	378	11.44%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	3	0.09%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	753	22.78%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,920	58.09%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	251	7.59%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,673	3,054	87.35%	87.00%	87.52%	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 program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	2,171	3,305	67.03%	68.00%	65.69%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	54	1.63%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	44	1.33%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,268	38.37%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,169	35.37%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	770	23.30%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	2,437	2,535	95.78%	94.50%	96.13%	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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	1,939	3,305	60.11%	62.00%	58.67%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	Connecticut has seen challenges in this area with children making growth but not reaching age appropriate skills levels by age 6. The decline of over three percent this year leads us to believe that challenges in access to developmentally appropriate experiences during the COVID health care pandemic have had a more significant impact on young children's social-emotional development than previously noted. Reports from districts indicate that young children are less likely to have these skills when entering preschool and are struggling to stay engaged with regular attendance at school, which hinders the ability of staff to provide consistent supports and model appropriate behaviors.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B2	Connecticut has seen challenges in this area with children making growth but not reaching age appropriate skills levels by age 6. The continued decline of one percent this year leads us to believe that challenges in instruction and the provision of access to developmentally appropriate experiences during the COVID health care pandemic have had a significant impact on young children's growth and development. Districts report that while children are back to in-person learning experiences, the rising rate of chronic absenteeism is directly impacting the ability of students to reach age appropriate skill levels by age 6.
C2	Connecticut has seen challenges in this area with children making growth but not reaching age appropriate skills levels by age 6. The continued decline of one percent this year leads us to believe that challenges in instruction and the provision of access to developmentally appropriate experiences during the COVID health care pandemic have had a significant impact on young children's growth and development. Districts report that while children are back to in-person learning experiences, the rising rate of chronic absenteeism is directly impacting the ability of students to reach age appropriate skill levels by age 6.

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

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (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 subtests 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

7 - OSEP Response

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 3 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 and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom 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

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut's Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner's Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

In FFY 2022, the CSDE determined that there was not currently a need to revise any of the indicator targets. The CSDE will continue to evaluate its progress on the SPP indicators during FFY 2023 and solicit stakeholder input on the current results indicator targets as needed to ensure that they remain measurable and rigorous.

Throughout FFY 2022, the CSDE Special Education Division Director participated in meetings focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities with the following groups: Center for Children's Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website that was created in FFY 2020 continued to be a mechanism to collect broad stakeholder input in FFY 2022. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions

that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also continued to build the capacity of stakeholders, including a diverse group of parents, by reviewing and presenting information, sharing resources and reviewing data related to the SPP Indicators and associated activities. The CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the SPP-APR through the existing structures of the LEA Advisory group, the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state's PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14

Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17

Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6

Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16

Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12

Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets are being made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	83.62%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	88.00%	88.25%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data	85.92%	83.62%	87.42%	85.52%	81.66%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
3,737	4,391	81.66%	85.00%	85.11%	Met target	No Slippage

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.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

23,686

Percentage of respondent parents

18.54%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	5.90%	18.54%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The responses collected from districts in this year's survey sample were analyzed for representativeness by gender, race/ethnicity and primary disability as compared to the total statewide population of students with disabilities. The state's analysis of representativeness of respondent parents used a +/- 6% discrepancy.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The +/- 6% discrepancy test of gender and primary disability identified no concerns with the representativeness of respondent parents. Survey respondents were under-representative of Hispanic/Latino families over-representative of white/Caucasian families of students with disabilities in Connecticut. However, Hispanic/Latino families were more likely to agree that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for their children (86.8% agreement) than parents of white/Caucasian students (83.42% agreement).

Gender / Survey / Statewide / Difference

Male - 66.5% / 65.3% / 1.2%
Female - 33.5% / 34.7% / -1.2%

Race/Ethnicity / Survey / Statewide / Difference

AI/AN - 0.3% / 0.2% / 0.10%
Asian - 3.1% / 2.5% / 0.7%
Black - 12.1% / 15.1% / -3.0%
White - 52.6% / 44.0% / 8.7%
Hispanic - 26.8% / 33.8% / -7.0%
NH/OPI - 0.2% / 0.1% / -0.1%
2+ Races - 4.9% / 4.4% / 0.5%

Disability/ Survey / Statewide / Difference

LD - 29.0 / 35.0 / -6.0
ID - 2.5 / 3.2 / -0.7
ED - 5.3 / 5.8 / -0.5
SLI - 13.1 / 12.4 / 0.7
Other - 13.3 / 10.6 / 2.7
OHI - 18.9 / 19.0 / -0.1
Autism - 18.0 / 14.2 / 3.9

The demographics of the children for whom parents are responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

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 recently launched a new state-wide electronic special education system that is required for all districts. Under our previous data collection, the state collected 10/1 child count data through a stand-alone system from each of our district vendor systems and we only collected the data necessary for all regulatory state and federal collections. Our previous contact information is incomplete, subject to human error and not collected in a reasonable timeframe associated with the mailing. With the launch of our new system in 2022-23, CT had access to all parent contact information on an on-demand basis. This new capability helped Connecticut reach more Black/African American families, and for the first time we did not have a discrepancy for this race/ethnicity category. Unfortunately, not all districts were able to initiate the sync between their local registration system and the state's new electronic special education system. Therefore we were still in a situation of having missing or incomplete contact information for families. This year, CT has spent concerted time and effort to ensure all districts have provided complete parent contact information to the new system and these efforts should directly impact our ability to reach all families for next year's parent survey.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The use of live contact information from the new state-wide electronic special education system has already increased our ability to increase the response rate, as seen in the increase from 5.9 to 18.5% response rate from last year. With the efforts this year to establish a sync between all local districts registration systems and the state system, we anticipate further increases next year that would specifically support outreach to Hispanic families in surveyed districts. Additionally, the State will consider oversampling Hispanic families in the stratified random sampling of families for inclusion in the survey in the districts where sampling is applied.

In an effort to increase responses by families of Hispanic ethnicity, the State will work with the districts included in next year's parent survey to increase communication and awareness with these families regarding the State's upcoming survey. This will require review of each district's racial data to identify and target districts, special education parent organizations, and related statewide advocacy groups to support the increased promotion of the State's parent survey.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

While a parent survey regarding the perception of schools to support parents' involvement in their student's education is not generally seen as a topic that would result in nonresponse bias (NRB), NRB can still occur for several reasons. First, surveys that are poorly designed often lead to nonresponses. For this reason, Connecticut uses 25 items from the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) Item Bank for this survey. Since these survey items have been designed and researched using the highest standards in instrument design, we can conclude the survey itself is not a reason for NRB. Next, having a select group of parents responding to a survey by failing to reach all members of a population may also contribute to NRB. Connecticut's extensive outreach prior to survey distribution via mail, telephone and email along with provision of the survey in six 43 Part B languages is specifically designed to counter this type of NRB. Furthermore, since the use of multiple mediums has been shown to increase survey response rates and prevent NRB, the survey is made available in a variety of formats including mail, paper, email, and text. The length of survey

collection periods can also impact response rates. Connecticut's survey is collected in several phases over the course of several weeks with multiple reminders to non-responsive families about the importance of completing the survey. While it's not always possible to completely eliminate the effects of NRB, it's possible to minimize the effects by using a smart survey design and distribution methodology. Connecticut's survey is designed to be relatively short and require minimal time and effort to complete and submit. Furthermore, the survey is distributed in such a manner that it reaches and is accessible to the vast majority of the identified population. Lastly, Connecticut extensively communicates about the importance and confidentiality of the survey with families as per recommended practice in NRB avoidance.

The State's analysis of the response rate for the potential of nonresponse bias included a review of the percentage of parents who agreed that the schools facilitated parent involvement across race/ethnicity categories. The review of responses by Hispanic families indicated a higher percentage of agreement (86.83%) as compared to the State's FFY 2022 Indicator 8 data of 85.1 percent agreement. A statistical analysis using chi square and effect size indicated no statistical difference between the response of agreement by Hispanic families as compared to all other major race categories. This is support that while Hispanic families were underrepresented in the response rate, there is no identified nonresponse bias.

In an effort to increase responses by families of children who are Hispanic, the State will work with the districts included in next year's parent survey to increase communication and awareness with these families regarding the State's upcoming survey. This will require review of each district's racial data to identify and target districts, special education parent organizations, and related statewide advocacy groups to support the increased promotion of the State's parent survey.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously approved sampling plan changed?	NO

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

Connecticut Special Education Parent Survey: Sampling Plan 2021-2022 through 2025-2026 Connecticut is continuing to use the same stratified random sampling approach with a combination of census and simple random sampling of parents of students with disabilities within each participating district. All 170 districts in Connecticut (CT) responsible for the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA, 2004) have been placed into one of three cohorts. The cohort design was purposeful and stratified to ensure that the cohort of districts included in any given year would be representative of the state overall.

District stratification is based upon enrollment size, racial demographics and regional "feeder" school alignment. Step three of the stratification used racial demographics and enrollment to randomly assign the remaining school districts to each of the three cohorts. At each step of assignment, each cohort was monitored to ensure representativeness of the cohort was maintained for the variables of age, race/ethnicity, grade, gender and disability type. When designing this system, we stratified the districts by all required breakout variables including age, race/ethnicity, grade, gender and disability type. We then used that stratification to place districts into one of the three cohorts and further tested the cohort's representativeness against the breakout variables for multiple years of child count data to ensure that when using any year of state data each cohort would continue to be representative at the state level. The process tested positively in each of the last eight survey years.

