

Connecticut Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps														
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 77.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 73.5%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 69%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, progress data from FFY 2005 as well as data from FFY 2006. The State provided the required data.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>														
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 2.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 3.8%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 5.3%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, progress data from FFY 2005 as well as FFY 2006. The State provided the required data.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>														
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 38.7%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 35%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 37.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>														
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations;</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="527 1382 1247 1521"> <thead> <tr> <th>Assessment</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Reading</td> <td colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Assessment	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target		Reading			Math			<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data reflecting all required measurements for Indicator 3B. The State provided the required data.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to</p>
Assessment	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target										
	Reading			Math												

Connecticut Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																		
<p>alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="527 233 1247 318"> <tr> <td>CMT</td> <td>98.4%</td> <td>98.5%</td> <td>96%</td> <td>98.7%</td> <td>98.9%</td> <td>96%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CAPT</td> <td>95.0%</td> <td>91.9%</td> <td>96%</td> <td>94.5%</td> <td>93.9%</td> <td>96%</td> </tr> </table> <p>These data represent progress in part and slippage in part from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 96% for reading and math for the CMT assessment, but did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 96% for reading and math for the CAPT assessment.</p>	CMT	98.4%	98.5%	96%	98.7%	98.9%	96%	CAPT	95.0%	91.9%	96%	94.5%	93.9%	96%	<p>improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>																				
CMT	98.4%	98.5%	96%	98.7%	98.9%	96%																														
CAPT	95.0%	91.9%	96%	94.5%	93.9%	96%																														
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="527 683 1224 930"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Assessment</th> <th>FFY 2005</th> <th>FFY 2006</th> <th>FFY 2006</th> <th>FFY 2005</th> <th>FFY 2006</th> <th>FFY 2006</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Data</th> <th>Data</th> <th>Target</th> <th>Data</th> <th>Data</th> <th>Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td align="center" colspan="3">Reading</td> <td align="center" colspan="3">Math</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CMT</td> <td>29.4%</td> <td>28.8%</td> <td>68%</td> <td>38.8%</td> <td>40.8%</td> <td>74%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CAPT</td> <td>34.1%</td> <td>45.9%</td> <td>72%</td> <td>33.7%</td> <td>32.2%</td> <td>69%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress in reading for the CMT and CAPT assessments, and for math for the CAPT assessment from the FFY 2005 data. These data represent slippage in math from the CAPT assessment from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets.</p>	Assessment	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	FFY 2006	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	FFY 2006	Data	Data	Target	Data	Data	Target		Reading			Math			CMT	29.4%	28.8%	68%	38.8%	40.8%	74%	CAPT	34.1%	45.9%	72%	33.7%	32.2%	69%	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data reflecting all required measurements for Indicator 3C. The State provided the required data.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
Assessment	FFY 2005		FFY 2006	FFY 2006	FFY 2005	FFY 2006	FFY 2006																													
	Data	Data	Target	Data	Data	Target																														
	Reading			Math																																
CMT	29.4%	28.8%	68%	38.8%	40.8%	74%																														
CAPT	34.1%	45.9%	72%	33.7%	32.2%	69%																														
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>These data are not valid or reliable because the State did not provide data for FFY 2006. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether there was progress or slippage or whether the State met its target.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 on the percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. The State provided data for FFY 2005, but did not provide data for FFY 2006.</p>																																		

