

2021 SPP/APR Stakeholder Improvement Strategies Feedback Process

SUMMARY OF BREAKOUT SESSIONS

INDICATOR 8 (Parent Participation) 11 (Evaluation Timelines) and 12 (FAPE at 3)

INDICATOR 8 Improvement Strategies

The following information/feedback was collected from a representative group of Connecticut Stakeholders:

Factors:

- *Addressing challenges that result in low response rates.*
 - *Study/understand other states strategies such as Hawaii and Oklahoma who have had very high response rates and the role of the school district within those states.*
 - *Parents are more likely to pay attention to communications from their school rather than the state or a vendor.*
- *Ensure survey responses accurately capture a range of parent experiences.*

Suggestions/Strategies

- *Collaborate with other agencies or resources to disseminate the survey.*
- *Perhaps the local school districts can play a larger role in the messaging of the survey.*
- *Use of social media platforms to increase messaging.*
- *Use of text messaging to disseminate the survey.*
- *Collaborate with CPAC to establish community based technical support for the survey. (Language/interpreter support).*
- *Timeline of dissemination of the survey. (Marketing and communications campaigns)*
- *Strategic thinking/timing of dissemination of the survey aligned with other surveys that the school district may be sending out. (i.e., culture and climate survey)*

What data should the CSDE be using to inform the development of improvement activities and continuous improvement for students with IEPs?

- *Publicly share data that is broken down by school district.*

Indicator 8, 11, and 12 Improvement Strategy Feedback

What recommendations do you have for the CSDE to evaluate the effectiveness of these strategies?

- *Share data broken down by school district response over time (increase or decline across multiple years).*

INDICATOR 11 (Evaluation Timelines) and 12 (FAPE at 3) Improvement Strategies

The following information/feedback was collected from a representative group of Connecticut Stakeholders:

Factors:

- *The complexities of Connecticut's initial evaluation timeline. (Example: delay in receiving parental consent).*
- *The increase in Prior Written Notice (5 days to 10 days) creates additional stress on evaluation timeline because Connecticut's timeline runs from Referral through IEP Implementation.*
- *Challenges related to timely scheduling of PPT meeting:*
 - *Ensuring the parent/student are present.*
 - *Challenges related to ensuring proper related services personnel are available for the meeting. In smaller districts related services personnel may not be in the building every day.*
- *Impact of high rates of special education referrals on the process (resources and capacity of the school district).*
- *Impact of COVID-19 on special education referrals.*

Suggestions/Strategies:

- *Use of vendor/electronic system to monitor timelines.*
- *Use of virtual PPT meetings to assist with participation/availability.*
- *Alignment of Birth to Three services and evaluations ((different test, disabilities, assessment strategies).*

Resources & Guidance/Training

- *Share best practice strategies that local school districts are utilizing to ensure compliance with the initial evaluation timelines. Staff training/organizational structure. Sharing of how school districts assign specific responsibilities across different roles related to the timeline.*
- *Addressing turnover in staff who are familiar with the legal requirements (need to train new staff after retirements, transfers, or resignations).*
- *Support districts by identifying specific steps to address delays.*

Indicator 8, 11, and 12 Improvement Strategy Feedback

What data should the CSDE be using to inform the development of improvement activities and continuous improvement for students with IEPs?

- *Analyze data to determine if there is a particular subgroup/disability category of students that are more impacted by lapsed timelines. (i.e., evaluations take longer)*
- *Suggest analyzing data regarding the number of referrals which do not result in a special education evaluation and follow up with districts if warranted based upon trends in the data.*

What recommendations do you have for the CSDE to evaluate the effectiveness of these strategies?

- *Since the overall data show a high level of compliance, address issues of non-compliance on a case-by-case/district-by-district basis.*