CT will be maintaining our survey as a mailing to approximately 20,000 families per year. In the approved sampling process, CT will census mail surveys to 70 percent of our districts in each cohort cycle. Under the approved sampling plan, 30 percent of districts that will be sampled. This means that for the sampled districts where a simple random sample is drawn for survey mailing, we will survey 50 percent of all district students with disabilities. This design is purposeful oversampling of our under-represented black and Hispanic families. CT is confident in the statistical merit of this approach when applied to the parent cohort using the new statewide special education system with real-time parent contact information.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 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 2021 SPP/APR

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

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 the reporting year, 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. 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 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/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	170	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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 for this indicator. We are calculating a risk ratio and applying a minimum cell size of 10 and a minimum N-size of 30. These minimums 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 a 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 2022, zero districts were contacted regarding disproportionate representation using the CSDE's definition because zero met the numeric criteria for further review.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

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 section 618 data for the reporting year, 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). 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 specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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 specific disability categories 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 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/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
12	0	170	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

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 minimums 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. For FFY 2022, two districts were compared to the state denominator. The threshold for the identification of disproportionate representation is a 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 2022, 12 districts were initially contacted regarding disproportionate representation using the CSDE's definition in 15 identified areas. The CSDE required the 12 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)

8 of the 15 areas of disproportionate representation were in the racial category of black.
 5 of the 15 areas of disproportionate representation were in the racial category of Hispanic.
 2 of the 15 areas of disproportionate representation were in the racial category of white.

8 of the 15 areas of disproportionate representation were in the disability category of Learning Disabled.
 4 of the 15 areas of disproportionate representation were in the disability category of Speech/Language Impairment.
 2 of the 15 areas of disproportionate representation were in the disability category of Other Health Impairment.
 1 of the 15 areas of disproportionate representation were in the disability category of Autism.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2018	93.48%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.58%	93.48%	96.97%	98.52%	98.78%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
2,483	2,127	98.78%	100%	85.66%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

The 2022-23 school year presented some unique challenges to the districts regarding the timely completion of initial evaluations. First, the CSDE launched a new statewide data system. Despite a comprehensive statewide offering of training and support, educator efficacy in the use of the new Connecticut Special Education data system varied across districts. Additionally, the linkages between the Part C system and the new Part B data system encountered some challenges that resulted in delays in notification of referral. Finally, the availability of evaluators impacted the scheduling and completion of evaluations as well as convening planning and placement teams (i.e., IEP teams) to review evaluation results and determine the student's eligibility for special education and related services.

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

356

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.

Range of days = 1 to 140

Reasons for delay include: unfamiliarity with the new special education data system, independent evaluations not being completed on time due to lack of available evaluators; inability to access multi-lingual evaluators or assessment instruments for non-native English speakers. Lastly, the continued vacancies in all areas of public education further exasperated the lack of available staff to participate in the initial evaluation process.

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.

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

State monitoring

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.

While the State typically uses the State database that includes data for the entire reporting year as the source of data for this indicator, for FFY 2022 it was necessary to use data acquired through State monitoring to ensure that the data being reported to OSEP are valid and reliable.

The decision to use monitoring for FFY 2022 is related to the implementation of the new statewide data system (CT-SEDS). During FFY 2022, the new data system was not accurately calculating the initial evaluation timeline when the system launched. As a result, the CSDE did not have confidence in the reliability of the data pulled from the system for the entire year. The CSDE addressed the issue with the vendor and as a result, the State thought it prudent to monitor the timely completion of initial evaluations only during the time period when the system was accurately calculating timelines and populating the reports that are used for the Indicator 11 analysis with accurate data.

The procedures to collect the data for this indicator included establishing a "monitoring window," and then analyzing the timeliness of all initial evaluations that were a result of a referral to special education being made during that timeframe. Upon resolution of the previously articulated calculation issues within the new data system, the CSDE used a 90 day window for its monitoring of initial evaluations. This included 2483 children for whom parental consent to evaluate was provided to the school district. CSDE staff reviewed the data for these records to verify that no more than 45 school days passed between the referral and IEP implementation dates, unless there was an allowable reason for going beyond the State's timeline such as the parent failing to produce the child for evaluation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
37	37	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

There were 37 districts determined to be out of compliance with Indicator 11 based on FFY 2021 (2021-22) evaluation timelines data. All 37 districts were required to submit statements of assurance that each had reviewed its policies, procedures and practices specific to conducting and

completing initial evaluations to determine the root cause that contributed to the untimely completion of initial evaluations and submit any revisions for review by BSE staff via desk audit.

The 37 districts were also required to provide monitored submissions of subsequent evaluation timelines data during 2022-23 for review by CSDE staff. During the monitored submission process, all 37 districts achieved 100% compliance for timely initial evaluations and were found to be implementing the specific regulatory requirements in 34 C.F.R. Section 300.301 and Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies Section 10-76d-13, 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 37 districts is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for initial evaluations, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

There were 37 districts determined to be out of compliance with Indicator 11 based on FFY 2021 (2021-22) evaluation timelines data. The CSDE reviewed the following information for each of the 193 children determined eligible beyond the timeline during FFY 2021:

- 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 every student determined eligible for special education and related services and for whom the parent provided written consent for the provision of services) for each of the 193 children whose initial evaluation exceeded the state timeline. 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 district policies, procedures, or practices.

Through the actions detailed above, the CSDE was able to verify within one year that 1) each of the 193 initial evaluations was completed, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, and 2) upon review of its due process data, that there were no outstanding corrective actions ordered through the State's written complaint procedures or a due process hearing decision for any of the 193 children, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

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.

Targets must be 100%.

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.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	91.90%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.85%	99.95%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	4,651
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	454

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	2,731
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.	549
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	190
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.	621

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 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.	2,731	2,837	99.95%	100%	96.26%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The 2022-23 school year presented some unique challenges to districts in the state. First, the CSDE launched a new statewide data system. Despite a comprehensive statewide offering of training and support, educator efficacy in the use of the new Connecticut special education data system varied across districts. Additionally, the linkages between the Part C system and the new Part B data system encountered some challenges that resulted in delays in notification of referral. Finally, for students who turn three during the summer months when school was not in session, districts were writing IEPs goals and objectives that would begin and be implemented at the start of the school year for qualified students with disabilities who did not qualify for ESY. By writing the IEP with the implementation date reflecting when a student would enroll and attend school, the calculation for the provision of FAPE by age three was being calculated incorrectly in the new data system. All of these new challenges contributed to 106 children being identified as not receiving FAPE by age 3.

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

106

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.

The range of Days beyond 2 to 297, with the majority being less than 45 days. The reasons for the delays included late notification to LEA, late notification of referral to appropriate staff, staffing shortages and the writing of IEPs with the implementation date reflecting when a student would enroll and attend, rather than the date the district offered FAPE.

The CSDE has provided extensive training statewide to support staff efficacy of use of the new system. Additionally, data sharing between part B and part C issues have been resolved and new safeguards implemented. Furthermore, extensive documentation and training has been shared with 619 staff regarding the accurate process for writing IEPs that are compliant for Fape by age three for students with summer birthdays.

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 Connecticut - Specialized Education Data System (CT-SEDS). 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 database is a comprehensive system that is required for use by all school districts in CT for all events including: referral to special education; parent communication and PPT invitations; referral, IEP and ISP document creation; monitoring progress on student IEP goals and objectives and transition goals and objectives; reevaluations; and exiting of students from special education. 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 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

As reported in the FFY 2021 APR, in the case of the one student that did not receive FAPE by age three, the birth to three referral was submitted to the district, who passed on the referral to the staff member in charge of processing early childhood referrals. However, the staff member was out on maternity leave; and the oversight was not discovered by the LEA until the teacher's return from leave. The referral process was expedited as soon as identified. The student's IEP implementation was delayed by a total of 17 school days.

Although the CSDE determined that this identified noncompliance was an isolated incident and not a systemic issue, the CSDE contacted the district and discussed staff training and revision of current procedures to add a mechanism to prevent this from happening in the future. Upon review of subsequent data, the CSDE verified that the district achieved 100% compliance for providing a free appropriate public education by age three for children referred by Part C and is correctly implementing the related regulatory requirements.

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

The CSDE used the special education SIS database to verify that an IEP was implemented for the student. The CSDE also reviewed its due process data to verify that there were no outstanding corrective actions ordered through the State's written complaint procedures or a due process hearing decision for this child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 Year	Baseline Data
2022	96.12%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.92%	99.97%	99.91%	99.43%	99.77%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
24,309	25,289	99.77%	100%	96.12%	N/A	N/A

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 the Connecticut - Specialized Education Data System (CT-SEDS). CT-SEDS collects multiple variables that allow the state to monitor individualized education program (IEP) compliance with Indicator 13 (Secondary Transition) including: use of age appropriate transition assessments; postsecondary goals and annual IEP goals and objectives related to individualized student transition services needs (including course of study); evidence that the student was invited to the Planning and Placement Team (PPT) meeting; and evidence that participating agencies were invited to the PPT meeting, where appropriate. Data were not obtained from sampling, secondary transition data are collected for every student with an IEP who is 14 years of age or older. All data reported here are valid and reliable as verified by a series of validation checks built into the statewide data collection system.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	YES
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?	YES
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	14

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Connecticut Legislature passed Public Act No. 21-144, An Act Implementing the Recommendations of the Department of Education, which in part, amends subdivision (9) of subsection (a) of Section 10-76d of the Connecticut General Statutes and requires that: “The planning and placement team shall, in accordance with the provisions of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, 20 USC 1400, et seq., as amended from time to time, develop and include a statement of transition service needs in the individualized education program for each child requiring special education, beginning not later than the first individualized education program to be in effect when such child becomes fourteen years of age, or younger if the planning and placement team determines it is appropriate. Such individualized education program shall include (A) appropriate measurable postsecondary goals based upon age-appropriate transition assessments related to training, education, employment and, where appropriate, independent living skills; and (B) the transition services, including courses of study, needed to assist such child in reaching those goals. Such individualized education program shall be updated annually thereafter in accordance with the provisions of this subdivision.”