Connecticut Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>The State was also required to describe in its FFY 2006 APR, the review and if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for: the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies based on data from FFY 2005 that the State was required to report in the FFY 2005 APR; and the LEAs identified as having significant discrepancies in the FFY 2006 APR.</p> <p>With respect to the LEAs identified with having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than ten days in a school year for FFY 2005, the districts completed a 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 to ensure compliance with the IDEA, but the State was unable to provide information related to any revision of policies, procedures and practices because LEA reporting of the status of this process is ongoing through the end of the 2007-2008 school year. Accordingly, the State did not report on the correction of noncompliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 for LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that any noncompliance with the requirements in 34</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected for LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2005.</p> <p>The State did not submit valid and reliable data for FFY 2006. This constitutes noncompliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §300.170(b). The State must provide the required data, including a description of the review and, if appropriate, revision of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for any LEAs identified for FFY 2006 with having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than ten days in a school year, and whether any noncompliance identified with 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected. For districts identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2005 data whose policies and procedures were reviewed consistent with 34 CFR §300.170(b) and that were also identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2006 data, the subsequent review, at a minimum, must include whether there have been changes to the policies and procedures since the last review; if so, whether those changes comply with requirements regarding the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards; and whether practices in these areas continue to</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
		<p>comply with applicable requirements.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must also describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).</p>																
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="527 1027 1398 1409"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>65.2%</td> <td>68.3%</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>7.7%</td> <td>6.2%</td> <td>9.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>6.7%</td> <td>6.9%</td> <td>5.8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>However, the State's FFY 2006 data under IDEA section 618 for this indicator are 66.9% for 5A.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	65.2%	68.3%	65%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	7.7%	6.2%	9.0%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	6.7%	6.9%	5.8%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	65.2%	68.3%	65%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	7.7%	6.2%	9.0%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	6.7%	6.9%	5.8%															

Connecticut Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																								
	<p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and slippage for 5C from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 targets for 5A and 5B and did not meet its target for 5C.</p>																									
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																									
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="527 800 1398 1482"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="527 800 1037 971">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1037 800 1157 971">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1157 800 1276 971">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1276 800 1398 971">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="527 971 1037 1040">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="1037 971 1157 1040">1.5%</td> <td data-bbox="1157 971 1276 1040">.76%</td> <td data-bbox="1276 971 1398 1040">.76%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="527 1040 1037 1179">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1037 1040 1157 1179">2.67%</td> <td data-bbox="1157 1040 1276 1179">1.15%</td> <td data-bbox="1276 1040 1398 1179">1.15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="527 1179 1037 1279">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td data-bbox="1037 1179 1157 1279">12.21%</td> <td data-bbox="1157 1179 1276 1279">14.12%</td> <td data-bbox="1276 1179 1398 1279">19.47%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="527 1279 1037 1380">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1037 1279 1157 1380">43.51%</td> <td data-bbox="1157 1279 1276 1380">20.23%</td> <td data-bbox="1276 1279 1398 1380">20.99%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="527 1380 1037 1482">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="1037 1380 1157 1482">40.08%</td> <td data-bbox="1157 1380 1276 1482">63.74%</td> <td data-bbox="1276 1380 1398 1482">57.63%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1.5%	.76%	.76%	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	2.67%	1.15%	1.15%	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	12.21%	14.12%	19.47%	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	43.51%	20.23%	20.99%	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	40.08%	63.74%	57.63%	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009; and baseline, data, and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior																							
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	1.5%	.76%	.76%																							
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	2.67%	1.15%	1.15%																							
c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	12.21%	14.12%	19.47%																							
d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	43.51%	20.23%	20.99%																							
e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	40.08%	63.74%	57.63%																							

Connecticut Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.	
<p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 87%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 87%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 87%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the revised FFY 2005 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data from FFY 2005 and information demonstrating that it has examined data for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for both overrepresentation and underrepresentation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State provided the required data.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 2.4%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 2.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that two of three findings of noncompliance identified in</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, data from FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 for this indicator. The State was also required to clarify that it examines data, at a minimum, for the six disability categories in determining whether there is disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. The State provided the required data and information.</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311 was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that demonstrate that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173, and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> <p>In the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe its determinations of whether the LEAs identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2006 data are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311. For districts identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2005 data, that were reviewed for compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311, and that were</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		also identified as having disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification based on FFY 2006 data, the subsequent review, at a minimum, must include whether there have been changes to the policies and procedures since the last review; and, if so, whether those changes comply with requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311; and a review of the district's practices for compliance with these requirements.
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 91.9%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 87.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 13 of 13 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99.5%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 97.4%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 97.8%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 12 of 12 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, FFY 2006 data on the percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that include coordinated, measurable annual IEP goals and transition services that are reasonably designed to enable the student to reach the postsecondary goals. The State provided the required data.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 81.1%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 97.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 99.5%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 82 of 84 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported program specific follow up activities.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has corrected the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State’s data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 4, 10, 11, 12, and 13, the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 98.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 95%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 65.2%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 67.3%.</p>	<p>demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 59.6%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 68%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 92.4 %. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 97.1%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>