

Connecticut Part B FFY 2010 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 revised baseline data for this indicator are 62.5%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because this is the first year the State is reporting the ESEA graduation rate. The State did not meet its revised FFY 2010 target of 85%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline and targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 and improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established targets.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 revised baseline data for this indicator are 15.4%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because this is the first year the State is reporting the ESEA dropout rate. The State met its revised FFY 2010 target of 15.4%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 26.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 34.4%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 70%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.7% for reading and 98.9% for math on the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT). These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98.1% for reading and 98.5% for math on the CMT. The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 95% for reading and math on the CMT.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 92.7% for reading and 91.2% for math on the Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT). These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 91.1% for reading and 90.8% for math on the CAPT. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 95% for reading and math on the CAPT.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 51.2% for reading and 59.2% for math on the CMT. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 47.8% for reading and 58.9% for math on the CMT. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 89% for reading and 91% for math on the CMT.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 45.4% for reading and 37.1% for math on the CAPT. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 45% for reading and 37.6% for math on the CAPT. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 91% for reading and 90% for math on the CAPT.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 14.12%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 14.71%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 20%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 24 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>The State reported that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement.</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010. The State did not identify noncompliance through this review.</p>	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage because the State revised its calculation methodology. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that 14 districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. The State reported that it reviewed the districts’ 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, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the districts identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2010.</p> <p>The State also reported that no districts were identified as having policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.</p> <p>The State reported that 13 of 170 districts did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size requirement of a minimum of five students with disabilities in the district suspended/expelled for greater than ten days or a minimum of ten students with disabilities in the district in each race category.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
<p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator]</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">70.4</td> <td align="center">71</td> <td align="center">70</td> <td align="center">0.60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">5.4</td> <td align="center">5.3</td> <td align="center">6.0</td> <td align="center">0.10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">7.2</td> <td align="center">7.3</td> <td align="center">6.0</td> <td align="center">-0.10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for 5A and 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2010 target for 5C.</p>						<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	70.4	71	70	0.60%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	5.4	5.3	6.0	0.10%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	7.2	7.3	6.0	-0.10%	<p>in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																						
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	70.4	71	70	0.60%																						
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	5.4	5.3	6.0	0.10%																						
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	7.2	7.3	6.0	-0.10%																						
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. [Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>					<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																				
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved: A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); B. Acquisition and use of</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills</td> <td align="center">54.3</td> <td align="center">54.7</td> <td align="center">56</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills	54.3	54.7	56	<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 2011 APR.</p>												
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																							
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills	54.3	54.7	56																							

Connecticut Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. [Results Indicator]	(including social relationships) (%)				The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	63.8	61.7	59	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	50.7	48.7	48	
	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	55.5	54	52	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	33.9	31.7	31	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	26.1	24.2	24	
	These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.				
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]	The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 87.7%. The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 88.5%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 88%. In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.				OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.

Connecticut Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>The State reported that it does not use a minimum "n" size requirement.</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 improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 1.8%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p> <p>The State reported that it does not use a minimum "n" size requirement.</p> <p>The State reported that all nine of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 99.2%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98.2%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 52 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (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 completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>100%.</p>	<p>with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 93.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 77.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 113 of 124 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining 11 findings subsequently were corrected by February 1, 2012.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (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</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
		<p>Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>																				
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 699 1583 1240"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">46.3</td> <td align="center">52.5</td> <td align="center">46.3</td> <td align="center">6.20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">61.2</td> <td align="center">66.5</td> <td align="center">61.2</td> <td align="center">5.30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">78.7</td> <td align="center">82.9</td> <td align="center">78.7</td> <td align="center">4.20%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met all of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	46.3	52.5	46.3	6.20%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	61.2	66.5	61.2	5.30%	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	78.7	82.9	78.7	4.20%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Enrolled in higher education	46.3	52.5	46.3	6.20%																		
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	61.2	66.5	61.2	5.30%																		
C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	78.7	82.9	78.7	4.20%																		
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints,</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to ensure the timely</p>																				

Connecticut Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 98.93%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 658 of 675 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that the 17 remaining findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State reported that the remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005, FFY 2006, and FFY 2007 is the same finding of noncompliance that was originally identified in FFY 2005. The State reported that this one remaining finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was not corrected. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p> <p>OSEP’s March 7, 2012 CIV letter (following its verification visit in November 2011) found that the State did not verify correction for two LEAs with previously-identified child-specific noncompliance by ensuring that each LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance), based on the review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system as required by the IDEA and OSEP Memo 09-02. On May 7, 2012, Connecticut provided OSEP with: (1) its final, revised <u>General Supervision System Manual</u>, that includes procedures for reviewing updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system, to ensure that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., has achieved 100% compliance); and (2) evidence based on updated data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system demonstrating that both LEAs with child-specific noncompliance identified through focused monitoring conducted in 2010-2011 are: (i) correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance); and (ii) has corrected the noncompliance for each child, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA. Therefore, no further action is required.</p>	<p>correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State’s data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02. OSEP is concerned about the State’s failure to correct longstanding noncompliance from FFY 2005. The State must take the steps necessary to ensure that it can report, in the FFY 2011 APR that it has corrected the remaining one finding identified in FFY 2005. If the State cannot report in the FFY 2011 APR that this noncompliance has been corrected, the State must report in the FFY 2011 APR: (1) the specific nature of the noncompliance; (2) the State’s explanation as to why the noncompliance has persisted; (3) the steps that the State has taken to ensure the correction of the remaining finding of noncompliance, and any new or different actions the State has taken, since the submission of its FFY 2010 APR, to ensure such correction; and (4) any new or different actions the State will</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>take to ensure such correction.</p> <p>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 11 and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>
16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 96%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 97.9%. The State did not meet	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to

Connecticut Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>reviewing the State’s FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data, demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 88.9%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 71.9%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 79.5%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 67.7%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 65.2%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 66.7%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 72%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

Connecticut Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 95.45%. However, OSEP's calculation of the data for this indicator is 97.62%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 95.24%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance. In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>