Public Act 21-144 technically went into effect July 1, 2021. However, because the final signature on the new law didn’t actually occur until well into the 2021-2022 school year and the need for districts to be alerted to the change in statute, the CSDE chose to implement the monitoring of this new requirement effective the 2022-23 school year. Therefore the data presented here represent all students with disabilities ages 14 and older.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
39	39	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

For each of the districts identified with noncompliance under Indicator 13 in FFY 2021, the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) verified within the one-year timeline that all districts achieved 100% compliance with 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. Each district was required to review student files to determine the root 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 Planning and Placement Team (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 via desk audit. Each district was also required to provide evidence of training for all staff members who were responsible for the oversight, development, or implementation of individualized education programs (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 section of the IEP – specifically information on pages 18 – 22 of the Connecticut IEP Manual. 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 For 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 districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (34 C.F.R. Sections 300.320(b) and 300.321(b)). 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 balances” review system/control measure of secondary IEPs, or revisions to related policies, procedures, and practices, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

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

For each of the 39 individual cases of noncompliance, districts were required to:

1. Convene a Planning and Placement Team meeting for the purpose of reviewing and revising the student’s 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 that are annually updated and based upon age appropriate transition assessments, b. transition services, including course 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, c. evidence that the student's preferences and interests were considered in transition planning, d. evidence that the student was invited to the PPT meeting, and e. evidence that the district invited, with the prior written consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority, a representative of any outside agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying 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 via desk audit.

For each of the districts identified with noncompliance under Indicator 13 in FFY 2021, CSDE personnel worked closely with district personnel to immediately correct the individual cases of noncompliance. In all 39 cases, individual correction occurred and was verified through a review of student individualized education programs (IEPs) within the one-year timeline. The CSDE also reviewed its due process data to verify that there were no outstanding corrective actions ordered through the State's written complaint procedures or a due process hearing decision for any of the 39 children, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 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 2022 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 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

13 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2022, and OSEP accepts that revision.

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 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 QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 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 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $[(\# \text{ of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school})] \times 100$.

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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 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”:

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 of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). 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).

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

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.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

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 must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	49.00%	49.10%	80.00%	40.00%	40.00%
A	44.78%	Data	86.40%	90.21%	90.95%	44.78%	42.21%
B	2020	Target >=	63.00%	63.10%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
B	92.86%	Data	91.60%	94.78%	93.71%	92.86%	95.02%
C	2020	Target >=	77.00%	78.75%	90.00%	95.00%	95.00%
C	97.43%	Data	95.32%	96.08%	96.14%	97.43%	98.91%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	40.00%	40.00%	40.00%	45.00%
Target B >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	93.00%
Target C >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	97.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut’s Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner’s Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live

comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

In FFY 2022, the CSDE determined that there was not currently a need to revise any of the indicator targets. The CSDE will continue to evaluate its progress on the SPP indicators during FFY 2023 and solicit stakeholder input on the current results indicator targets as needed to ensure that they remain measurable and rigorous.

Throughout FFY 2022, the CSDE Special Education Division Director participated in meetings focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities with the following groups: Center for Children’s Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website that was created in FFY 2020 continued to be a mechanism to collect broad stakeholder input in FFY 2022. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also continued to build the capacity of stakeholders, including a diverse group of parents, by reviewing and presenting information, sharing resources and reviewing data related to the SPP Indicators and associated activities. The CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the SPP-APR through the existing structures of the LEA Advisory group, the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state’s PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

- Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14
- Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17
- Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6
- Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16
- Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12
- Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets are being made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	6,478
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	4,283
Response Rate	66.12%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1,936
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	2,022
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)	131
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).	121

Measure	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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	1,936	4,283	42.21%	40.00%	45.20%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year	3,958	4,283	95.02%	85.00%	92.41%	Met target	No Slippage

Measure	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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
of leaving high school (1 +2)							
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)	4,210	4,283	98.91%	95.00%	98.30%	Met target	No Slippage

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.

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	75.11%	66.12%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The responses collected from districts in this year's survey sample were analyzed for representativeness by gender, race/ethnicity and primary disability as compared to the total statewide population of students with disabilities. The state's analysis of representativeness of respondent parents used a +/-6% discrepancy.

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. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The +/- 6% discrepancy test of gender, race/ethnicity and primary disability identified no concerns with the representativeness of respondent youth.

Gender / Survey / Statewide / Difference

Male - 36.9% / 35.5% / 1.4
 Female - 63.1% / 64.5% / -1.4

Race/Ethnicity / Survey / Statewide / Difference

AI/AN - 0.23% / 0.25% / -0.02
 Asian - 2.01% / 1.99 / 0.02
 Black - 17.9% / 18.6% / -0.7
 White - 49.7% / 45.9% / 3.8
 Hispanic - 27.4% / 30.3% / -2.9
 NH/OPI - 0.05% / 0.06% / -0.01
 2+ Races - 2.7% / 2.9% / -0.2

Disability/ Survey / Statewide / Difference

LD - 43.8% / 40.3% / 3.5
 ID - 3.3% / 4.3% / -1.0
 ED - 12.1% / 14.7% / -2.6
 SLI - 3.0% / 2.6% / 0.4
 OTHER - 2.7% / 3.8% / -1.1
 OHI - 26.8% / 25.4% / 1.4
 AUTISM - 8.3% / 9.0% / -0.7

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

YES

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

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

In FFY 2017, the CSDE contracted with the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) to obtain higher education enrollment and persistence data for our exiting students with disabilities. In FFY 2018, the process by which LEAs send exit contact information for the CT Post-School Outcome Survey (PSOS) to CSDE, captured using the Summary of Performance (SOP), was modified to a data collection via the Special Education Data Application and Collection (SEDAC) system. In FFY 2019, the CSDE made additional changes to its Indicator 14 data collection process in an effort to further increase overall response rate, as well as the representativeness of responders. First, the PSOS, and all subsequent materials were translated into Spanish. Second, the online survey and online learning module include additional accessibility features for exiters (i.e., subtitles/closed captioning, low vision mode). In FFY 2020, the CSDE worked with the CT Department of Labor (DOL) to obtain employment and wage information on students with disabilities who exited in 2019-2020 and may have been employed since exiting school. This was process was continued in FFY 2021 and FFY 2022. Moreover, the CSDE IDEA Part B Data Manager and the Indicator 14 Lead are members of and have participated in the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: the Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 14 Community of Practice.

Through all of these efforts, CT has seen our response rates increase from below 15% before FFY 2017 to 66.12% in FFY 2022. Furthermore, we now have a respondent pool that is representative of the demographics of all youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, across all demographic areas.

The next step in CT's long-range plan to improve the response rate is the implementation of a Connecticut's new statewide Special Education Data System (CT-SEDS). With the launch of this new system in July 2022, the state has immediate access to the most current and up-to-date contact information for exiting students. In previous years, the state conducted a separate collection of contact information for all exiting students. However, this collection was conducted in the winter after students had already exited and prior to late spring survey outreach by the vendor. This process to obtain contact information resulted in out-of-date mailing addresses, email addresses, and phone numbers before the survey was ever sent. Therefore, Connecticut's long-term plan to increase the response rate will be implemented with the spring 2024 survey when the state has access to the most up-to-date student contact information. We expect that access to the most current and up-to-date student contact information will help to address the inability to reach some exited students with disabilities.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

While a survey regarding the activities of students after exiting from high school is not generally seen as a topic that would result in nonresponse bias (NRB), NRB can still occur for several reasons. First, surveys that are poorly designed often lead to nonresponses. For this reason, Connecticut uses 12 items that have been designed and researched using the highest standards in instrument design, we can conclude the survey itself is not a reason for NRB. Next, having a select group of people responding to a survey by failing to reach all members of a population may also contribute to NRB. Connecticut's extensive outreach prior to survey distribution via mail, telephone and email along with provision of the survey in two languages is specifically designed to counter this type of NRB. Furthermore, since the use of multiple mediums has been shown to increase survey response rates and prevent NRB, the survey is made available in a variety of formats including mail, paper, email, text, and telephone interview. The length of survey collection periods can also impact response rates. Connecticut's survey is collected in several phases over the course of several weeks with multiple reminders to non-responsive exiters about the importance of completing the survey. While it is not always possible to completely eliminate the effects of NRB, it is possible to minimize the effects by using a smart survey design and distribution methodology. Connecticut's survey is designed to be very short and require minimal time and effort to complete and submit. Furthermore, the survey is distributed in such a manner that it reaches and is accessible to the vast majority of the identified population. Lastly, Connecticut extensively communicates about the importance and confidentiality of the survey with exited students as per recommended practice in NRB avoidance, which is clearly reflected in our 66.12% response rate.

Even though the response rates of youth with disabilities no longer enrolled in Connecticut schools were representative across all demographic categories, an analysis of nonresponse bias was still conducted as part of standard data analysis procedures. The response rate analysis for nonresponse bias indicated no statistical differences across gender, race/ethnicity, and primary disability for outcomes of respondent youth, one year after leaving high school. This analysis included chi square statistical significance and effect size testing across each of the three demographic and post high school outcome areas. This is evidence that nonresponse bias did not exist.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

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 ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

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 and targets 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	83
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	44

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut's Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner's Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

In FFY 2022, the CSDE determined that there was not currently a need to revise any of the indicator targets. The CSDE will continue to evaluate its progress on the SPP indicators during FFY 2023 and solicit stakeholder input on the current results indicator targets as needed to ensure that they remain measurable and rigorous.

Throughout FFY 2022, the CSDE Special Education Division Director participated in meetings focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities with the following groups: Center for Children's Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website that was created in FFY 2020 continued to be a mechanism to collect broad stakeholder input in FFY 2022. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also continued to build the capacity of stakeholders, including a diverse group of parents, by reviewing and presenting information, sharing resources and reviewing data related to the SPP Indicators and associated activities. The CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the SPP-APR through the existing structures of the LEA Advisory group, the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations

group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state's PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14

Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17

Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6

Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16

Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12

Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets are being made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2013	45.07%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	45.00%	45.10%	52.00%	40.00%-50.00%	25.00%-50.00%
Data	57.14%	60.19%	50.00%	64.52%	50.68%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	30.00%	35.00%	40.00%	45.10%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
44	83	50.68%	30.00%	53.01%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

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 ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

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 mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets 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 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	197
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	54
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	102

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut's Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner's Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

In FFY 2022, the CSDE determined that there was not currently a need to revise any of the indicator targets. The CSDE will continue to evaluate its progress on the SPP indicators during FFY 2023 and solicit stakeholder input on the current results indicator targets as needed to ensure that they remain measurable and rigorous.

Throughout FFY 2022, the CSDE Special Education Division Director participated in meetings focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities with the following groups: Center for Children's Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website that was created in FFY 2020 continued to be a mechanism to collect broad stakeholder input in FFY 2022. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also continued to build the capacity of stakeholders, including a diverse group of parents, by reviewing and presenting

information, sharing resources and reviewing data related to the SPP Indicators and associated activities. The CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the SPP-APR through the existing structures of the LEA Advisory group, the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state's PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

- Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14
- Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17
- Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6
- Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16
- Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12
- Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets are being made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	68.60%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	68.00%	68.70%	68.70%	50.00%	50.00%
Data	61.88%	66.96%	75.00%	80.00%	81.48%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	55.00%	55.00%	55.00%	68.65%

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
54	102	197	81.48%	55.00%	79.19%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Increase the reading performance of all third-grade students with disabilities (SWDs) statewide, as measured by Connecticut's English Language Arts (ELA) Performance Index.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/Special-Education/SPP/CT-Part-B-State-Systemic-Improvement-Plan.pdf>

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2018	51.50%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	47.50%	48.50%	49.00%	51.60%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Numerator- Sum of all third grade SWDs' individual ELA Performance Index points	Denominator- Total count of ELA participating third grade SWDs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
2,994	6,031	49.66%	47.50%	49.64%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

The data source used by the CSDE is the statewide ELA summative assessments: the Smarter Balanced (SB) Assessment and the Connecticut Alternative Assessment (CTAA), administered statewide to students in Grades 3-8 and 11 in the spring of 2023. The SiMR data are directly derived from the State's approved ESSA Accountability Index.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

The State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) for the Connecticut State Department of Education's State Systemic Improvement Plan is to increase the reading performance of all third-grade students with disabilities (SWD) statewide, as measured by Connecticut's English Language Arts (ELA) Performance Index. The methodology for calculating the ELA Performance Index starts by taking the scale score on the statewide ELA assessments: the Smarter Balanced (SB) Assessment and the Connecticut Alternate Assessment (CTAA), administered statewide each spring, and converting that scale score into an appropriate index point value that ranges from 0 to 110 (the individual ELA performance index). The ELA Performance Index is then calculated by averaging the individual performance indices (numerator) earned by all participating third grade students with disabilities (denominator).

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

<https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/Special-Education/SPP/CT-Part-B-State-Systemic-Improvement-Plan.pdf>

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

SSIP Leadership Team

The CSDE formed an SSIP Leadership Team, to increase the collaboration between the Bureau of Special Education (BSE), the Academic Office, the Center for Literacy Research and Reading Success, the Office of Dyslexia and Reading Disabilities, as well as other internal CSDE colleagues and external partners; share expertise, research, and resources; support the State's SSIP; plan professional learning (PL) opportunities to build capacity on reading/literacy strategies for SWDs; and support local education agencies (LEAs) as they work toward improving the reading performance of third grade students with disabilities (SWDs) – Connecticut's SiMR. There are a variety of existing initiatives in the state that are coordinated by the CSDE, which directly relate to and support the SSIP. The CSDE's infrastructure has improved through the development of an SSIP Leadership Team. The regularly scheduled virtual meetings has allowed the CSDE colleagues to discuss the content, implementation, and effectiveness of these initiatives, and restructure existing and create new activities to ensure that CSDE initiatives continue to evolve in a way that best supports the reading instruction of SWDs in the state. Through this collaborative effort, the SSIP Leadership Team worked to develop and maintain the Web-based repository of resources, plan for ongoing PL opportunities, and support the Connecticut Intensive Intervention Implementation Initiative (CONNi4) project, which will support LEAs in implementing the data-based individualization (DBI) process.

Online TA and Resource Library

While previous SSIP-related resources focused almost solely on evidence-based reading instruction and intervention, it was necessary to broaden the scope of this work this past year to support districts with the statewide implementation of the new IEP document and the Connecticut Special Education Data System (CT-SEDS). An intra-department approach to formulate a strategy, develop resources, and provide technical assistance (TA) was utilized. The BSE worked collaboratively with internal CSDE colleagues, as well as external partners such as the State Education Resource Center (SERC), the Connecticut Alliance of Regional Educational Service Centers (RESCs), and the state's parent training and information (PTI) center in order to provide TA and online resources. In its effort to build capacity statewide, and to support the implementation of the new IEP and the CT-SEDS, the BSE created a New IEP/CT-SEDS webpage to provide information, documents, and tools, and to assist in the roll-out of the new IEP, as well as developed CT-SEDS flowcharts and a CT-SEDS Preview Series to provide a preview of how CT-SEDS will support various special education processes. A five-part Specific Learning Disability (SLD) Preview Series was developed to assist planning and placement team's (PPT) engagement in thoughtful, comprehensive, data-driven dialogue about students referred for special education due to a suspected SLD:

- 1) Overview,
- 2) Subject-Specific Worksheets,
- 3, Multidisciplinary Evaluation Report,
- 4) Understanding Common Profiles of Reading Disabilities, and
- 5) Understanding a Pattern of Strengths and Weaknesses.

Ongoing Professional Learning

The CSDE, in collaboration with the SERC and the RESCs, also provided two robust PL opportunities to build capacity and support the statewide implementation of the new IEP and CT-SEDS: IEP Quality Training and CT-SEDS Expert User Training.

In its effort to build capacity statewide to address the needs of students with reading difficulties, including those identified with SLD and SLD/Dyslexia, the CSDE, in collaboration with the SERC, made the following nine, free online webinars available to districts. Webinars 1-3 are included in an online module, available to educator preparation programs (EPPs) (see #10 below).

1. Increasing Awareness of SLD/Dyslexia: Implications for CT Educators
2. Using Literacy Screening Data to Support Students with Reading Difficulties
3. Remediating and Accommodating Students with SLD/Dyslexia at the Secondary Level
4. Identifying Students with SLD/Dyslexia: An Online Module
5. It's Never Too Late: How to Motivate and Teach Older Struggling Readers with SLD/Dyslexia
6. Case Study Review of a CT Student with SLD/Dyslexia
7. Identifying Students who are Gifted and Talented and Have SLD or SLD/Dyslexia
8. Distinguishing Between Typically Developing English Learners and Students with Reading Difficulties
9. SLD/Dyslexia: Connecting Research to Practice in Connecticut

10. Online Module for EPPs

The CSDE, in collaboration with the RESCs, sponsored six, free cohorts of “Systematic Teaching of Basic Literacy Skills” available to districts. Participants learned systematic, structured methods for teaching decoding, encoding, oral, and written expression to students with learning disorders and specific language disabilities.

Additionally, as part of its Structured Literacy Program Training Series, the CSDE, in collaboration with the SERC, provided the following fifteen, free training sessions available to districts.

1. Wilson Reading System Introductory Training (7 sessions)
2. Orton-Gillingham Introductory Training Program (5 sessions)
3. Lindamood Bell Phoneme Sequencing Program for Reading, Spelling, and Speech (1 session)
4. Lindamood Bell Visualizing and Verbalizing for Language Comprehension and Thinking (1 session)
5. Lindamood Bell Seeing Stars (1 session)

CONNi4/DBI Project Leadership Team

The DBI Leadership Team meets bi-weekly to monitor the progress of the CONNi4/DBI project. Members of the DBI Leadership Team include BSE staff members and researchers at the University of Connecticut (UConn). During DBI Leadership Team meetings, the team discusses the development of training and implementation resources and materials, data gathered from the districts/schools participating in Cohort 1, recruitment of districts/schools for Cohort 2, the deliverables, timeline, and outcomes of the project, and information and communications regarding the SSIP/SiMR and the CONNi4/DBI project to be shared with stakeholders, including the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC) and CT’s PTI.

The CONNi4 project consists of a series of PL activities: 1) DBI Launch training, which provides: an overview of the CONNi4/DBI project, information on the importance of intensive intervention, how DBI aligns with multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) and specially-designed instruction, the steps of the DBI process (pre-DBI data review and selection of an evidence-based intervention, progress monitoring, diagnostic assessment, and intervention adaptation), the conditions needed for DBI success (leadership, capacity and infrastructure, and communication and collaboration), and an opportunity for teams to create a DBI plan using a case study; 2) Job-embedded PL (i.e., District DBI Leader Check-ins, School DBI Team Meetings, Teacher DBI Check-ins); 3) DBI Diagnostic Assessment and Adaptation PD; 4) Cross-District Site Visits; and 5) Cross-Cohort DBI Summit. Surveys are completed by participants, consisting of items corresponding to assessment and intervention skills and beliefs, frequency of data-based decision making at the district/school level, implementation of evidence-based practices, reflection activities corresponding to the training, and an evaluation.

The UConn Research Team meets weekly to discuss the scope of work, provide updates on job-embedded PL and the desktop application/graphing system developed for DBI plans, which allows for data visualization to identify if response to intervention is strong or limited, and to create supplemental materials and resources. This team also recruits educators statewide for a DBI Advisory Board that meets at least once per year to provide input on project materials (e.g., reading intervention resource map, intervention selection tip sheet, fidelity form).

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

SSIP Leadership Team

The regularly scheduled virtual SSIP Leadership Team meetings have allowed the CSDE colleagues to discuss the content, implementation, and effectiveness of these initiatives, and restructure existing and create new activities in order to ensure that CSDE initiatives continue to evolve in a way that best supports the reading instruction of SWDs in the state. Through this collaborative effort, the SSIP Leadership Team worked to develop and maintain the Web-based repository of resources, plan for ongoing PL opportunities, and support the CONNi4 project, which will support LEAs in implementing the DBI process.

Online TA and Resource Library

The following list highlights some of the content resulting from this improvement strategy and the associated metrics illustrate the short-term outcomes that were achieved.

- CT-SEDS Preview Series Page views: 18,942
- Specific Learning Disability (SLD) Preview Series Page views: 5,686
- Session 1: Overview views: 708
- Session 2: Subject-Specific Worksheets views: 660
- Session 3: Multidisciplinary Evaluation Report views: 511
- Session 4: Understanding Common Profiles of Reading Disabilities views: 368
- Session 5: Understanding a Pattern of Strengths and Weaknesses views: 183

While quantitative metrics data reviewed to evaluate the outcome of individuals accessing the electronic repository of resources developed during FFY 2022 showed that a high number of individuals viewed or downloaded this information over the past 12 months, qualitative data in the form of stakeholder input yielded additional valuable information regarding the topics and content of the resources posted this past year. Feedback on the resources was received from a diverse group of individuals including district administrators and teachers, parents, parent advocates and attorneys throughout the state, via Office Hours and ongoing PL opportunities, which suggest that the newly developed resources were generally regarded as timely, appropriate, accessible, and practical. Although the ever-changing educational landscape provided a challenge in finalizing and releasing some of the guidance quickly, CSDE staff members worked extremely hard to be responsive to the immediate needs of the state’s school districts and will continue to work to provide helpful guidance, TA, and resource documents moving forward.

Ongoing Professional Learning

Several activities were planned during the FFY 2022 as part of ongoing PL activities. The following list highlights the PL offerings from this improvement strategy and the associated metrics illustrate the short-term outcomes that were achieved.

Two robust trainings were made available to districts to assist in the implementation of the new IEP and CT-SEDS. Below is a breakdown of total participants for each training.

1. CT IEP Quality Training (68 training courses): 3312 participants
2. CT-SEDS Expert User Training (in-person and virtual): ~800 participants
3. CT-SEDS Office Hours Meetings (19 meetings): ~500 participants

4. CT-SEDS Targeted Sessions: 1731 participants
5. CT-SEDS Functionality Webinars: ~ 600 participants

Nine SLD and SLD/Dyslexia online webinars were made available to districts and one online module was made available to EPPs. In total, 958 participants attended these online sessions. Below is a breakdown of total participants for each online offering, as well as participants response to the evaluation prompt: "The lectures and corresponding materials increased my knowledge and skills in SLD/Dyslexia."

1. Increasing Awareness of SLD/Dyslexia: Implications for CT Educators: 82
 - 87% strongly agree or agree
2. Using Literacy Screening Data to Support Students with Reading Difficulties: 44
 - 91% strongly agree or agree
3. Remediating and Accommodating Students with SLD/Dyslexia at the Secondary Level: 55
 - 89% strongly agree or agree
4. Identifying Students with SLD/Dyslexia: 37
 - 89% strongly agree or agree
5. It's Never Too Late: How to Motivate and Teach Older Struggling Readers with SLD/Dyslexia: 49
 - 88% strongly agree or agree
6. Case Study Review of a CT Student with SLD/Dyslexia: 90
 - 86% strongly agree or agree
7. Identifying Students who are Gifted and Talented and Have SLD or SLD/Dyslexia: 32
 - 94% strongly agree or agree
8. Distinguishing Between Typically Developing English Learners and Students with Reading Difficulties: 54
 - 85% strongly agree or agree
9. SLD/Dyslexia: Connecting Research to Practice in Connecticut: 7
 - 100% strongly agree or agree
10. Online Module for EPPs: 508

The Structured Literacy Series, "Systematic Teaching of Basic Literacy Skills," was offered across six cohorts during the FFY 2022. In total, 117 participants attended these sessions.

The Structured Literacy Program Training Series provided 15 training sessions during the FFY 2022. In total, 363 participants attended these sessions. Below is a breakdown of total participants for each different training offered.

1. Wilson Reading System Introductory Training (7 sessions): 166
2. Orton-Gillingham Introductory Training Program (5 sessions): 124
4. Lindamood Bell Phoneme Sequencing Program for Reading, Spelling, and Speech (1 session): 28
5. Lindamood Bell Visualizing and Verbalizing for Language Comprehension and Thinking (1 session): 27
6. Lindamood Bell Seeing Stars (1 session): 18

CONNi4/DBI Leadership Team

The CONNi4/DBI project is currently in the full implementation phase with four districts/six schools participating in Cohort 1 and nine districts/nineteen schools participating in Cohort 2. In Cohort 1, 46 educators participated in the two-part DBI Launch Training. Feedback was collected from all participants. During session 1, 100% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that all of the training objectives were met, the training activities were useful for reinforcing concepts, and the training activities were useful for thinking about practice. During session 2, 95% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that all training objectives were met and 90% of participants found the training activities useful for reinforcing concepts and thinking about their practice. The DBI Diagnostic Assessment and Adaptation PD was provided to 33 educators in a self-paced module format. Three districts participated in the Cross-Cohort DBI Summit. They shared how DBI led to changes in their professional practice, teaming structures within their school site, and that DBI is beginning to influence district-level changes in how reading intervention and data-based decision making are implemented.

Participants receive ongoing, job-embedded PL through District DBI Leader Check-ins, School DBI Team Meetings, and Teacher DBI Check-ins. During the first round of School DBI Team Meetings, DBI plans were created for 15 students, ranging from first through fifth grade. Thirteen of the 15 students (87%) receive special education/related services. Twelve of the 15 students continued receiving DBI throughout the remainder of the school year. Ten of the individuals providing the interventions are special education teachers and three individuals are literacy specialists/interventionists. Fidelity checklists were created to monitor the success of the DBI implementation. Fidelity of the first round of School DBI Team Meetings, ranged from 89% to 100%, ranged from 78% to 100% during the second round of School DBI Team Meetings, and ranged from 83% to 100% during the third round of School DBI Team Meetings, with some districts demonstrating independence in DBI school team meeting implementation at the conclusion of the year. Interventionists often served as the facilitator of the meeting when reporting updates for their students and school, and district support staff provided assistance with decision making for adaptations. A protocol is sent to School DBI Teams in advance of the meeting in order to assist in meeting preparation and facilitation.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

SSIP Leadership Team

A key infrastructure improvement strategy for successful SSIP implementation and evaluation will be the continuous enhancement of intra-agency collaboration. The BSE's joint efforts with colleagues in the Academic, Turnaround, and Performance Offices, as well as the Center for Literacy Research and Reading Success and the Office of Dyslexia and Reading Disabilities (within the Talent Office) will continue to be critical in supporting districts in providing effective reading instruction to SWDs in grades K-3 in the upcoming year.

Considering the reading needs of SWDs during the Alliance District improvement planning meetings as well as promoting the disaggregation of data by specific subgroups will help to ensure that the district-level work targeted for the SIMR is embedded into the greater improvement efforts of the districts and not viewed as a separate, burdensome requirement. It is anticipated that a BSE staff member will attend planning meetings, review Alliance District applications, and act as a liaison with the Turnaround Office is expected to continue as a priority during the next reporting period.

Special attention will still need to be given to the social, emotional, behavioral, and mental health needs of our students. Many students throughout the state have experienced personal and family health issues and deaths, housing and food insecurity, disengagement from the school community and challenges with returning to in-person instruction. In order for students to be available to learn and make academic progress, a holistic approach to

assessing, understanding, and appropriately addressing their needs will be necessary during the upcoming year and potentially thereafter. SWDs may require more support in this area than their typical peers and focused intra-agency collaboration between the Office of Student Supports and the BSE will be important to the outcome of creating useful resources and supporting district staff in this area.

Online TA and Resource Library

The expansion of the Web-based repository to include new SSIP resources, further resources to support the implementation of the new IEP and the CT-SEDS, as well as additional resources as determined by the SSIP Leadership Team, and through other intra-agency meetings, will continue into the FFY 2023.

Ongoing Professional Learning

During the FFY 2023, the CSDE, in collaboration with the SERC and the RESCs, will continue to make available the IEP Quality Training and CT-SEDS Expert User Training. Additionally, the CSDE, in collaboration with the SERC, will continue to make available the nine, free online webinars to districts, as well as the free online webinar for EPPs during the FFY 2023. In addition, the CSDE, in collaboration with the RESCs, will sponsor another six, free cohorts of the series "Systematic Teaching of Basic Literacy Skills" during the FFY 2023. Finally, as part of its Structured Literacy Program Training Series, the CSDE, in collaboration with the SERC, will provide the following eleven, free training sessions during the FFY 2023.

1. Wilson Reading System Introductory Training: 5 sessions
2. Orton-Gillingham Introductory Training Program: 5 sessions
3. Lindamood Bell Phoneme Sequencing Program for Reading, Spelling, and Speech: 1 session

CONNi4/DBI Leadership Team

CONNi4/DBI project is a multi-year initiative between the CSDE and UConn. The six schools from four districts (Cohort 1) have completed the first year of DBI implementation. Four schools from three of these districts have continued to meet with the CONNi4 team to discuss sustainability and maintenance efforts. These meetings include DBI interventionists, building principals, and district leaders responsible for elementary reading and special education. We are learning about which components of the DBI model are continuing to be implemented. Cohort 2 launched DBI during the 2023-24 school year (twenty schools from ten districts). The UConn Team will continue to collect data throughout the implementation of the DBI project to evaluate a) student achievement, b) changes in educators' perceptions and skills, and c) how districts sustain, maintain, and scale up implementation of intensive intervention/tiered instruction. By the next reporting period all data from Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 will be reported. Moreover, by the CONNi4/DBI Leadership Team will have identified new schools and districts, as well as additional schools from Cohorts 1 and 2, to participate in the next phase of this project.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

Connecticut Literacy Model

Ongoing Professional Learning of Evidence-Based Practices

CONNi4/DBI Project

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Connecticut Literacy Model

The CSDE, along with literacy initiative partners (i.e., UConn, Hill for Literacy, and Literacy How), have worked to implement and refine an intensive reading strategy to serve as a model for use by schools. The intensive reading strategy, known as the CT K-3 Literacy Initiative (CK-3LI) includes priority goals and actions that reading research has identified as effective for improving reading outcomes for Kindergarten through Grade 3 students, including students with disabilities and English Learners.

Ongoing Professional Learning of Evidence-based Practices

Through its SSIP efforts, the BSE remains committed to building district capacity to meet the needs of SWDs in the area of reading through the training of special education teachers statewide in the area of Structured Literacy (see "Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period." for details about specific training offerings). Structured Literacy is a highly explicit, systematic approach to teaching foundational skills and components of literacy.

CONNi4/DBI Project

The CONNi4 project implements data-based individualization (DBI). DBI is a specific way of implementing intensive intervention using a five-step process that involves intervention, progress monitoring, and adaptation. In step 1, pre-DBI data is reviewed to select an evidence-based intervention program aligned to the student's need. The program should be: a) validated by rigorous experimental studies; b) implemented with groups of students who have not responded to secondary prevention; and c) one used for secondary prevention but—in DBI—at the student's instructional level. Initially, interventionists provide small-group or individual instruction with only those adjustments agreed upon in collaboration with the school team. In step 2, progress monitoring is used to track student response to the intervention. Progress monitoring assessments should be: a) general outcome measures (usually) with reliability and validity for target skills; b) done weekly or more frequently; and c) used for secondary prevention but—in DBI—is at the student's instructional level. Progress should be evaluated relative to an aimline based on a pre-defined goal and adequate based on tracking the aimline. In step three, diagnostic assessment data are examined. These data include standardized assessments, teacher-made tests, and observations. Discussion focuses on how the data might reveal issues in the dimensions of the taxonomy. Step 4 involves the creation of a student-specific intensive intervention plan. During the meeting, the school-based team agrees on a plan that is based on the examination of the diagnostic assessment data, focuses on one or more areas of the taxonomy, and includes the ideas most likely to increase achievement. In step 5, the plan developed is implemented, student response to the intervention is tracked, and the school team cycles back to step 3 as needed. The interventionist implements the plan and tracks the student's progress closely, meeting with the school team every 5-6 weeks to evaluate the student's performance data relative to the student's aimline. If progress is strong, then intervention is continued but the team may choose to incorporate adaptation to further accelerate student progress and if the progress is inadequate, the team returns to step 3.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes.

Connecticut Literacy Model

The CSDE, along with literacy initiative partners (i.e., UConn, Hill for Literacy, and Literacy How), have worked to implement and refine an intensive reading strategy to serve as a model for use by schools. The intensive reading strategy, known as the CT K-3 Literacy Initiative (CK-3LI) includes priority goals and actions that reading research has identified as effective for improving reading outcomes for Kindergarten through Grade 3 students, including

students with disabilities and English Learners, which directly supports the State's SSIP and SiMR.

Ongoing Professional Learning of Evidence-based Practices

Through its SSIP efforts, the BSE remains committed to building district capacity to meet the needs of SWDs in the area of reading through the training of special education teachers statewide in the area of Structured Literacy (see "Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period." for details about specific training offerings). Structured Literacy is a highly explicit, systematic approach to teaching foundational skills and components of literacy, which supports the State's SSIP work and SiMR. Below are examples of two of the trainings offered by the CSDE.

1. Orton-Gillingham Introductory Training Program: The program introduces the rationale for providing structured literacy instruction and the O-G Approach, which is based on best practices. Educators receive training in the components of language that underlie reading acquisition and a scope and sequence of instructional approaches appropriate for struggling learners.
2. Wilson Reading System Introductory Training: This course provides participants with an overview of the Wilson Reading System (WRS) 4th Edition curriculum. The course examines how WRS addresses the teaching of phonemic awareness, word identification, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension through an integrated study of phonology, morphology, and orthography with students in grade 2 and above with persistent phonological coding deficits.

CONNi4/DBI Project

The CONNi4 project implements the DBI process through explicit, systematic, and strategic training and support for the participating districts and schools in the cohort. By the next reporting period, the six schools from four districts (Cohort 1) will have completed the second year of DBI implementation, and the twenty schools from ten districts (Cohort 2) will have completed the first year of DBI implementation. For Cohort 2, a DBI Coaching Cycle will be initiated, which includes a series of meetings. At the initial meeting, the UConn Coach will review the DBI process with the School DBI Team and work with the school on the selection of students. At the next meeting, student progress monitoring data will be discussed along with adaptations that may need to be made to the delivery of the intervention based on the student response to intervention. The UConn Coach will provide modeling throughout the first and second meeting. The third meeting consists of reviewing the adaptations made to the student intervention and discussing implementation fidelity. After this meeting, the UConn Coach begins completing site visits to monitor implementation fidelity. At the fourth meeting, the School DBI Team discusses if additional students may benefit from DBI. The School DBI Team leads this meeting with support from the UConn Coach. At the fifth meeting, the DBI Coaching Cycle begins for a new student, and the School DBI Team will lead this meeting along with all other meetings in this DBI Coaching Cycle, with support from the UConn Coach. The DBI process will support the progress of the State's SiMR through this intensive intervention implementation initiative.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Connecticut's Literacy Model

CK-3LI was evaluated through a series of rigorous research studies that meet the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) evidence standards and recommendations for selecting evidence-based practices. Results indicated statistically significant impact on measures of phonemic awareness, word reading, and reading fluency with increasing effects across years of implementation. Results suggest that Connecticut's Literacy Model (CK-3LI) had a strong impact on key reading outcomes of students in participating schools and that impacts increased over multiple years of implementation.

Ongoing Professional Learning of Evidence-based Practices

The evaluation of professional learning opportunities is ongoing. In total, 379 participants attended these sessions. Below is a breakdown of participants response to two evaluation prompts: "As a result of this session, I have increased my knowledge and skills" and "The information was useful and relevant and will assist with informing my practice".

1. Wilson Reading System Introductory Training: 363
 - 100% strongly agree or agree; 98% strongly agree or agree
2. Orton-Gillingham Introductory Training Program: 124
 - 98% strongly agree or agree; 99% strongly agree or agree
3. Lindamood Bell Phoneme Sequencing Program for Reading, Spelling, and Speech: 28
 - 100% strongly agree or agree; 100% strongly agree or agree
4. Lindamood Bell Visualizing and Verbalizing for Language Comprehension and Thinking: 27
 - 100% strongly agree or agree; 100% strongly agree or agree
5. Lindamood Bell Seeing Stars: 18
 - 100% strongly agree or agree; 100% strongly agree or agree

CONNi4/DBI Project

The CONNi4/DBI project is a multi-year initiative between the CSDE and the UConn. The first cohort of districts and schools began implementation during the 2022-23 school year, and the second cohort of districts and schools will begin implementation during the 2023-24 school year. By the next reporting period, we will have identified new schools and districts, as well as additional schools from Cohorts 1 and 2, to participate in the next phase of this project. The DBI Leadership Team will have analyzed statewide summative assessment results for third grade students with disabilities, in addition to the student-level data from universal screening and progress monitoring assessments gathered through the DBI process, as well as data gathering from educators participating in Cohorts 1 and 2.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

The data source used by the CSDE for the SiMR is the statewide ELA summative assessments: the Smarter Balanced (SB) Assessment and the Connecticut Alternative Assessment (CTAA), administered statewide to students in Grades 3-8 and 11 in the spring of 2023. The SiMR data are directly derived from the State's approved ESSA Accountability Index. See "Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change." above for a summary of additional data collected during FFY 2022.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Connecticut Literacy Model

The CSDE, along with literacy initiative partners (i.e., UConn, Hill for Literacy, and Literacy How), will continue to implement and refine an intensive reading strategy to serve as a model for use by schools. The intensive reading strategy, known as the CT K-3 Literacy Initiative (CK-3LI) includes priority goals and actions that reading research has identified as effective for improving reading outcomes for Kindergarten through Grade 3 students, including students with disabilities and English Learners, which directly supports the State's SSIP and SiMR. During the 2023-2024 school year, the CSDE, will be engaged in TA in order to create or enhance our Comprehensive State Literacy Plan and infrastructure.

Ongoing Professional Learning of Evidence-based Practices

Through its SSIP efforts, the BSE remains committed to building district capacity to meet the needs of SWDs in the area of reading through the training of special education teachers statewide in the area of Structured Literacy (see "Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period." for details about specific training offerings). Structured Literacy is a highly explicit, systematic approach to teaching foundational skills and components of literacy, which supports the State's SSIP work and SiMR.

CONNi4/DBI Project

DBI will launch with an additional cohort of districts and schools during the 2024-25 school year. By the next reporting period, we will have identified new schools and districts, as well as additional schools from Cohorts 1 and 2, to participate in the next phase of this project. The participants in this new Cohort will undergo the same project activities as the participants in Cohorts 1 and 2, however refinements will be made based on lessons learned throughout the implementation with those Cohorts.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

SSIP Leadership Team

The CSDE's infrastructure has improved through the development of an SSIP Leadership Team.

Online TA and Resource Library

While quantitative metrics data reviewed to evaluate the outcome of individuals accessing the electronic repository of resources showed that a high number of individuals viewed or downloaded this information, qualitative data in the form of stakeholder input yielded additional valuable information regarding the topics and content of the resources posted. Feedback suggest that the newly developed resources were generally regarded as timely, appropriate, accessible, and practical.

Connecticut's Literacy Model

Results suggest that Connecticut's Literacy Model (CK-3LI) had a strong impact on key reading outcomes of students in participating schools and that impacts increased over multiple years of implementation.

Ongoing Professional Learning/Ongoing Professional Learning of Evidence-based Practices

Results suggest that these ongoing PL opportunities, including ongoing PL of evidence-based practices, had a strong impact on participating educators.

CONNi4/DBI Leadership Team/Project

While we are only in second year of DBI implementation, preliminary quantitative and qualitative results suggest the CONNi4/DBI project had a positive impact on participating districts/schools, teachers, and students.

Evaluation data for infrastructure and evidence-based practices support the decision to implement the SSIP without any modifications. However, a variety of data will continue to be collected and analyzed; data-based modifications to the SSIP will be made, if necessary.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

The Part B results indicator data targets were set during FFY 2020. Over a period of five months, the CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the indicator targets for each FFY (2020-2025) during discussions with a diverse group of stakeholders, including parent representatives across each of the six regions of the state. The CSDE conducted 21 virtual meetings with interpreters available for participants to solicit broad stakeholder input. The participants of these sessions were sent follow-up surveys to capture input that was not provided during the meetings. The survey was also made available to the public through the newly created State Performance Plan Website. Extensive and thoughtful consideration was given to the intersection of improvement activities and the targets for performance of students with IEPs. Additionally, student feedback was collected via a live interactive presentation through Connecticut's Youth Advisory Council. Finally, a virtual meeting was held with the State Advisory Council on Special Education (State Advisory Panel) to build capacity on understanding the progress of SSIP implementation and to solicit stakeholder feedback. Virtual presentations were also held for parent leadership forums, the Commissioner's Round Table for Parent Engagement, and parent informational sessions collaboratively facilitated by our Parent Training and Information Center (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center). Input was received in the form of live comments/discussions and survey questions and was reviewed by CSDE staff to inform further development of Indicator 17.

In FFY 2022, the CSDE determined that there was not currently a need to revise any of the indicator targets. The CSDE will continue to evaluate its progress on the SPP indicators during FFY 2023 and solicit stakeholder input on the current results indicator targets as needed to ensure that they remain measurable and rigorous.

Throughout FFY 2022, the CSDE Special Education Division Director participated in meetings focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities with the following groups: Center for Children's Advocacy (CCA), Special Education Equity of Kids of Connecticut, (SEEK), Connecticut Legal Aid, Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE), Office of Child Advocate, LEA Advisory Group, Council of Approved Private Special Education Facilities (CAPSEF), Connecticut Associate of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS), Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS) (Principals) and CPAC (Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center).

The CSDE SPP/APR Overview Website that was created in FFY 2020 continued to be a mechanism to collect broad stakeholder input in FFY 2022. The webpage contains an overview of the SPP/APR including a summary video. Additionally, the CSDE posted the feedback/recommendations/suggestions that diverse groups of stakeholders have provided throughout the process. There is also an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the feedback and/or submit additional recommendations.

During FFY 2022, the CSDE also continued to build the capacity of stakeholders, including a diverse group of parents, by reviewing and presenting information, sharing resources and reviewing data related to the SPP Indicators and associated activities. The CSDE solicited stakeholder input on the SPP-APR through the existing structures of the LEA Advisory group, the State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC), the Special Populations group as well as a diverse group of parents through the state's PTI center parent meetings. To help structure the conversations, the CSDE grouped the indicators into six "clusters" that were reviewed separately.

Cluster One: Indicators 1, 2, 13, 14
Cluster Two: Indicators 3, 7, 17
Cluster Three: Indicators 5, 6
Cluster Four: Indicators 8, 15, 16
Cluster Five: Indicators 11, 12
Cluster Six: Indicators 4, 9, 10

While no revisions to targets are being made at this time, the CSDE is considering the input received during these meetings concerning potential trainings to be offered, resources to be developed, data analysis considerations, and how to best use advisory groups for evaluating progress and planning. The CSDE also sought input from these groups on how it could increase parent engagement in the SPP-APR process. Specifically, the group members were asked to provide input on how the CSDE can build the capacity and obtain input from a diverse group of parents to support the development and implementation of professional learning and technical assistance activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. When looking at the diverse membership of the parent group, stakeholders were asked to consider: race, ethnicity, geographic location, age, sex/gender, socioeconomic status, educational background, and work experience.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

Online TA and Resource Library

The CSDE employed multiple strategies to engage stakeholders with regard to the key improvement efforts that occurred during the FFY 2022.

- The Connecticut Parent Advocacy Center (CPAC), the State's PTI Center, attended a series of virtual meetings to provide input in several guidance documents revised with the implementation of the new IEP and the CT-SEDS. Additionally, the BSE, in conjunction with the CPAC, hosted multiple webinars for families regarding the new IEP and the CT-SEDS.
- Other stakeholder activities that occurred during FFY 2022 included the BSE Back-to-School Event; the BSE Office Hours meetings with a special educators; meetings with the Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE) Executive Board; meetings with Regional ConnCASE Directors; and State Advisory Council on Special Education (SAC) presentations and updates. Engaging in meaningful dialogues with these groups helped to inform the content of the BSE guidance and the development of resources for the online library, specifically with regards to the implementation of the new IEP and the CT-SEDS.

SiMR/SSIP and CONNi4/DBI Project

The BSE obtained feedback regarding the SSIP/SiMR and the CONNi4/DBI Project from the SAC. The CSDE formed a SSIP stakeholder group to assist the agency with the development of Phase One of the SSIP. This group (described in the state's SSIP Phase One submission) provided the State with the expertise and diverse perspectives needed for planning and development. Since the submission of Phase One, the CSDE has been using the SAC as its primary stakeholder group for input (including the resetting of targets), feedback and dissemination of information related to the SSIP. SAC members must be individuals involved in, or concerned with the education of children with disabilities; and representative of the ethnic and racial diversity of, and the types of disabilities found in, the state population.

The SDE provided the opportunity for the UConn Team to attend in the 2-day IEP Quality Training to ensure alignment of the CONNi4/DBI Project with other statewide initiatives. The SSIP Leadership Team and the UConn DBI Leadership Team prepared and delivered a presentation at the BSE Back-to-School Event to share information about the CONNi4/DBI Project, answer questions from stakeholders, and recruit districts/schools for the Cohort. Additionally, a presentation was prepared and delivered during the SAC Indicator 17 (SSIP) and CONNi4/DBI Update Meeting. The presentation provided a review of the SSIP/SiMR, a review of SSIP activities, including the CONNi4/DBI Project, defined the DBI process, provided examples of each of the five DBI steps, and shared status updates of the implementation of the CONNi4/DBI project. After the presentation, there were opportunities for the stakeholders to ask questions and write comments in the chat. Additionally, a survey was made available to all participants and allowed them to confidentially share feedback and comments. Items on the survey included: a) additional questions stakeholders still had about the SSIP, including the CONNi4/DBI project, b) an opportunity to share how they felt the CONNi4/DBI project would contribute to supporting the SSIP goal to increase the reading performance of all third grade students with disabilities, c) outcomes from the SSIP, including the CONNi4/DBI project that they are most interested in learning more about, and d) how they would like to receive ongoing updates about the SSIP, including the CONNi4/DBI project.

Furthermore, as part of the CONNi4 project, an Advisory Board has been established, consisting of educators from across the state, which meets at least once annually to provide feedback concerning the project's activities and its implementation design. The Advisory Board includes teachers, administrators, and experts on intervention, progress monitoring, DBI implementation, and implementation science. In addition, research and community partners across the United States who have implemented DBI/MTSS provide ongoing feedback.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Online TA and Resource Library

Similar themes have been identified by the various stakeholder groups that have been convened to support districts with the implementation of the new IEP and the CT-SEDS. Those themes have included: staffing and transportation; student attendance and engagement; the increased need to support students student's social, emotional, behavioral, and mental health needs; the unique challenges for high needs students, minority, and/or low-income students and their families; and the quality of specially-designed instruction.. The BSE addressed these concerns expressed by stakeholders in the development/revision of guidance, resources, and tools, and in the offering of PL opportunities, which were added to the Online TA and Resource Library.

SiMR/SSIP and CONNi4/DBI

During the SAC Indicator 17 (SSIP) and CONNi4/DBI Update Meeting, several themes were identified by various stakeholders regarding the SSIP and CONNi4/DBI project. One theme shared amongst stakeholders was the importance of communicating information about the State's SSIP/SiMR, CONNi4/DBI project, and statewide assessments with parents, so that parents understand the goals of the State, the State's efforts towards meeting these goals, the Districts efforts and progress toward meeting these goals, and their child's progress on statewide assessments. Another theme shared amongst stakeholders was the importance of communicating information with parents at the onset and throughout the DBI process regarding their child, including informing parents of their child's progress monitoring data; sharing with parents the specific intervention their child receives and how it addresses reading foundational skills, so they can support their child at home; including parents in the School DBI Team discussions regarding their child, so they are full, equal, and equitable partners in their child's education; and sharing information about the DBI process. A third theme shared amongst stakeholders was the importance of making all family materials related to the SSIP/SiMR and the CONNi4/DBI project accessibility (e.g., translated in multiple languages and written in plain language). The SSIP Leadership Team and UConn DBI Leadership Team addressed all questions, comments, and concerns raised during the meeting. DBI Family Materials were developed specifically for families about DBI and the DBI process to allow parents to fully understand and be informed about the process. Additionally, DBI training provided to schools/districts contain information on how to

involve families in the DBI process, and how to use the DBI Family Materials to promote family engagement. The SSIP Leadership Team and UConn DBI Leadership Team will continue to provide regular updates to the SAC on the status of the CONNi4/DBI project by email and at future meetings.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

IEP Quality Training

New IEP document and the CT-SEDS

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

CT IEP Quality Training

- Background: During the 2020-21 school year, the BSE worked with the American Institutes of Research (AIR) to develop the CT IEP Quality Training materials. The CT IEP Quality Training was piloted in Fall 2021. Revisions were made to the materials, based on feedback from the pilot. The CT IEP Quality Training was launched statewide in Winter 2022 to “train the trainers” and build state and district capacity. During the summer following the 2021-22 school year, revisions will be made to the training materials, based on feedback from the state and district trainers. The CT IEP Quality Training was launched during the 2022-23 school year. The CT IEP Quality Training is comprised of eight segments: IEP Basics, Present Levels of Performance, Measurable Goals and Objectives Part I, Measurable Goals and Objectives Part II, Supplementary Aids and Services, Secondary Transition, Special Education Service Delivery, and Progress Monitoring in the IEP. Participants in the CT IEP Quality Training will be able to understand how the IEP components create cohesive programs for students with disabilities; develop quality IEPs that (a) are grounded in a student’s present levels of performance; (b) have aligned, rigorous, and measurable goals and objectives; and (c) have established progress monitoring processes; describe how educators in different roles contribute to the IEP development process; and understand how the IEP is documented in the new CT IEP form/CT-SEDS.
- Timeline: During the 2023-24 and 2024-25 school years, the CT IEP Quality Training will continue being implemented statewide. The CSDE is committed to a cycle of continuous evaluation and improvement of the materials and trainings throughout the implementation.
- Anticipated data collection and measures: Evaluation data will be collected from participants in the pilot, state and district trainers, and all participants in the statewide training, including, but not limited to, school and district administrators, special education leaders, special educators and related services personnel, general educators, approved private special education programs, state agency personnel, institutes of higher education, parents, advocacy groups, and youth.
- Expected outcomes that relate to SiMR: The CT IEP Quality Training will build statewide capacity in not only developing quality IEPs that are not only grounded in a student’s present levels of performance, have aligned, rigorous, and measurable goals and objectives, and have established progress monitoring processes, but will build capacity to better identify a student’s unique needs, design, implement, and monitor the specially-designed instruction and evidence-based interventions for each student, ultimately, improving instruction for and the performance of students with disabilities.

New IEP document and the CT-SEDS

- Background: In the 2018-19, the BSE began work with both an internal team and an external stakeholder group to develop the new IEP document in CT; stakeholder comments were open through October 2019. In September 2020, the CSDE entered into a partnership with the Public Consulting Group (PCG) to support its goals and vision of developing a comprehensive statewide Special Education Data System (CT-SEDS) to make available to all of its local school district partners. CT-SEDS adaptive electronic IEP document is being designed to improve format and flow of information with intuitive, easy to use displays. The new system will include a parent portal for families to access their student’s IEP and other important information as well as a language translation feature to ensure that parents receive information in their native language. The new and improved document will also assist PPTs in navigating the special education process, leading to the development of high-quality IEPs for Connecticut’s students. During the 2020-21 school year, the BSE worked with PCG to design the CT-SEDS. The CT-SEDS Pilot Training was launched in Winter 2022. During the spring of the 2021-22 school year, revisions will be made to the CT-SEDS, based on feedback from the pilot. The BSE implemented the new IEP document and the CT-SEDS statewide in the 2022-23 school year.
- Timeline: CT-SEDS Training will continue statewide through the 2024-25 school year, with ongoing technical support, as needed.
- Anticipated data collection and measures: In addition to the IEP Module, the CT-SEDS will also have a Services Plan Module, Section 504 Accommodation Plan Module, Gifted and Talented Module, and a Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) Module. Data from the IEP Module, including Progress Reports, as well as data from the MTSS Module will be collected to determine the ELA performance of students with and without disabilities on progress monitoring measures.
- Expected outcomes that relate to SiMR: The year-to-year analysis of the achievement for students with disabilities will be used as a factor in determining the effectiveness of instruction and interventions, as well as the need for additional professional learning and technical assistance.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

- CSDE staff/time to commit to current plan – assess current proposed staffing assignments and consider the need to revise the current SSIP implementation methodology
- Scaling up professional learning activities for SSIP – consider increasing the role of other organizations to address SSIP professional learning support
- Ability to sustain current intra-agency partnerships – continue to expand current levels of communication and collaboration throughout the calendar year
- Need to align goals within intra-agency departments, related to literacy.

The State has benefitted from both the virtual and in-person technical assistance opportunities provided by the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and appreciates this additional support. We plan to continue our involvement with the Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) Collaborative and engage with other states in an effort to best support the SSIP and the reading achievement of students with disabilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - 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:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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:

State Special Education Division Director

Email:

bryan.klimkiewicz@ct.gov

Phone:

860-655-8217

Submitted on:

04/25/24 6:09:49 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Connecticut 2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
85.00%	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	16	80.00%
Compliance	20	18	90.00%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B."

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4	97%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	95%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	25%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	92%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	36%	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	92%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4	97%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	93%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	41%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	90%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	23%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	92%	1

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	14	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	84	2

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. §300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	2.76%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	85.66%	YES	1
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	96.26%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	96.12%	YES	2
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	83.95%		1
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

**Data Rubric
Connecticut**

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	52.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	5/3/2023

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in *EMAPS*. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part B

Connecticut

School Year: 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	207
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	81
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	50
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	59
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	9
(1.2) Complaints pending.	10
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	6
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	116

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	315
(2.1) Mediations held.	197
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	69
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	54
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	128
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	102
(2.2) Mediations pending.	62
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	56

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	248
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	83
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	44
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	10
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	4
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	6
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	73
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	165

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	6
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	3
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	2
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	1
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	5

State Comments:

Errors:

Please note that the data entered result in the following relationships which violate edit checks:

State error comments:

CT has no edit check violations. We are providing a data note regarding the increase in written signed complaints filed and complaints withdrawn or dismissed. In 2022-23 Connecticut noted a second year of increases in parent complaints compared to pre-pandemic. These increases appear to be a continued resurgence in complaint filings following the pandemic. All states are feeling the increase in students with anxiety and behavior issues that developed as a result of the isolation during the Pandemic. As parents are increasingly seeking a variety of supports, we see the complaint system being used as a conduit to more productive conversations between families and districts which is directly supported by the significant number of complaints withdrawn. I will note that the increases in withdrawn/dismissed were reflective of the increases in filings.

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:

Connecticut

These data were extracted on the close date:

11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Final Determination Letter

June 21, 2024

Honorable Charlene Russell-Tucker
Commissioner of Education
Connecticut State Department of Education
450 Columbus Boulevard
Hartford, CT 06103

Dear Commissioner Russell-Tucker:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Connecticut meets the requirements and purposes of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Connecticut's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Connecticut's 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's or Entity's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "[How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616\(d\) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B](#)" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2024, as it did for Part B determinations in 2014-2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Connecticut).

In making Part B determinations in 2024, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2021-2022) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2024 determinations, OSEP using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2024 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2023 determination. OSEP did not use NAEP data in making the BIE's 2024 determination because the NAEP data available for the BIE were not comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; specifically, the most recently administered NAEP for the BIE is 2019, whereas the most recently administered NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico is 2022.)
- (2) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (3) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

For the 2024 IDEA Part B determinations, OSEP also considered participation of CWD on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment). While the participation rates of CWD on Statewide assessments were a factor in each State or Entity's 2024 Part B Results Matrix, no State or Entity received a Needs Intervention determination in 2024 due solely to this criterion. However, this criterion will be fully incorporated beginning with the 2025 determinations.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Connecticut's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your Connecticut-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access Connecticut's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 17, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Connecticut is required to take. The actions that Connecticut is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

You will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Connecticut's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600
www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

- (3) "2024 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated Connecticut's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the Connecticut's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, Connecticut's 2024 determination is Meets Requirements. A State's or Entity's 2024 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%, unless OSEP has imposed programmatic Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering three criteria related to IDEA Part B determinations as part of the Department's continued efforts to incorporate equity and improve results for CWD. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State and Entity through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State or Entity that would otherwise receive a score of Meets Requirements would not be able to receive a determination of Meets Requirements if the State or Entity had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is considering as potential additional factors the improvement in proficiency rates of CWD on Statewide assessments. Third, the Department is considering whether and how to continue including in its determinations criteria the participation and proficiency of CWD on the NAEP.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and States and Entities will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, and 6 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the EDPass or EMAPS system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, Connecticut must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency's (SEA's) website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in Connecticut on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after Connecticut's submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, Connecticut must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the State's SPP/APR;
- (2) determine if each LEA "meets the requirements" of Part B, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part B of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, Connecticut must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA's website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) includes Connecticut's determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates Connecticut's efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with Connecticut over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,

Valerie C. Williams
Director
Office of Special Education Programs

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

cc: Connecticut Director of Special Education

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.